

**“Theorising Evidence-based Policing: A
Discourse Analysis”**

P. R. Betts BA(Hons) MPA

A Thesis Submitted to the University of Birmingham for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Political Science and International Studies

School of Government and Society

University of Birmingham

February, 2021

Word Count: 77,790

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the rise of evidence-based policing (EBP) in the UK over the last two decades. EBP is a 'what works' initiative, claiming to offer benefits to policing policy and practice based on scientific research graded as 'evidence'. EBP has exerted growing influence in British policing in parallel with attempts to 'professionalise' policing through the development of the College of Policing, imitating the medical 'royal colleges' model. The College is but one example of observable institutional changes occurring to take account of, and so reinforce, the EBP project.

The burgeoning hegemonic status of EBP is met with almost no challenge, despite fierce debate about 'evidence-based policy' in other fields. Drawing on post-structural theoretical perspectives after Foucault, this thesis reports discourse analytical research into selected EBP texts illuminating its 'smaller practices' to reveal relations of power, presented around story-lines, subject positionalities, and institutional modification. This thesis interrogates EBP's central claims of being a neutral, science-based producer of 'knowledge' as a force for 'policing improvement'. EBP is repositioned as doing political work, sharing genealogical heritage with other socio-political projects of late modernity, particularly managerialism and neoliberalism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis is my work and I accept all of its mistakes and frailties as my own. However, as with most PhD projects it would not exist without a broad range of support and encouragement from others along the way. Not only during this project, but in the lifelong education that underpins it. These educators and friends are too many and various to mention, but writing this in Birmingham in winter 2019 there are a number who stand out as particularly important in helping me complete this project.

For their lifelong belief in my academic ‘talent’ such as it is, their unflinching financial assistance through two degrees, and continual love and support in all I undertake, I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my Mom and Dad.

For their advice, challenge and guidance through various academic existential crises *en route* to finally producing a thesis worthy of the name, I owe thanks to my supervision team, Simon latterly, and Pete formerly.

I have also had the unquestionable privilege to meet several outstanding academic colleagues, who have become friends along this journey, both in the UK and Australia. Their combined experience, wise counsel, intellectual inspiration, care and belief in my project has proven invaluable in getting me over the line. “Thank you” to Mari, Dr A, Nathan, Professor George, Fiona H, and Dave Mac.

It is not overemphasising the point to say I would never have considered myself capable, nor had the confidence to undertake this project, without the ten years of

encouragement and support from Emma. From when Annie thought it might be funny to introduce a middle aged police officer to a young radical academic with pink hair to supervise my Masters work, through to finalising my PhD thesis, Emma has become a 'constant' in my life. Even during the 'wilderness years' between graduating from the MPA programme, and being anxious about 'taking the plunge' to return to conduct PhD research she was always encouraged me to 'go for it'. As a supervisor, Emma has been flexible in helping me to manage my 'PhD life' with my 'real life', providing challenge and support in equal measure. She introduced an ageing Marxist to important new theoretical work that have provided intellectual stimulation and caused me to re-evaluate my thoughts, and my life plans. Emma has opened worlds I never thought possible for someone like me. "Thank you" doesn't seem quite enough for all she's done for me. Emma, is an amazing doctoral supervisor and a true friend.

Lastly, for putting up with, and occasionally encouraging (!), my madcap ideas to sign up for a PhD while managing our very busy family and professional lives. For supporting my crazy plans such as absenting myself from our life together to pursue a scholarship in Australia for a month (or two!). For all of the missing 'husband' hours, days and months while I sat with my lap top and books. For 'not minding' my rambling about socially constructed concepts not being 'real', or my theoretical struggles listened to patiently while we were supposed to be enjoying relaxation time taking lunch, coffee, wine or dog walking... For her constant companionship, love, warmth and belief in me, my absolute thanks to the love of my life, my darling Kate.

PRB

Birmingham, summer 2020

PREFACE

“If you think of it like joining a cult, it’ll be much less painful”¹

Evidence-based policing (EBP) has emerged in the UK and other advanced neoliberal economies in the previous two decades. To the non-specialist, it should not be confused with the requirements on the police to collate all available evidence during investigations into criminal matters, which the courts can weigh as *evidence* tending to point to the culpability of an accused person. Intelligence-led policing is something different again: the prioritisation and deployment of police resources against key issues informed by analysis of the cumulated position of a variety of intelligence sources. EBP is neither of these and something quite specific; quite different to the two ‘operational issues’ described above.

Collecting evidence is an important job for the police: to be certain. In criminal cases to ensure miscarriages of justice are minimised and faith can be retained in the justice system. Policing then appears ‘pump-primed’ for an ‘evidence-based’ approach. Policing is arguably intellectually predisposed to look for facts to prove points; gathering ‘evidence’ is what policing organisations exist to do. However, this relates to the prosecution of criminal cases, and that function is nothing whatsoever to do with EBP. EBP is looking for ‘facts’ and ‘truths’ about policing *itself*, and seeks to use these ‘facts’ to ‘improve’ policing through the application of policy changes to policing strategies and tactics. At first glimpse there is an irresistibility to this approach, which carries the hallmark of enlightenment science: the possibility of human progress through our modern ways of knowing, through facts. The great advances of science,

¹ This is a comment made by a junior police colleague advising another student about undertaking the Masters Police Executive Programme at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge, which promotes EBP.

technology and engineering that have been possible in shaping the post-enlightenment modern world. Evidence-based policing is founded on these solid assumptions.

EBP supplants the term 'evidence' over the term 'knowledge', and there are several reasons for this in my view. The distinction of the term 'evidence', over simple 'knowledge', ensures one attaches a status and credibility to 'evidence', beyond simple knowledge or understanding. 'Evidence' implies greater certainty than merely, 'to know'. This is rooted in ideas of knowledge produced by scientific inquiry as being 'better' than knowledge and ways of understanding which may be more anecdotal, artisanal or 'hand-me-down'. The categorisation of particular forms of knowing is important for EBP. The application of the term 'evidence' implies that EBP's knowledge can be relied upon, proven by scientific inquiry through hypothesising and testing in repeatable experimental conditions. It is therefore virtually certain to produce provable 'facts', upon which decisions can be made with a high degree of certainty. The application of the term 'evidence' to particular forms of knowledge has become a cornerstone of EBP and it is a term that is closely monitored and guarded through application of taxonomic devices.

So EBP could be conceived as a 'battleground' over what types of knowledge should be used to 'improve' how policing is done, how decisions are made and resources allocated. Policing has been, and predominantly remains, a craft-based vocation, with ways of knowing based on anecdote, and retained through story-telling via apprenticed new entrants to the craft. EBP is an attempt to shake this approach and

move to what a chief architect of EBP has described as '*a science based profession*' (Neyroud, 2014).

This research project emerged for two reasons. First, from my own 'insider' subject position I have observed first-hand the development of EBP in the UK during the last two decades. Rooted in 'administrative criminology', initially EBP was an emergent academic idea, but in the previous decade or so EBP has gained traction and begun to form the lexicon in which policy initiatives for policing are discussed. Importantly, it has been accompanied by institutional changes which are observable from my 'insider' subject position. Secondly, my 'outsider' subject position as an academic afforded me insights from post-structural philosophies on power, discourse, and knowledge. This meant that I felt an increasing unease with the developments I was seeing towards an increasingly-hegemonic EBP model at an institutional level. My 'external' academic subject position equipped me with the knowledge to critically question what I was seeing from my 'internal' policing subject position. So, I felt I had something to say about what I was seeing. My almost unique dual subject positions therefore provided impetus, a strong rationale and potentially an important reason to write this thesis.

I observed a certain band-waggoning around EBP in language, individuals and institutions. There is a notable thirst, particularly from colleagues seeking career advancement, to learn more about EBP, sign up for courses, conferences, and join newly created societies of evidence-based policing. My own organisation avowed to become an 'evidence-based organisation'. From the vantage of the university I saw

colleagues in that environment equally thrilled at the prospect of the police opening up their data for analysis, and seeking to partner with academics in the production of new knowledge about policing. I noted the explosion of interest in policing degrees, attendant situations vacant of hastily created new departments for 'lecturers in policing', and the development of new centres and institutions. All of this fitted neatly into the marketised landscape of UK higher education chasing impact, funding, more externality, 'real world' application, relevance and knowledge transfer in its pursuit of advancement in ranking tables. These trends are observable in both academic individual career advancement and institutional aggrandisement. EBP appears therefore to be in happy harmony; a coalition forming of policing and academia around common neoliberal goals.

From my dual subject positions however, something appeared rotten in the state of Denmark. EBP appears to ignore or gloss over the debates in social and political sciences on the nature of knowledge, critique of evidence-based policy in other fields, and wider more critical-radical critiques of problems with UK policing.

A number of policing colleagues discussed in hushed tones concerns about the appliance of science to policing, a move away from our more craft-based apprenticed knowledge and the seemingly unrelenting march towards EBP. Often the issues to which EBP turned its attention seemed trifling compared to the bigger challenges facing the service. Nobody could quite articulate why, but some senior people in policing are uncomfortable with EBP as a grand project. To the EBP champions these concerns are easily dismissed as the incoherent whining's of the luddite who simply

doesn't understand the science: people who were resistant to change, and would come to see the benefits over time through being more educated or enlightened. The articulated 'benefits' of EBP are often met with indifference on the part of the luddites, maybe lacking the tools to voice their concerns or perhaps simply too busy to think too much about it. The luddites are ultimately passive in their acquiescence to EBP's champions with their passion for their new project.

The conception of a 'battleground' over types of knowledge therefore is not entirely useful. There is a discursive contest, for sure, as policing moves towards science and away from anecdote, but portraying it as a significant debate exaggerates the reality of what is occurring here. It seems to me to be a very one-sided battle. It is a limp battle, with only one side doing the fighting. The EBP side also comes equipped with the weaponry of well-considered and articulated arguments, the tactical advantage of framing the terms of the battle, and is increasingly securing its field position with institutional reforms and support from revered and high status individuals, state and institutional actors which will be difficult to overcome. In short, EBP either has – or is producing – 'the evidence' to secure its own position. The Ludditian side is seemingly lacking the energy, insight, weaponry or 'bothered-ness' to fight, or even articulate a position. Having given almost three decades of my life to policing, and considered the emergence of EBP very deeply, there is a danger for me that unchallenged thinking on EBP will lead to irreversible damage to the progress policing as a potential force for social good or social justice could make in future years.

From my outsider academic position, the understandings I take from Michel Foucault's genealogical work about knowledge-power, the importance of discourse in his genealogical work in shaping problematisations, what is possible in particular time periods, the significance of knowledge hierarchies and classification, and the impact discourse has on institutional modifications all mean that I feel privileged to have insights other colleagues in policing may not possess. From Foucault's great theses on madness and prisons, I have insight into the import of charting institutional modifications over time. I believe I am bearing witness in policing to such modification that needs to be examined to understand how we arrived at our present condition with EBP becoming increasingly strategically important. To use Foucault's own language, I feel I may have the tools available to me to explore the rules, sites or conditions in which the EBP discourse is emerging. Given the duality of my insider-outsider policing-academic subject positions, I feel an incumbency to attempt to apply these theoretical insights to what I observe in policing in a way that might allow for the emergence of alternative ideas.

For me, this thesis starts exactly from this latter point. There is a gap in the critical consideration of the changes we are seeing in UK policing that are being driven through the EBP project. This thesis is aimed at that gap, and is a humble attempt to give an alternative view for people to consider. Positioned as it is, I suppose I found the energy to attempt to articulate the concerns of the luddite.

PRB

Birmingham, spring, 2020

CONTENTS

Abstract

Acknowledgments

Preface

Contents

List of Abbreviations

List of Figures and Tables

Introduction

Chapter 1: Debates and Tensions of Evidence-based Policing

1. Neoliberal Strategic Alliances
2. Who Decides On The Evidence? Political Evidence Selection
3. How To Decide Which 'Evidence Counts'? Academic Evidence Selection
4. Enlightenment Scientific Method And 'Objective Truths'
5. Seven Areas of Concern with EBP
6. Summary

Chapter 2: Epistemological Considerations: Towards a Theoretical Framework

- i.* Foucault's Archaeology and Genealogy
- ii.* Episteme and Discursive Formations
- iii.* Hegemonic Narratives
- iv.* Power-Knowledge
- v.* Subject Positioning
- vi.* Techne, Discipline and Governmentality
- vii.* Summary

Chapter 3: Methodology

1. Methodological Approaches Of The ‘Discourse Analysts’
2. Methodological Considerations On My Own Research Design

Text Selection

- *Academic Texts*
- *Operational Policing Texts*
- *Political and Official Texts*
- *Special Interest Group Texts*

Coding

Analysis

A note on validity

3. Concluding remarks / shaping the thesis

Chapter 4: Story-lines of Evidence-Based Policing

1. ‘Policing Improvement’
 - i. *The ‘cops’ need ‘enlightening’*
 - ii. *‘Improvement’ as economic efficiency*
 - iii. *‘What works’*
2. ‘Real Science’
 - i. *The nature of ‘evidence’*
 - ii. *Medicalisation*
Treatment
Dosage
 - iii. *Randomised Controlled Trials (RCT) and Experiments*
3. Development of Evidence-based Policing
 - i. *‘Implementation’*
 - ii. *‘Critique’*
4. Summary

Chapter 5: Subject Positionalities of Evidence-Based Policing

1. Subject Positions ‘within’ Policing

Battler Cops and Professional Officers

2. Subject Positions Within Academia

The Magicians

The Priests

The Gurus

The Prophets

3. Subject Positions of Politicians

The independent, non-ideological, politician

Chapter 6: Institutional Modification as Discourse Institutionalisation

1. Academic Institutional Modification

New university courses

New publications

New EBP ‘knowledge’ partnerships

Research funding

New Research Centres and Conferences

2. Institutional modification in Policing

College of Policing

Evidence-based research driving policy

3. Institutional modifications in political governance of policing

Evidence-based ‘requirements’

4. Societies’ of Evidence-Based Policing (SEBP)

Chapter 7: Conclusion

References: Primary Sources

- *Academic Texts*
- *Operational Policing Texts*
- *Political and Official Texts*
- *Special Interest Group Texts*

References: Secondary Sources

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACMD – Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs

ADA – Argumentative Discourse Analysis

APCC – Association of Police and Crime Commissioners

EBP – Evidence-based Policing

PFEW – Police Federation of England and Wales

PSA – Police Superintendents Association

NPCC – National Police Chiefs Council

NPIA – National Policing Improvement Agency

NPM – New Public Management

PKF – Police Knowledge Fund

SEBP – Society of Evidence Based Policing

WWCCR – What Works Centre for Crime Reduction (College of Policing)

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1: Schematic of UK Policing Organisations	Pg. 143
Table 1: Search Results for Texts	Pg. 144
Table 2: Coding Framework for Discourse Analysis	Pg. 165
Table 3: WWCCR, Effect Rating Scale (WWCCR, 2016a)	Pg. 310
Table 4: WWCCR Research Quality EMMIE Scale (WWCCR, 2016)	Pg. 312

INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores the emergence of evidence-based policing (EBP) in the UK. By 2020 EBP exerts significant influence on how actors think, speak and act about UK policing. EBP now shapes policing discourse and it is becoming institutionalised. The question is why? How did we come to this position? And what might the impacts be?

EBP has emerged as 'the answer' to a range of unspecified, unclear and somewhat trifling managerialist 'problems' with policing that have become prioritised for action. Examples problematised include a lack of 'professionalism' or efficient use of resources. Simultaneously, fundamental 'big questions' about policing and crime, and the 'critical' or theoretically-informed academic literature that discusses these have become increasingly marginalised, lacking influence in the policy sphere (Smith, 2010). What type of policing should a modern society aspire to have, or what counts as 'crime' in the early part of the twenty-first century are questions increasingly othered by EBPs more managerial interests (Hillyard and Tombs, 2007; Pemberton, 2007).

The language of EBP has become common parlance among civil servants, police officers, and policing's political overseers and EBPs rise is remarkable. EBP's lineage in the UK can be traced to about the mid-1990's. Although its intellectual origins lie in the experimental and administrative criminology emerging in the US which focussed on policing from about the 1970s. Notably the US research of scholars such as David Weisburd and Larry Sherman. Although differing in their approach to American experimental criminologists, in the UK context the research of academics such as

Nick Tilley and Gloria Laycock began to influence the Home Office, founded on 'what works', during the early 2000s. In 2001 Laycock established the Jill Dando Institute of Security and Crime Science based at UCL, London. This was synchronous with UK government policy dominated by 'what works', attracted significant public funding and built on 'problem oriented policing' to bring research into policy. Laycock was engaged in the Home Office Police Research Group, and the Home Office 'Tilley Awards' on effective practice in policing are named in honour of Professor Tilley. Therefore, EBP emerged within a context of policing and government from circa 2000 that built on New Labour's 'what works' agenda, and with which EBP shares an ideological heritage. Hillyard et. al. (2004) note the increasing tendency of the Home Office to control research funding on crime in the direction of empirical 'what works' / crime science agenda, charting progress to 2004. EBP though builds on a much longer standing partnership tradition of criminologies linked to state agendas, which date back to at least the League of Nations in the 1930's (Walters, 2003).

The development of EBP intensified from the mid-2000s. In 2007 Sherman began his tenure as Wolfson Professor of Criminology at Cambridge University, and Director of the Institute of Criminology and has been a major influence on the progression of EBP in the UK. In 2008 the Institute founded a new Police Executive Programme, focussing on EBP to bring 'science' to the way policing operates. This extended the legacy of state-linked 'police studies' in the Department of Crime Science at Cambridge, whose history is well documented (Walters, 2003). The Cambridge programme has become a refuge for retired senior officers to mentor and supervise students. For example, Peter Neyroud was the Chief Constable heading the National Policing Improvement

Agency (NPIA) overseeing its transition into the College in 2012/3, and is now a lecturer of EBP at the Institute. Sherman is a strong advocate of 'experimental criminology' and his leadership of the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge through education, research funding and dissemination have ensured his ideas have been extremely influential in shaping and progressing EBP.

The Society of Evidence Based Policing was founded at Cambridge in 2010, later spawning associated societies in other advanced neo-liberal economies (US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand), bringing together academics, police officers and policy makers. A new 'College of Policing' was announced by the Home Secretary in 2011 to 'professionalise' policing and champion EBP, further institutionalising EBP as an entity within academia, politics and policing. The College aspires to attain 'Royal' status, following the model of medical royal colleges. Galvanised by the partnership of Cambridge, Home Office and the College, who exercise or contribute to control over access to police research funding, data and dissemination using a variety of mechanisms, EBP has grown in strength and stature.

During the first two decades of the twenty first century therefore, there is notable coming together of what Young (1986) describes as 'administrative criminology', the growth of the 'what works' agenda in UK government, and a growing narrative on the need to 'professionalise' policing. Taken together, these are the roots of EBP. Web of Science citation indices for the term '*evidence-based policing*' supports this summarised trajectory and key dates. Before 2005, the term was cited a handful of times a year. By 2012, this had risen slowly to 226; with 339 by 2014. By 2019, the

number of citations of this term increased rapidly to 1420. Sherman's (2013) paper "*The Rise of Evidence-based Policing: Targeting, Testing and Tracking*" is the most cited work on the subject at 141 citations, demonstrating his influence.

Completing an MPA degree in Birmingham in 2011 I was first introduced to social policy as an academic discipline, and the work of Michel Foucault. Sharing critical insights on both, developed during my MPA, with senior policing colleagues who had completed the Cambridge programme became 'clunky' conversations. Unfamiliar with literature outside of the EBP 'bubble', there appeared uncritical acceptance of the teachings of the programme in the way one would eulogise about discovery of a new religion. They were simply unaware of theoretical or critical socio-criminological literatures, or critique of evidence-based approaches in other policy fields after 2 years of postgraduate education. This caused me great concern given the positions of influence we occupied within policing. It seems of crucial importance to have senior police officers who think independently, disruptively, challenge and are critical of what they do in the hope we can progress and improve policing for citizens and the public good. The interests of EBP seem to me to be incredibly narrowly focussed on very peculiar aspects of 'policing improvement' and from a very limited pseudo-scientific perspective. EBP has developed obsessive concerns over minor matters of only managerial interest, such as the deployment of police resources in ways that are most 'efficient' (see Heaton and Tong, 2016, for a discussion on EBPs potential to improve cost-effective use of police resources following NHS drugs methodologies as an example). Many police and academic colleagues might not prioritise these managerial concerns as the key problems of modern policing in need of further

research and investment.

Rooted in administrative and experimental criminology, EBP is obsessed with methodology (randomised control trials in particular) and hierarchies of knowledge – how one might judge knowledge to ascribe it the label of ‘evidence’. EBP is concerned with the ‘robustness’ of ‘what works’ research in a way I had not encountered in my previous under- or post-graduate education. It is problematic that EBP’s advocates judge the quality of knowledge (research) being applied to policy and labelled as ‘evidence’ using simple hierarchies without apparent understanding or consideration of the literature on the contested nature of knowledge, or post-structural perspectives on power-knowledge as a contingent product of discourse (Foucault, 1991). Transmitting this opinion to police leaders and officials through a Cambridge education programme as ‘true’ amplifies this concern.

There is a significant literature that critiques ‘what works’ (on the NHS see Morrel, 2006, or Fotaki, 2009, as examples). There is also a weighty ‘critical’ literature debating the use of *evidence-based policy* in various other policy fields. There are calls for evidence-based policy-making to be challenged (Marston and Watts, 2003, on youth justice in Australia), with others suggesting it should be more modest in its claims (Solesbury, 2001; Bullock and Tilley, 2009). Additionally, there is a vigorous and ongoing debate within criminology on the nature of the discipline, that demonstrates the narrow ‘type’ of criminology upon which EBP is based is only one of a range of options that could be deployed to support the development of policing policy and practice (Chancer and McLaughlin, 2007; McAra, 2017).

While such debates can be found in the EBP academic literature, they are largely absent from EBP's growing hegemonic institutional status *within policing* that I have observed from my 'insider' position. Debates and nuances are generally written out of other texts advocating for EBP approaches in spaces such as the College of Policing, or official statements that favour of simplistic motif story-lines.

"This body (the UK College of Policing) has tremendous potential to follow the pathway to innovation Johnson (2010) associates with such major advances as the printing press, which was inspired by the wine press: a lateral-thinking style of adaption of an idea used in one setting (evidence-based medicine) to another (such as evidence-based policing)" (Sherman, 2013, p.379)

Setting aside the arrogance of this claim, the lexicon of EBP as it becomes institutionalised appears unaware of critique of the 'evidence-based' policy movement in other domains (Sanderson, 2002; Pawson et al, 2005), or the debates within criminology on the relationship of its knowledge production to the state (Walters, 2003; Hilyard et al, 2004), or these are at least glossed over.

There are centuries of philosophical debate on modernity, science, knowledge and its liberating potential for humanity. Given the philosophical debates on science, the criticisms of evidence-based policy-making found in other policy domains, and the unsettled arguments on the state of the criminology discipline, Sherman's claim that deployment of particular types of research 'evidence' into policing through EBP shares a similar potential for human flourishing as the invention of the printing press feels like a very bold assertion indeed. Certainly, it is a claim worthy of further examination in this thesis.

The Organisation of the Thesis

This thesis is set out in seven chapters. In Chapter 1 I present a review of the literature surrounding the development of EBP. I describe and unpack the 'debates and tensions' apparent in EBP that arise from the literature. There is notable absence in the EBP literature of critically-positioned, post-structural, theoretically informed research. I have engaged with wider literature in producing this chapter, and so bring in relevant studies from criminology, social policy work from fields other than policing, and work on the sociology of knowledge to help position some of the problems identifiable with EBP's progression.

I organise the literature that advocates for furtherance of the EBP approach into two broad camps: EBP 'purists' that are typified by the work of the 'Cambridge school' promoting pseudo-scientific approaches; and EBP 'realists' or 'critical realists'. 'Realist' work typically identifies the tensions caused by pursuing positivist pseudo-scientific methods in the production of research knowledge about policing as a complex social phenomenon. I argue the realists' archetypal position in offering critique becomes undermined however by their final position which falls to the 'lure of relevance' (Laster, 1994; Chan, 1994) by suggesting amendments to 'how' EBP might be done better (Bullock and Tilley, 2009). For example, in dealing with the problems caused by 'knowledge hierarchies' (a cornerstone of EBP) that grade research according to its method of production or usefulness for policy makers, realist work is characterised by advocating the extension of knowledge that should be 'included' within EBP discourse to embrace more mixed methods research (Willis and Mastrofski, 2016). Realists therefore, rather than following the tensions they expose

to a different conclusion that questions the ontological assumptions upon which EBP rests, often end up supporting EBP as a concept, albeit with some recommended modifications (see Ellefsen, 2011 as a further example).

The 'purist' literature on the other hand is obsessive about guarding the scientific boundaries of EBP, supporting its constructed knowledge hierarchy taxonomies, and the work is largely 'applied' and atheoretical. 'Purists' build on more traditional 'crime science' looking at causation, mirroring statist strategic objectives. Purists advocate use of positivist pseudo-science methods, such as randomised control trials, to be included and admitted as 'gold standard evidence'. The development of EBP as a project is a combination of advocacy and debate of the purist / realist research which comprises the existing domain of EBP literature. I argue both purist and realist positions are flawed for different reasons. However, importantly both positions ultimately support the continual extension of EBP as a project and so ensure a continuation of EBP discourse.

I identify four key themes from the literature that I use to structure Chapter 1. First, I explore 'neoliberal strategic alliances' that are promoted between individual and institutional actors through EBP discourse. These relationships share strategic alignment on neoliberal objectives, such as advancing individual market position. Second, 'political evidence selection' summarises the existing literature on political interference in 'evidence-based' policy. Following Harding (1992), I draw distinction 'old politics' that crudely self-selects research 'evidence' to support preordained policy positions, and 'new' or 'obscure politics' that pre-wire outcomes due to normalised

assumptions. Third, 'academic evidence selection' I suggest is an example of the 'new politics' that has been expanded through EBP discourse and has the effect of including or 'othering' research knowledge. This 'othering' is facilitated and (re)produced through the development of disciplinary governance elements through EBP. Examples of this include knowledge hierarchies and conditional access to funding or data through institutional reforms. Fourth, 'enlightenment scientific method and objective truths' refers to the underpinning foundational beliefs of EBP: that the adaption of pseudo-scientific method, aping its language, methods and standards can somehow produce objective truths, 'facts' and 'evidence' upon which policy improvements can be made for 'better policing'. I conclude Chapter 1 by summarising seven areas of concern with EBP that arise from the literature and I subsequently address through my empirical work.

Chapters 2 and 3 set the background to my research, covering theoretical framing and method. In Chapter 2 I set out the epistemological foundations upon which my approach rests. A thesis of this nature requires this important space to set out my understanding of Foucault's key concepts upon which I rely in producing my discourse analysis of EBP. Foucault's work is subject of contestation and interpretation in a variety of studies, which meant I returned to translated original texts to develop my own understanding. Chapter 2 presents my understanding of Foucault's key concepts based on my own reading of Foucault's translated original works. I present discussion on archaeology and genealogy; episteme and discursive formations; hegemonic narratives; power-knowledge; subject positioning; and *techne*, discipline and governmentality.

Foucault was keen to examine 'issues of current concern' and encourages this to be done through a very specific type of historical method. In Chapter 2 I attempt to lay this out in a way that makes sense and so renders my later analysis accessible to the non-specialist. Foucault described working genealogically to create a "*history of the present*" (Foucault, 1975, p.30-31) in order to understand how our modern problematisations and 'orders' appear as they are. This is founded on an understanding of our present condition as contingent, both on historical period and geographic domain. The demonstrable differences in the way ideas such as 'health', 'sexuality' or 'punishment' are observable in spatial and historical contexts show the contingency about our modern interpretations.

Given this contingency, Foucault was interested in how particular discourses came to acquire hegemonic status and authority, and particularly claims made by social scientists and psychologists. Foucault sought to expose this contingency through detailed archaeological methods to unearth the hidden origin of rules and specific social practices that become institutionalised to claim legitimating authority over time. The founding of the EBP discursive project on notions of the deployment of scientific methods to discover absolute generalisable truths about policing has therefore unsurprisingly attracted my attention as a Foucauldian scholar. Foucault particularly focussed on medicine in much of his work (1963; 1964), notably how in the nineteenth century we see a shift from a focus on 'health' to a more pathologised version we recognise as modern which is focussed on 'disease' and a return to 'normal'. Given the roots of EBP lie in evidence-based medicine, and its associated claims to

legitimate and 'authorise' truths, the use of Foucault's work to examine EBP discourse finds a special resonance to me.

Chapter 3 builds on the discussion in Chapter 2 and sets out a clear methodological approach to my research. Foucault is noted for leaving a lack of methodological instruction for those who follow him (Kendal and Wickham, 1999). Foucault's legacy in this regard means I am not the first scholar who has been left to wrestle the problem of how to conduct discourse research from a Foucauldian perspective. In Chapter 3 I present how other discourse analysts have approached discourse analytical methods after Foucault (Hall, 1997; Fairclough, 1995, 2003; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Howarth, Glynos and Griggs, 2016; Hajer, 1995, 2002). Chapter 3 discusses the merits, shortcomings and commonalities of each approach, before presenting my own method that I have used to produce this research. In conducting this research I borrow most strongly from the work of Maarten Hajer (1995), focussing on the nexus of analyses of story-lines; subject positionality; and institutional modification.

Chapter 3 also details how I selected texts for analysis from the four core groups I identify as having the most influence upon EBP discourse: academia; operational policing; politico-official texts; and special interest groups. I also describe how I have coded those texts. Chapter 3 concludes with a discussion on how my method and work might be assessed; drawing on Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) suggestions on methodological validity judged by the works coherence and fruitfulness, and/or by its solidity, comprehensiveness and transparency.

Chapter 4 sets out findings from my research on EBPs' story-lines. This includes elaborating on the principal story-lines my work reveals, and the function story-lines play in developing EBP discourse. I explain and utilise Hajer's (1993, 1995, 2002, 2003) twin concepts of 'discursive closure' and 'discourse coalitions' in this Chapter. In three sections I present examples taken from the texts to illuminate the story-lines I identify as key components of EBP discourse: 'policing improvement'; 'real science'; and 'development of EBP'. Each story-line section is further subdivided using additional story-lines bracketed under the three core story-lines. For example under 'policing improvement', I present identifiable story-lines on 'the cops need enlightening', 'improvement as economic efficiency' and 'what works'. I present examples of typical narration of these story-lines from the analysed texts, alongside analysis of what this potentially tells us about EBP discourse. The story-lines help to demonstrate the overlapping genealogy with dominant neoliberal discourses of our current time. Additionally, I highlight how my analysis of EBP might help further develop the theoretical work of Hajer and Foucault.

Chapter 5 focusses on subject positions within EBP discourse. I again utilise Hajer's concepts to help explain 'discourse structuration' (Hajer 2002). In essence, the process by which individual and institutional actors come to assimilate discourse as a process of 'discipline'. This structuration positions actors against other actors subject positions within discourse, and against the attendant story-lines of a particular discourse. I present the Chapter with subsections offering analysis of subject positions within policing that I describe as the 'battler cop' and the 'professional

officer'; providing both a material explanation and illustrating these positions with examples of how they are narrated in the analysed texts. I then describe subject positions within academia using my analysis to revise a taxonomy presented in Haines and Sutton's (2000) paper on 'criminology as religion' that proposed criminological academics as religious 'ideal types' based on the work of Weber: magicians; priests, gurus; and, prophets. I present a revised taxonomy, punctuated with examples that appear in EBP texts. Chapter 5 also contains a commentary on the subject position of the non-ideological politician (re)produced through EBP discourse. I present extended examples from the coded texts with analysis of what EBP subject positions mean for EBP discourse, and how they might have grown towards hegemonic status. The chapter is summarised with what the texts help us to understand about the role and function of discourse on subject positionality, extending Hajer's thesis on agency.

Chapter 6 presents analysis of institutional changes that I argue are linked to the development of EBP discourse. Foucault was most interested in charting institutional modifications over time in his great works, according to his historicised archaeological and genealogical methods (Foucault, 1969). I use, and so explain, another conceptual device from Hajer in my analysis of institutional change: 'discourse institutionalisation' (Hajer, 2002, 2003). Hajer defined this as the reform of institutions such that policy begins to be conducted and framed according to dominant discourse. I present Chapter 6 in four sections, charting institutional changes that have occurred as EBP discourse has begun to dominate in academia; operational policing; the political governance of policing; and for 'special interest groups'. Each of the four sections is

further subdivided to highlight new governance techniques. For example, in the section on 'academia' I note recent developments which have occurred to take account of EBP discourse such as: new university courses; new publications; new EBP police-academic 'knowledge partnerships'; new research funding; and, new research centres and conferences. I offer analysis of the genealogical overlaps between the emergence and progress of EBP's discourse and how this helps to sustain the advancement of neoliberal political projects through governmentality. The section presents observable institutional modifications, illustrated with examples drawn from detailed analysis of the selected texts. I end the chapter with a discussion of what my data allows to be said about Hajer's theorem of discourse institutionalisation.

Chapter 7 draws together the analysis presented in Chapters 4-6, summarising my findings by returning to address the seven areas of concern I outlined in Chapter 1. I also offer suggestions on the contribution the thesis makes and where it can be situated within current literatures. I suggest the thesis makes five distinct and important contributions: methodologically, theoretically, and empirically.

Methodologically I have made a contribution as to *how* one might apply Foucault's work and theory, and take it forward as a research tool. I believe a more accessible way of 'doing' discourse analysis research would attract more scholars to this valuable revelatory approach. Discourse analysis has the advantage for the researcher of dealing with 'messy' social issues in an empirical way by highlighting 'micro practices' through examination of the text archive. It provides a route into complex social and

political phenomena, and an access point to reveal contingencies of modern phenomena that appear presentationally 'normal'. Positivist quantitative research adds value to "x+y=z"-type problems looking for causation and 'one best way'. Such approaches see phenomena as simple, and rely on their capacity for discovering underlying 'truths'. Discourse analysis can be criticised as lacking definitive causation (the desire of normalised scientific discourse). However, I believe the discourse analytical approach contains a strength in the potential of its analysis to reveal insights into complex social and political phenomenon such as policing, that should require reflection and re-open foreclosed issues, creating prospects of change.

Theoretically, the insights taken from Foucault on truth, knowledge and power have added significant value to my analysis. In this important respect my work can be seen as supporting and furthering Foucault's theoretical concepts. Thinking about my work through the lenses offered by Foucault inspired my project initially, but have helped me to address why we have come to think, speak and act as we currently do about policing with the emergence of EBP. The challenge of how we might act, speak and think *differently* remains a significant one theoretically. Foucault's (1970) earlier work in the 'Order of Things' described an epistemic determination, and this finds some support in my commentary on the alignment of EBP with wider politico-economic neoliberal discourses. If one accepts a more deterministic version of Foucault, my conclusions on the endurance of neoliberal politico-economic structures, further reinforced by EBP as another phenomenon is quite disheartening for those interested in change. However Hajer's (1993; 1995) work specifically challenges Foucault on this point about change and agency, and introduces Argumentative Discourse

Analytical (ADA) allowing for a more optimistic reading on agency and change. My thesis extends the work of Foucault and Hajer specifically, and adds to the broader literature on post-structural discourse theory.

Empirically the thesis contributes to three distinct literatures. First, it extends what might be said about EBP as a socio-political phenomenon. By archaeologically charting EBP's discursive development through its texts, my analysis suggests that EBP can be understood as a product of discourse. Through presentation of typical samples from texts, my work reveals EBP to have a shared genealogical heritage - a DNA - with neoliberalism. Through use of analytical devices of story-lines, subject positioning, and institutional reform this thesis reveals how EBP might be seen as a product of wider political discourses; produced and reproducing dominant neoliberal discourses. This has clear implications for academics, police officers, politicians and officials advocating EBPs extension as it secures hegemonic status through deepening institutional change.

Second, my empirical work extends the debate on the development of the evidence-based policy movement in other policy fields in the social policy literature. My empirical research contributes to the critical literature questioning the underlying ontological assumptions of the evidence-based policy / 'what works' movement (Sanderson, 2002), but also contains insights for those seeking to develop evidence-based approaches in a 'realist' tradition (Williams and Glasby, 2010). The insights into EBP my work has produced; about EBPs alignment with wider discourses, its disciplinary effects on various individual and institutional actors through governance,

alongside its reproductive properties are potentially useful in understanding the emergence and progression of the evidence-based movement more generally. In sum, the insights generated here into EBP support other literature that suggests 'what works' practices and policies have been successful in securing their elevated status in policy making over the last two decades due to their accord to neoliberal managerialist discourses (see Fotaki, 2009; Morrell, 2006; Smith, 2010; Marston and Watts, 2003).

Third, my work contributes to the literature debating the current positioning of criminology as a discipline, and particularly in respect of the sociological knowledge criminology produces and its relationships with the state (Walters, 2003). Those engaged in the promulgation of EBP (Sherman, 2013; Bullock and Tilley, 2009; Nutley et al, 2012), and those engaged in wider criminological research have argued for a greater role for academics in public policy and debate through various forms of 'public criminology' (see Loader and Sparks, 2010). More recently, others have suggested a need for greater distance between criminologists and state / policy actors, and sound a much louder note of caution on attempts to draw this relationship closer in the way conceived and advocated by EBP advocates (see McAra, 2017; Jackson, 2020). My research highlights examples of individual and institutional academic and state actors operating 'within' the story-lines, subject positions, and institutional changes EBP discourse has (re)produced. To this degree, my work supports Foucault's theoretical insights into discourse operating in a disciplinary way through governmentality that positions and (re)produces itself. This insight contributes strongly to the criminological

debate on professional and public engagement versus the need for distance in research.

CHAPTER 1

Debates and Tensions of Evidence-based Policing

This chapter explores themes and issues relevant to EBP found in both EBP-specific and wider literatures. There is an ongoing trend of incorporation of EBPs core ideas into UK policing institutions, represented through a growing collaboration of policing and academia. Despite this development being encouraged and aggrandised, a review of wider literature provides insights to suggest EBPs progress should be subject of great interrogation than is discovered from surveying existing EBP literature. This chapter reports literatures that underscore these tensions, drawn from debates in criminology, political theory, wider social policy, and a range of contributions on neo-liberalism and the impact on university research.

I present the chapter in five sections. First, I summarise literature on evidence-based policy-making and its links to the production of knowledge. Specifically, as it applies to an ever-increasing alliance of neoliberal strategic objectives between policy makers, politicians, think-tanks and universities. Second, I look at the literature on the *political selection of evidence* for use in policy-making. This contains reported examples of 'old politics' - a blunt interference with research using state power that supports pre-determined ideological policy or party political positions; so-called '*policy-based evidence-making*'. Third, I present what is reported on 'new politics'. These are strategic choices made that pre-wire political outcomes through governance processes of normalisation. This includes *academic selection of evidence* for use in policy, through the increasing deployment of 'experts' and

‘knowledge hierarchies’ into the policy-making space. This features not old school political interference, but a subtler power that pre-determines what counts as evidence, what knowledge is included and excluded, funded or commissioned, based on the methodological and epistemological preferences of the ‘experts’ selected. This uses techniques of governance that have a disciplinary effect on actors and sustain discourses. Fourth, I investigate considerations on the *nature of knowledge* and Enlightenment epistemologies. I conclude the chapter by offering seven points of concern about EBP that arise from consideration of the literature summarised, and that I seek to address through my research.

There are two issues that arise with EBP however that need to be discussed before commencing the review of the scholarship. These problems exist at two levels: for academia and for policing. To deal with the *academic* issues first. In attempting to position itself as a unique and emergent discipline, EBP narrates itself as a settled scientific discipline and this is deeply flawed, even to the casual observer. Pronouncements in the EBP texts I have analysed from the College of Policing and other politico-official and special interest groups (such as the Police Superintendents Association or SEBP) seem to herald a ‘new dawn’ with EBP as a ‘new scientific discipline’ that will revolutionise police policy and operational decision making. Despite being persuasive at first glance, this is presentationally inaccurate. There are very apparent debates that obviously permeate *within* EBP’s academic literature itself. This nuance is essentially a difference of emphasis and approach within the EBP literature I characterise as ‘purist’ and ‘realist’. There is a debate about how EBP should be configured, and what knowledges should be included. However, I contend

that the continuities of these two approaches to EBP – advocating for the extension of research evidence into policy through institutional governance - are more striking than their differences. These continuities represent a common commitment to the notions upon which EBP rests: that the intensified application of pseudo-scientific knowledge can ‘improve policing’. Despite these continuities, I believe the debate within EBP should be greater acknowledged rather than presenting itself as a monolithic discipline to the outside world.

When engaging with literature outside of EBP these tensions become more marked. EBPs rise to occupy the minds, speech and actions of state and individual actors ideologically has occurred apparently irrespective of the ongoing fierce academic debate on the sociology of knowledge and its relationship to the state in criminology. There is extensive literature from specialists in the field who would not subscribe to the EBP view of policing, pseudo-scientific criminological knowledges, and the transfer of academic knowledges into policy spaces using very proximal or ‘partnership’ forms of engagement between policing, state, and academia (see as examples: Drake and Walters, 2015; Chancer and McLaughlin, 2007; Hillyard et al, 2004; Young, 2004; Rock, 2014). Typifying the warnings found in this literature on the development of too-cosy relationships between academic, policy and state, Chancer and McLaughlin note,

“The construction of a market in crime control research and practice has strip-mined the discipline’s broader intellectual integrity and academic prestige. It is peopled with ‘entrepreneurs’ and ‘consultants’ who are willing to sell their ‘expertise’ and provide ‘off- the-shelf’ evaluation packages to law enforcement and criminal justice agencies on a national and international basis. Political clientalism in the commissioning process across a range of managerialized policy sites also means that critical criminologists have difficulty in accessing

funding 'to conduct rigorous, challenging and socially relevant research that will alleviate rather than exacerbate problems caused by conventional crime, while simultaneously confronting the social harms generated by the powerful' (Hillyard et al., 2004: 385)" (Chancer and McLaughlin, 2007, p.159)

As well as providing a reasonable summary of the perspectives found in theoretically informed or critical literature; there are a multiplicity of views about how 'crime', 'justice', and 'policing' should be defined and problematised. This passage highlights many of these issues that are ignored - or at least glossed over - as EBP gains traction.

My research illustrates that EBP is presented by actors as the *best* or *only* way of 'doing policy' for policing; and this has become institutionalised with mechanisms that self-sustain EBPs discourse, making challenge increasingly difficult. Yet, the criminological literature is not as one-sided as EBP discourse presents. For example, Loader and Sparks (2010) in their work '*Public Criminology?*', suggest 5 'ideal-types' as a taxonomy of criminologists; the scientific expert; the policy advisor; the observer-turned player; the social movement theorist/activist; and the lonely prophet. This develops ideas in an earlier paper building Weberian ideal-types in criminology (Haines and Sutton, 2000), which I reprise in my later analysis on subject positions (Chapter 5). The point for here is this, despite EBP presenting as neutral and monolithic by those who advocate it, there is vigorous debate and challenge in wider criminological literature on the nature of the discipline and the use to which its knowledge should be put by the state.

This lack of agreement on EBP with its 'what works' foundations, is not simply confined to criminology literature however. The debate can be contextualised within

a much broader literature on 'what works' in other policy fields. Throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s, there was a fierce debate about 'what works'. Although advocacy for evidence-based policy pre-dates the 1990s, the rapid expansion of literature in the 90s and 2000's can be positioned as a reaction to New Labour's insistence on evidence-based policy in a range of policy areas from 1997. There is extensive coverage of this found in traditional social policy literature and the debate between Chalmers and Hammersley is a good example of the argument. Hammersley (2005) suggested evidence-based policy does 'more harm than good' and warns social policy not to follow the example of evidenced-based medicine, based on theoretical considerations. This was written in response to earlier work of Chalmers, who argued for the extension of systematic reviews to consider a broader range of research 'evidence' than the pseudo-scientific experimental. Chalmers suggests considering other factors such as humility and other implementation factors in formulating policy, from a more practical orientation. Chalmers considers it "very clear" (Chalmers 2005, p.227) that policy should be informed by research evidence underpinned by robust empirical evaluations, based on the moral requirement of needing to do so given the impact policy has on the lives of citizens. This debate is unresolved.

Williams and Glasby (2010) writing on health and social care settings, advocate for a '*knowledge-based practice*' approach to 'evidence-informed practice', which triangulates service user voices, academic research and practitioner knowledges to produce better policy decisions. This is typical of the 'realist revision' literature of academics who believe their research should be used in policy and practical settings to improve lives of citizens, but are uncomfortable with the types of knowledge

hierarchies and taxonomies that have dominated the evidence-based policy landscape. This has led to a range of ideas for change and alterations in language from 'what works', to 'evidence-based', to 'evidence-informed', with suffixes created on policy, practice and these are interchangeable across a range of papers (see Nutley, Davies and Tilley, 2000; Boaz, Davies, Fraser and Nutley, 2019). Sandra Nutley has had a multi-decade career researching and publishing on cross sector developments in evidence-based approaches. Nutley, Boaz, Davies and Fraser (2019) provide a useful look back and summary of this period and identify 10 key strands that still pervade this agenda including: government-led funding; the sustained domination of 'what works' as a research question; and a more general understanding that several knowledges are useful to informing policy and practice, such as user voices and practitioner knowledge – not simply knowledges produced from scientifically 'robust' methodologies. The point for here is that while this agenda has evolved and been contested across a range of academic disciplines and policy areas, there remains a steadfast advocacy amongst 'realists' for using evidence in research – howsoever modified.

Despite theoretical critiques, there is not a universal rejection of the ideas of evidence-based policy amongst academics. In fact the opposite is true. There is a large body of work that remains quite 'purist' in advocating for inclusion of only the most scientifically robust evidence into policy considerations and systematic reviews. The purist view is very influential in the EBP literature. There is a much larger body of 'realist' work that views evidence-based, useful and impactful research as key to academic relevance in modernity. A large number of academics calling for more 'public' sociologies and criminologies do so because they passionately believe in the

power invested in ideas to change the world for the better (see Loader and Sparks, 2010).

These debates can be found within the EBP texts I have studied, and I have even found more recent examples of ardent ‘purist’ advocates of taxonomies of research evidence softening their stance (Sherman, 2017). However this nuance becomes lost as EBP is converted into a hegemonic set of ideas that are narrated by actors through its ‘story-lines’ on policing improvement, effectiveness and so on. I develop this much further in Chapter 4, giving examples of EBP story-lines from a range of actors where this debate is absent. Instead EBP is presented as a coherent and monolithic project. My belief is that this is because to include this discussion makes the EBP project incoherent: it introduces *doubt* into the minds of those it is trying to influence. From an academic perspective, the EBP project would be less useful or attractive to academic, state actor or practitioner ‘partner’ markets if it were presented as contestable, or one of several choices to be made about policing. The power of EBP to develop material and political capital would be lost. Such debates do not neatly ‘fit’ into the core EBP story-lines of objective, robust research evidence supporting ‘guaranteed’ policy improvement.

Consequentially I postulate that EBP has developed ‘in a bubble’, an echo-chamber that aggrandizes its own position to present itself as a unique discipline with a settled set of operating practices and knowledges that are undisputed. This is done by drawing ideologically from a claimed similarity and heritage with evidence-based medicine. This approach has the strategic advantage of positioning EBP alongside a discipline with its genealogy grounded in natural sciences where debates on

knowledge production and policy transfer is more settled. I suggest this is presentationally preferable for EBP in positioning itself as a new ‘useful’ and ‘serious’ scientific discipline. It serves a function for EBP to self-promote and sell its wares in the policy marketplace more effectively than referencing the criminological and social policy literatures with which EBP shares a common – if more controversial – lineage. EBP’s criminological heritage is not accommodated as easily as its claimed medical descendancy by the core tenets of its discourse and is thus avoided or obscured.

It is deeply concerning to me that there is not a detectable louder and more coherent critical voice in the rise of EBP within its own literature. The exclusion, failure to engage or ‘othering’ of critical literature within EBP ensures a consequential lack of visibility to policy makers and lack of impact in turning criminal justice policies in a more liberal direction. This is a question this thesis seeks to address by illuminating how EBP has developed, operates, and what is privileged for inclusion through techniques of governance. The intention of this thesis is to bring that revelation to wider audiences so that EBP can be more accurately positioned as one of many possible approaches to how policing might develop and improve. In doing so, this might help to elevate the visibility of ‘othered’ critical research to policy makers and practitioners in the hope of ensuring EBP can no longer continue to be normatively presented simply as the ‘truth’ about policing, or the ‘one best way’ of progressing policing in the UK.

The second issue is for *policing* and pertains to how EBP is positioned as driving irresistible progress in policing ‘improvement’ and ‘legitimacy’. EBP arises from

positivist crime science, and it has been substantially influenced in its development by ideas from US academics. It seems to me that if EBPs claims of improvement are valid then we should see US policing as a model for progress. And yet there are very, very significant problems with US policing's 'legitimacy', and its punitive criminal justice policies more generally. As I began my research during the summer of 2016 policing legitimacy in the US was arguably at an all-time low following the multiple shootings of unarmed black citizens and subsequent rise of the international activist movement 'Black Lives Matter' in solidarity. The summer also saw a number of 'revenge killings' of police officers in the US as a response (Millward, 2016). As I finalise my thesis in summer 2020, the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis by a US police officer on 25th May 2020 and subsequent international protests about injustices under the Black Lives Matter banner lends further weight to the argument that the UK should think carefully about 'importing' US 'solutions' to aid modern policing's 'legitimacy' or 'improvement': 'evidence-based' or not.

By 2020, after two decades of EBPs development in the UK context, a short scan of academic literature or media commentary on the policing of issues such as youth crime (McAra, 2017), or policing protest (Jackson, 2020) rapidly surfaces doubts over EBPs claimed foundational attributes to 'improve' policing. The US and UK experiences of policing policy – and EBP adding value to this - therefore potentially undermine some of the claims made about EBP's potential for unleashing a new age of innovation and improvement in policing (see Sherman, 2013). Frankly put, one might have expected to be able to identify numerous examples of 'better', 'fairer' or more 'legitimate' policing from EBPs interventions after twenty years of development.

Yet such examples are difficult to pinpoint. The use of such nebulous or ‘empty’ terms such as ‘legitimacy’ and ‘improvement’ in advocating the EBP approach are an entire other discussion. Suffice to say for now, that the lack of consideration or discoverable definitions of such terms in the EBP literature needs interrogation. Quite how EBP has managed to identify, define and prioritise this particular set of policing ‘problems’ to which to add its weight and resources in trying to ‘solve’ remains opaque.

The obvious repost about the lack of observable ‘progress’ or improvement delivered by the growth of EBP is referenced within EBP narratives that comment on its own progress. Broadly, this is represented through a claim that faster and more rigorous application of EBP ‘knowledge’ would produce better results if only the barriers such as ‘police culture’ could be overcome. According to this narrative, the problems with policing highlighted by writers such as Millward (2016), McAra (2017), and Jackson (2020), would only benefit from the extension of EBPs very specific version of scientific research and knowledges into policy and practice. Again, this obscures and excludes the insights of more critically-positioned literatures that suggests more “*harm than good*” (Hammersley, 2005) might emerge from pursuit of criminological pseudo-science linked to policy.

“From this perspective, de-politicized definitions of ‘policy expertise’, ‘relevance’ and ‘application’ are geared towards funding the building of better mousetraps while neutralizing the possibility of critical investigation of the state’s surveillance, criminalization and punishment capacities and highly sensitive ‘crime sites’.” (Chancer and McLaughlin, 2007, p.159)

My research illustrates that irrespective of these valid concerns about policing identifiable when one peeps outside of the EBP ‘bubble’, EBP remains in rude health. Regardless of the tensions and flaws with EBP it continues to make astonishing

progress, drawing in actors and institutions to maintain its discursive march towards hegemony in the policy field of policing. This thesis is normatively critically positioned to trace the growth of EBP from a theoretically-informed discourse analytical perspective, addressing a gap in the literature that exists specific to EBP as a current socio-political phenomenon.

1. Neoliberal Strategic Alliances

EBP relies on the coming together in partnerships of academics, policing practitioners, policy makers and their data. My contention is that EBP has achieved exponential traction and energy compared to what it has actually delivered. This is because there is a shared strategic political and economic benefit in the EBP project from all three actors, based upon *neoliberal* marketisation and *managerialism* in states with advanced neoliberal economies. This is supported by a brief resume of states where EBP has gained the most traction (US, Canada, UK, Australia, New Zealand). This is not a thesis on neoliberalism so I do not treat it to full discussion, but it is worth me clarifying what I understand by neoliberalism and managerialism; two terms that feature in my analysis of EBP.

There are extensive literatures across multiple disciplines dealing with definitions of neoliberalism which I do not catalogue here². Despite various attempts to define neoliberalism (see Harvey, 2005), defining neoliberalism remains contested. Therefore, I limit my comments on neoliberalism based principally on the work of

² In general linking neoliberalism to managerialism and conceptions of 'risk' see Beck, 1992. On the history of neoliberalism as a global phenomenon see Harvey, 2005. Charting neoliberal developments in UK politics Hood, 1990; Giddens, 1998. Specifically linking crime control and criminological developments to neoliberalism see O'Malley, 1998; 2000; Hughes, 1998.

Lemke (2001) as he usefully links neoliberalism to Foucault's work on governmentality, which provides a useful framework for my own analysis. For Lemke (2001), *neoliberalism* can be understood as championing the withdrawal of the state from economic management, allowing the market to prevail, and reduction in state welfare. The neoliberal position relies on individuals being seen solely as economic-rational actors, weighing choices purely based on cost-benefit principles. Neoliberalism is also about the individualisation of problems or issues (see also Rose, 1996). Through neoliberal lenses we have come to see as 'natural' narratives surrounding 'social risks' - crime, social care, pension affordability, unemployment, poverty and so on – as essentially pathologised problems of individuals' 'choices'. Through the neoliberal lens such issues are shifted from problems produced by structural injustices or political policy choices and instead become problematised as a series of individual 'failings': of not working hard enough; not saving enough for old age; making psychological choices to commit crime based on individualised pathologies on delinquency or fecklessness.

Neoliberalism helps the state to hide social-structural inequalities and its responsibility to formulate social policy to address such inequalities behind a range of other bodies acting on behalf of the state, including individual 'rational choices'. Blame is thus moved onto individual actors and arms-length agencies such as ALMOs (Arms-Length Management Organisations, commonly found in provision of social housing) and QANGOs (Quasi-Autonomous Non-Governmental Organisations, often found in policy spaces) in processes of depoliticisation; "*shifting the regulatory competence of the state onto 'responsible' and 'rational' individuals*" (Lemke, 2001, p.202. See also Miller and Rose, 1990; Rose, 2000).

Lemke's (2001) paper considers the political problem for the state of how to maintain discipline on populations from a withdrawn position. Considering how to 'govern', Lemke develops Foucault's ideas on 'governmentality' to expand the thesis: the assimilation by individual actors of the mentality of the state or government. Government then becomes a much broader term than it is traditionally understood. Government follows the ancient Greek understanding as an issue of self-governance, or self-care, ahead of state control or use of executive powers. Lemke and others argue there is a synergy between neoliberalism, with its individualising traits, and governmentality as a feature of modern global capitalism. Throughout this thesis I will use the term 'governance' to describe identified areas of dispersed state power that discipline actors. I argue the link of governmentality of actors through EBP discourse to the growth of neoliberalism cannot be overstated.

Neoliberalism then in its purest sense is the championing of the economic above all else; the triumph of the market, and the ultimate expression of free market capitalism for individual 'choice'. Although a global phenomenon (and indeed globalisation is one manifestation of neoliberal global capital), in the UK context neoliberalism is most associated with Thatcherite political ideology which has dominated British politics since 1979, irrespective of the party of government. The elements of continuity which are observable across the past forty years at a level of policy, and trends within party politics, suggest an underlying neoliberal project in British politics (see Bevir and Rhodes, 1998; Burnham, 2001; Flinders & Buller, 2006; Hall, 2007). Jessop (2007) notes continuity of policy driven by progression of neoliberalism, and argues neoliberalism has become routinised and is hegemonic in the UK.

So neoliberalism can be summarised as championing the market, ‘free’ from state interference, allowing ‘freedom’ for individuals to make ‘economic-rational’ choices. A withdrawn position for the state who’s role becomes one of facilitating market conditions – a partner for global capital and individual choice. The state’s role beyond this – in policy areas such as health or welfare, for example – is reduced as these policy areas are, over time, moved from state responsibility and into market competition. Early advocates of this approach suggested governments’ should be “*steering not rowing*” within a newly-entrepreneurial state (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992). ‘Policy’ therefore becomes a matter for markets to develop, under contract to government. Individuals, in exchange for this ‘freedom’ of choice and ‘rights’ to choose, have to exercise a degree of ‘responsibility’ for their self-governance.³

Managerialism is distinct from neoliberalism but the two are inextricably linked, underpinned with shared marketised values. Managerialism has a long history, potentially traceable to the work of Frederick Winslow Taylor in 1911 with his ‘one best way’ thesis in the ‘Principles of Scientific Management’. This champions the approach that ‘management’ know better than ‘lazy and stupid’ workers. Where this can be underscored with scientific ‘proof’, more the better for turning a profit in the factory. More recently in the UK context managerialism is absolutely linked to the rise of New Public Management (NPM) during the 1990’s, accelerated under New Labour from 1997, to improve ‘performance’ of government. This saw the application of private sector principles in the public sector, marketised tropes in a drive for ‘efficiency’, ‘improvement’ and ‘effectiveness’, often accompanied by growth in

³ For excellent discussions on New Labour’s narratives on individual ‘rights’, ‘responsibilities’ and ‘choice’ on the NHS and Social Care see Fotaki, 2009; Morrell, 2006.

subcontracting 'problems' to private sector management consultancies for 'solutioneering' (Hood, 1994). With clear links to progression of neoliberalism, NPM has been described as "*governing without government*" (Rhodes, 1994; 1997).

The 1990's saw the growth of performance indicators, putting emphasis on managers hitting targets. Hood notes the "*aggrandizement of management*" (Martin 1983) and *a rapid middle-level bureaucratization of new reporting systems (as in the remarkable growth of the 'performance indicator industry')*" (Hood, 1991, p.9). Policing was not immune from this wider managerialist development under NPM and targets became embraced as the core business driving policing in the UK. Despite extensive criticism on issues such as 'gaming', or targets driving perverse behaviours, elements of this approach pervade today (see Guilfoyle, 2013, for a discussion). It is not enough simply to build legitimacy, trust and confidence communities. The movement of trust and confidence 'indicators' must be measured to appease the God of managerialist performance.

Managerialism is founded on a belief that the success or failure of managers can be judged upon their ability to achieve set targets. Within policing, performance targets were centred on the reduction and detection of crime. Predominantly volume crime (burglary, robbery, violent crime and vehicle crime) was measured comparing temporal performance year-on-year or even day-to-day, and spatial performance which pitted Police commanders and teams who were responsible for certain geographic areas 'against' each other and the targets. Reward and recognition followed for 'best in class' performance, and 'performance management' was introduced to address those assessed as 'under-performing'. Myriad other factors

were added into the equation during the first decade of the millennium. By the end of the 2000s, a more sophisticated 'balanced scorecard' approach was adopted in many policing organisations. This not only looked at managers' ability to reduce and detect crime, but also graded community confidence and a plethora of other systems and process information ranging from resilience to people management, to finance, health and safety matters or vehicle fleet availability. Intriguingly, the same 'balanced scorecard' approach was also used in the same period to assess the performance of manager-franchisees of Volkswagen dealerships in the UK.

I contend that EBP needs to be understood in the wider context of neoliberal and managerialist discourses that have created the fertile politico-economic climate in which EBP has emerged in the past two decades. EBP's sharing of ideological predilections – a DNA – with both neoliberal and managerialist discourses to 'improve', be more 'efficient', and measure policing's ability to do so is demonstrated in this thesis from the text archives of EBP. I insist that this is an important insight to understand how and why EBP has come to dominate policing research and policy by 2020. This is an entirely appropriate suggestion given Foucault's insistence on the necessity to adequately 'historicise' the emergence of issues of concern that appear in the present.

Turning to the wider literature on the neoliberalism of universities, Peter Squires (2013) has described a "*quantitative market positivism*" in the higher education sector. Research is a crucial bedfellow of EBP as it provides the 'evidence' on which EBP is founded. EBP and "*quantitative market positivism*" favour 'objective' and 'scientifically

robust research'. Such trends are noted as creating '*academic treadmills*' that limit critical research on crime and deviance to a niche pursuit with more limited opportunities to conduct important, qualitative, challenging and critical research (Smith, 2010). Smith (2010) and others (Hillyard et al, 2004) note that critical approaches potentially suffer from under-funding, or being delivered at all, at the expense of projects which conform to positivist pseudo-scientific methodologies, are particularly quantitative and normatively geared towards evaluation of outcomes required by policy-makers operating within normalised neoliberal discourses (Walters, 2003; Brown, 2010).

In the social policy literature, Sanderson (2002) and Pawson et al (2005) all note what Solesbury (2001, p.4), describes as "*the utilitarian turn in research*". Slater's (2012) observations on the narratives surrounding the funding of academic research, "*REF returnable*' and '*the impact agenda*' – *usually used alongside 'income generation'*", suggests a generalised but notable coming together of the political policy world and the research academic. Projects like EBP that support the 'knowledge transfer' and 'policy impact' imperative that REF-tested universities are seeking to achieve to improve market position are winning the day for resourcing (Collier, 2013). Moreover, this develops an (un)happy strategic alignment between the 'what works' agenda at a policy level (an agenda with which EBP shares an ideological DNA), and the attraction of research funding for universities.

In sum, I suggest this coming together in 'research under contract' as an *alliance* of '*knowledge-commissioners*' and '*knowledge-producers*'. Hillyard et al (2004) and

others (Brown, 2010; Smith, 2010) note the problematic features of drawing together university and state into neoliberal enterprises, including the loss of academic freedom: *"The way a project is formed, takes shape and is disseminated may no longer be in the hands of researchers, but may rest with those who employ and manage them."* (Hillyard et al, 2004, p.379). Armstrong (2020) notes the deleterious impact of the neoliberal marketisation of higher education on research quality, citing neoliberal ideologies as a key reason for a move to faster and more quantitative research and away from more considered qualitative method. This alliance of strategic objectives, determined and shaped by neoliberal discourse, serves to function as a 'disciplinary technique' such that alternative or critical research is increasingly difficult to get commissioned. A lack of serious independent scholarly critique potentially results from such 'governance' (see Foucault, 1964; 1975; Walters, 2003).

Hillyard et al (2004) influential paper argued the by-product of criminology being closer to the state was a discipline increasingly *"oriented towards an ever smaller terrain of utility, and more and more fails to engage with issues beyond this terrain, let alone stand back and think critically about the criminal justice system, its rationale, its constituent elements, and so on"* (p.370). This should be a critical concern for academics interested in promoting social justice through their research insights. There are identifiable overlapping complicities in the growing criminology / policy 'industry' which sees universities, funders and policy makers joining together in *"policy-led evidence-chasing"* which operates in a mutually reciprocal beneficial relationship (Squires, 2013).

Despite the ‘independence’ requirements of science, advocates of purist EBP approaches appear inherently conflicted in calling for research evidence produced and commissioned not only ‘independently’ by academics but simultaneously through a network of ‘pracademic’s’. The pracademic approach follows the model of evidence-based medicine and is proposed to see police officers and police staff becoming ‘research active’ holding ‘clinical’ professorial positions; part researchers, part practitioners (Sherman and Murray, 2015). Such alliances seem to undermine the scientific distancing of the researcher and the researched that would be necessary to produce ‘objective evidence’. Although critically-oriented Jackson (2020), in charting policing of UK fracking protests goes further in advocating a contrary position more in line with ‘objectivity’, suggesting research of policing should actively be done ‘on’ and not ‘with’ the police.

The conclusion one can draw is that for researchers conducting social research in the disinterested pursuit of deeper understanding is in the process of being eroded or replaced by a need to conduct ‘relevant’ research which can be ‘used’ to ‘improve’ policy, shaped by neoliberal discourse. Academic research in the EBP project is valorised not only for its pseudo-scientific ‘robustness’, but also for its ‘utility’ to policy-makers and practitioners. ‘Ranking’ universities through criteria determined through arrangements such as REF appears to accelerate the decline of independent academic critique in favour of market position. It can be posited that the implication for academic research is that it is arguably now produced, commissioned and funded ‘in-the-main’ or ‘at scale’ to provide the powerful with legitimating ‘robust’, ‘independent’, ‘objective’ scientific research *evidence* for their political projects. The

'utility' referred to above by Solesbury (2001) and others can be interpreted therefore as a utility for policy makers pursuing political projects, academics pursuing funding opportunities and academics, civil servants and police officers pursuing career advancements by falling in line with organisational (neoliberal) objectives. All of these 'utilities' are further reinforced by the growth of EBP. It is unsurprising therefore that EBP is progressing towards an hegemony and flourishes amongst those who materially and politically benefit 'within' the alliance. Moreover, there is no identifiable equivalent 'utility' for actors engaged in generating new knowledge or re-evaluating policy from more critical perspectives of those marginalised by it; "*from the edge*" as Foucault (1975) would describe it.

2. Who Decides On The Evidence? Political Evidence Selection

This subsection focusses on the political selection of 'evidence' for use in policy-making by elites. There is a significant literature developing the concept of '*policy-based evidence-making*' applied to social policy fields other than policing. On criminological matters, Drake and Walters (2015) comment; "*The cherry-picking of criminal justice research and the silencing of voices critical of government policy has been explored within criminological discourses (Hope, 2008; Hope and Walters, 2008)*" (Drake and Walters, 2015, p.425). The calls of EBP to draw 'evidence' closer to policy is concerning if the reporting in literature of selection of 'evidence' to support political programmes is valid.

Tim Hope (2004) reports his own experiences participating in the Midlands consortium of the Home Office Reducing Burglary Initiative (RBI). Despite reported successes in reducing burglaries that led to rolling out of 'effective practice', Hope suggests the data analysis was methodologically flawed. Hope's refreshed analysis showed increases in crime and 'false positives' in some of the projects. Hope's explanation is that parties involved in the RBI programme had various 'capitals' invested in it being seen as 'successful', future funding relied upon 'evidence of success' and this influenced reported results. Hope considers his RBI experiences demonstrate the need to retain space between policy and research, removing vested political interests, and separating research commissioning and funding from those doing the research. The growth of EBP in the UK, which increasingly promotes the harnessing together of policy-makers with academics and professionals through institutional reforms observable in higher education and policing institutions, overlooks the concerns raised by Hope.

Stevens (2010) reports similarly from his ethnographic study on the use more widely of evidence-based policy in the UK civil service,

"The civil servants I worked with were not encouraged to select evidence which challenged the unequal status quo for use in telling these policy stories. These stories therefore ultimately supported the consolidation of power in the hands of the people who already hold it. This made their policy-making an intensely ideological activity" (p.252)

Stevens analysis is alarming for those interested in social progress, but finds support elsewhere. Learmonth and Harding's (2006) paper on an NHS-commissioned study into change management within health care raise similar concerns to that reported by Hope (2004). Learmonth and Harding highlight the vested interests of officials with

stakes in delivering 'efficient and effective' programmes within dominant discourses for political overseers, influencing the production and selection of 'evidence' that supports pre-determined political policy priorities. They suggest that alternative concepts outside of prevalent managerialist ideas were omitted from the NHS study, concluding that for 'evidence based management' to retain its coherence as a managerialist manifestation it must exclude alternative or radical understandings

"this debate is not simply obscured by evidence-based management (in the NHS) – it is necessarily written out ... radical understandings of 'the evidence' cannot be included in the project of evidence-based management for it to remain coherent." (Learmonth and Harding, 2006, p.251)

Such studies are troubling to those interested in challenging policing to become more progressive, while EBP draws 'evidence' and policy ever closer to conservative state actors through partnerships.

From the reported literature there seems to be two distinct ways in which political selection of evidence may be occurring, and the distinctions are linked to understandings of the operation of political power and agency. Sandra Harding (1992) suggests that two kinds of politics can be observed as interfering in 'pure science'. The first is a deliberative 'old politics' that consciously manipulates selection of scientific projects, manipulating research and interpretation of results for political interest. This is an overt and deliberative selection of studies (and by implication exclusion, silencing or 'burying' of others) by officials and politicians that support pre-ordained state strategies.

The nearest example in the literature I have found of this type of overt interference contains the reporting on the case of Prof David Nutt, who was removed as Chair of the Advisory Council on the Misuse of Drugs (ACMD) by the former Home Secretary: *“The case of David Nutt provides a clarifying moment, a poignant event that draws our attention to the precariousness of the relationship between research evidence and policy-making.”* (Drake and Walters, 2015, p.422). The circumstances leading to Nutt’s removal were sparked by research he reported in the 2009 paper *“Equasy, an Overlooked Addiction with Implications for the Current Debate on Drug Harms”*. This noted an equal or greater strain on society (and the NHS in particular) from adventure sports (horse-riding) as from use of Ecstasy. Following ‘the evidence’, Prof Nutt advocated for refreshing drugs policy to consider the classification of some substances and was subsequently removed from office.

Rosenau (1992) charts the development of post-modernism and suggests that from the 1960’s;

“attention began to focus on the abuse and misuse of modern science. It became clear in some cases modern science legitimated the preferences of the powerful, justified normative positions that were mere preferences rather than ‘scientific facts’. ‘Scientific’ research results were employed in an ad hoc fashion to ‘prove’ the value of subjective political policy preferences” (Rosenau, 1992, p.10).

Drugs policy in the UK provides a powerful example of this deployment of ‘facts’ or ‘evidence’ in an ad hoc manner. Critically, it also illustrates the ‘overt’ subjugation of ‘evidence’ for politico-moral ideological reasons.

“In both social policy and criminal justice arenas the value-laden undercurrents that shape both policy- and law-making are too seldom fully explicated and the

David Nutt case demonstrates a head-on confrontation between values and evidence-based policy-making.” (Drake and Walters, 2015, p.417)

From this perspective, on the deliberative selection of research that justify or support political policy for moral, values-based or ideological reasons, the advocacy of bringing ‘evidence’ closer to policy needs to be extremely carefully managed to avoid harmful consequences. A reasonable conclusion from what is reported here might be that such suggestion should be resisted as a flawed concept entirely. The implication of this for EBP should be significant if EBP discourse allowed such insights gained from this more ‘external’ perspective to be surfaced and considered.

Harding’s second interference emerges from a more ‘obscure politics’ that can be seen to influence neutrality. This politics is less conscious and deliberative, but still influences science not ‘on’ but ‘through’ “*dominant institutional structures, priorities, practices and languages of science*” (Harding, 1992, p.567). This is a more covert technology that ‘dupes’ the same actors into making similar choices as ‘old politics’, but for less deliberative reasons. This second politics resonates with Lemke’s (2001) understanding of how ‘governmentality’ operates through discourse to condition behaviour. This second politics perversely ‘depoliticises’ science, makes it appear as a neutral activity – *apolitical* - by wrapping it into an accepted set of medico-scientific normalised constructs. Contrast to the ‘old politics’ of intrusion, the institutionalised ‘obscure politics’ does not force itself to manipulate science and policy. It has no need to because it pre-structures both through discursive arrangements that discipline actors and institutions.

“it defends and legitimates the institutions and practices through which the distortions and their exploitative consequences are generated. It certifies as

value-neutral, normal, natural and therefore not political at all the existing scientific policies and practices through which powerful groups can gain the information and explanations that they need to advance their priorities. It functions more through what its normalising procedures and concepts implicitly prioritise than through explicit directives” (Harding, 1992, p.568-9)

The requirement of this institutionalised normalcy of science is that people follow the methods and procedures, the rules laid down. Criticism from outside the hegemonic normalcy can be easily dismissed as critique from ‘special interest groups’ as seeking to undermine scientific neutrality. We can describe these two politics as theoretically inspired by structuralist explanations formerly, and the second as more of a post-structuralist approach to power as it is understood by Foucault - as a kind of non-deliberative ‘governance’ of actors through dominant discourses. Hillyard et al (2004) allude to this pre-structuring through discursive practices that promote state interests over research which may challenge those definitions and assumptions:

“the voices of academic experts are used to legitimate the definition of certain key terms - while those who would propose alternative forms of definition are, in turn, silenced, inaudible above the consensus of the technicians and the suffocating policy demands of the state.” (Hillyard et al, 2004, p.372)

My research reveals elements of EBPs discourse that ‘pre-structure’ and produce ‘normalcy’ by governing how actors have come to think, speak and act about the production of criminological knowledge related to policing, and the importation of that knowledge into policy through institutional modification. These governance techniques in EBP include elements such as the hierarchisation of knowledge, valorising scientific methodologies and rationalities, accepted ‘empty’ problematisations, access to data and funding. I propose that these are all observable disciplinary elements of EBP discourse which combine to present political decisions as normalised and neutral, governing actors. Harding (1992) suggests it is difficult to

be self-critical of widely shared values that create your own *“institutionally shaped research assumptions”*. The institutional reforms illuminated by my research, together with the subject positions created and the language used to narrate EBP’s story-lines I posit are clear examples of what Harding describes as processes of normalisation that have disciplinary effects on actors.

With these assumptions and discursive governance elements in place, marginalised perspectives are easily dismissed as being produced by,

“bad habits by those with the most authoritative voices in the social order and our research disciplines. The latter, with no conscious bad intent will arrive at such judgements by simply following the normalizing procedures of institutions and conceptual schemes legitimated as value-neutral” (Harding, 1992, p.572).

The analysis presented in Chapters 4 to 6 help explain ‘authoritative voices’ that have emerged within EBP discourse, and their potential exclusionary impact on alternative knowledges simply by following the normalised rationalities of pseudo-scientific methodology upon which EBP is founded. Marston and Watts (2003) provide an example of this type of pre-structuring in their critique of the spread of bio-medical evidence-led approaches to social policy in Australia. They case-study juvenile crime research and note *“a risk that ‘evidence-based policy’ will become a means for policy elites (to) increase their strategic control over what constitutes knowledge”* (2003, p.158).

Dayem et al (2014) explored in detail the academic-policy making relationship in their survey of 205 academics conducting British government research. They found widely reported pressure from officials to engage in design of studies, how and which data

should be collected, and how results might be interpreted or presented, to produce 'politically congenial' results. It is difficult to determine whether one might ascribe Harding's first or second type of political evidence selection / interference to this type of reporting. My reading of the literature on political selection suggests it is much more likely the second explanation holds credibility for what is occurring: the operation of unobtrusive power on actors through discourse. This explanation conforms to my world view of political power, so maybe I am drawn to interpreting the reported literature in that way. Whichever type of politics prevails – and conceivably both might be occurring simultaneously – it seems clear that political selection of evidence is a factor to be considered for any advocate of evidence-based policy initiatives.

Applied these insights to policing, with its potentially harmful impacts through criminalisation and incarceration of marginalised populations, the legitimating impact of neutral, 'independent' or an apolitical 'evidence-base' is concerning. This forms a core rationale for undertaking my research: to illuminate and question some of the normative assumptions upon which EBP is founded.

3. How To Decide Which 'Evidence Counts'? Academic Evidence Selection

If one starts from a premise of accepting the narrative that *'evidence-based policy-making is a good idea'*, and an idea which should be applied more consistently to policing by promoting EBP, then what counts as the 'robust' evidence which such an approach necessitates is a key question. Such questions remain contested in the literature as a concern for those promoting the development of EBP (see Nutley et al,

2012, 2002; Thomas, 2014; Ellefsen, 2011; Bullock and Tilley, 2009). Even the most ardent advocates are aware of, and have responded to, the debate within EBP about 'what counts' as evidence for inclusion. Whatever the individual perspective from those engaged in promoting EBP, there is a shared narrative about the need for the evidence to be 'scientifically robust', 'independent' and 'objective'. I suggest this is a process of 'pre-structuring' or 'obscure politics' in the way Harding (1992) describes. Viewed through this lens, the application of judgements on the 'value' of research evidence becomes a political choice. Moreover it is a political choice which is laden with the discursive elements that govern actors thoughts and behaviours. This becomes political therefore as decisive political moments are hidden behind veneers of normalcy and the 'natural order of things', away from the glare of public scrutiny through democratic process and transparency.

There is a range of literature referenced in the previous subsection that comments on the positivist turn in research, impacting academic freedom, and driven by neoliberal goals of evidence-based policy and the impact agenda. The selection of evidence academically is significantly linked to epistemological positioning of researchers, but there is support in the literature for the idea that positivism is becoming institutionalised as the 'natural' choice for the research academic through governing neoliberal discourses (Armstrong, 2020; Jackson, 2020; Brown, 2010; Smith, 2010; Collier, 2013; Walters, 2003):

"For us, such trends are the key context for understanding how the massed ranks of policy-driven academic criminology have swollen with such alacrity in recent years. The processes - the marketisation and commodification of knowledge - have touched criminology as much as any other discipline in the social sciences, with significant effects for those who work within the discipline

and, concomitantly, the work they produce.” (Hilyard et al, 2004, p.377)

The transfer of this knowledge into policy is where the approaches Hilyard et al (2004) identify become problematic because they valorise positivist research methodologies, neoliberal and state agendas over others with no basis for doing so. Whatever preferences young researchers begin with there is a ‘market reality’ of the H.E. job market (re)produced by neoliberalism which governs academics to begin to write for ‘the market’. Armstrong (2020) notes the increasing neoliberalisation of research agendas, and the impact this has on favouring quick, shorter term, and quantitative methodologies over longer term qualitative work. This is a trend identified as one of the ten key strands in Nutley, et al’s (2019) review of two decades of development of ‘what works’. These choices are conditioned by neoliberal goals of universities favouring prestige and market position through publication of ‘impactive’ research which is attuned to the market requirements of metrics and performance. It is a theme underscored by Walters (2003);

“It is clear that contracts with governments and commercial entities are increasingly designed to be business transactions: a fee-paying client (the government or corporate body) purchasing a product (from a criminologist) for a specific purpose (development of state policy or business strategy).” (Walters, 2003, p.90)

This view is also supported by the research of Smith (2010) over ten years into health inequalities, which suggests there is a *“growing pressure to produce ‘policy relevant’ research”* (p.176). This has the nett effect of moving researchers towards quantitative research that demonstrates neoliberal ‘policy relevant’ outcomes such as ‘value for money’, over and above highly policy relevant longer term and qualitative research that would explore issues such as user voice, and potentially lead to explosive challenge of policies that prevail within advanced neoliberal economies. ‘Policy

impact' and 'relevance' are examples of this with statist agendas favoured over more challenging narratives: a political choice veneered within normalised language. Brown (2010) documents the impact of this market pressure from public sector 'clients' on researchers as shaking confidence of academics to recommend and deploy qualitative methods for these commissioners. Such approaches to research are considered to be less authoritative, less 'scientific', and therefore less reliable than those which ape the language and method of the natural sciences, leading to a pressure to use the latter. This pre-structuring governance of academic selection of how to conduct research, presented as 'natural', is deeply troubling. More so where it is accompanied with a squeezing of spaces for intellectual exploration of alternatives identified by Smith (2010), Brown (2010) and Hillyard et al (2004).

The narratives found within the EBP literature can be described dichotomously between 'purist' and 'realist' revisionists. Purists advocate reverence to evidence produced by the methods deployed in the natural sciences, following Enlightenment ideas about the pursuit of 'objective truths'. Sherman promotes the use of the 'Maryland Scale' of scientific methods as a basis for assessment which promotes the Randomised Control Trial – in line with evidence-based medicine - as the 'gold standard' of research evidence. The 'great achievements' of medicine are held up by Sherman and those who follow his ideas as the path to follow for EBP. The language of medicine has been assimilated by experimental and administrative criminologists into the language of EBP. This could be seen as being deployed in order to 'lend' the status and legitimacy deriving from Enlightenment medical science to their own work within the social sciences. Simultaneously the use of this type of judgement hierarchy

– ostensibly created to allow practitioners and policy makers to decide which ‘evidence’ is ‘best’ – relegates and devalues qualitative social science methods down the scale of ‘reliability’. I explore this idea further when presenting my data on the ‘story-lines’ of EBP in Chapter 4.

‘Realists’ within the ‘EBP bubble’ are equally keen advocates of EBP as an approach. However in contrast to the purist school and in line with ideas in social policy literature, realists lobby for ‘softer’ hierarchies of evidence, or inclusion of a broader range of knowledges. This is seen as a ‘fix’ to the tensions noted in evidence-based policy-making on this issue (Nutley, et. al. 2012). Realists remain just as firmly wedded (or unwittingly discursively captured) to the principles of evidence-based policy-making - the ‘what works’ agenda – as the more ‘purist’ experimental criminologists of the Cambridge school, but take a more pragmatic stance on inclusion of research for consideration in policy formation. Realists are generally less puritanical about included methodologies and hierarchies than those from the ‘purist’ school. There is a nuance within the EBP hegemony, and there is some support for a softening of the purist approach. However, I have also identified examples (presented in Chapter 6) of incorporation of ‘purist’ ideas on knowledge hierarchies into institutional arrangements of the College of Policing. Writing from a realist position calling for more mixed methodologies, Nutley et. al. (2012) have criticised the use of hierarchies and synthesized studies and reviews;

“(it) focusses too narrowly on the question of what works, which means large swathes of data are excluded... There is a growing body of literature which

argues that hierarchies based on study design tend to undervalue the strength of evidence produced by well-conducted observational studies” (Nutley et al, 2012, p.9).

Irrespective of identifying problems with EBP, the ‘realists’ recommended amendments are potentially explicable as they still stand to gain from forming alliances with knowledge-commissioners. Realists can achieve career enhancement through ‘impactive’ research as much as those purists, both governed by neoliberal discourses.

Aside from theoretical concerns about the ability to judge criminological research being essentially a political choice rather than a scientific one, a scan of criminological literature suggests the conclusions of policy-makers and academics who advocate use of hierarchies, scales and classifications that elevate natural science methodologies may simply be wrong. A range of criminologists and social policy academics extol the virtues of longer term studies, deploying qualitative methods to understand lived experiences of those subjected to criminal justice interventions to help influence policy in more liberal directions (see Nutley et al, 2019; Williams and Glasby, 2010, as examples). McAra’s (2017) study into the impact of the Scottish youth justice system is a case in point. She argues the ‘pathway to impact’ has led to proximal relationships of researchers and state actors that require careful navigation to avoid the deleterious effects this can have: including the silencing of those impacted by the criminal justice system.

Jackson (2020) recommends ethnographic work to bring an alternative perspective to policy on behalf of those marginalised by its systemic effects. He insists on maintaining a 'critical distance' between those being researched (the police), and the researcher. Although McAra and Jacksons' studies are relatively recent interventions in the debate on academic methods for policy impact, this debate is not new. Writing in 2004, Jock Young submits,

"What we need is an ethnographic method which can deal with reflexivity, contradiction, tentativeness, change opinion, posturing, concealment, which is sensitive to the way people write and rewrite their personal narratives. It will not be solved by fake scientificity but by a critical ethnography honed to the potential of human creativity and meaning." (Young, 2004, p.29)

Classical sociological-criminological studies by Young (1971) and Stan Cohen (1980), that developed insights over many years into a range of crime policies and their effects demonstrate the need to continue to fund and engage in this type of research. Insights from these type of studies are arguably more than ever relevant for policy than the current marketised fad for the metric; especially so for those interested in more progressive and liberal change. Chancer and McLaughlin (2007) go further still in criticising the data-driven criminologies of 'crime science' as potentially the wrong approach to the discipline: *"This 'junk science' has damaged criminal justice policy and practice and communities and wasted scarce public resources."* (p.161). This literature therefore suggests that even if hierarchisation of research evidence were useful – and this is by no means being suggested here – great care would be needed about the ordering of such a taxonomy. Elevation of quantitative pseudo-science of crime would by no means 'naturally' be positioned over other approaches as it appears in current incarnations of such hierarchies EBP discourse has produced.

EBP discourse presents the hierarchisation of knowledge as politically neutral, and yet Foucault suggests that such labelling of knowledge as 'evidence' is a value judgment linked to privileged positions of those who do the labelling (Foucault, 1977). EBP shows a high incidence of academic actors (either willingly or alternatively 'duped' by market discourses) to engage in these classifications in furtherance of EBP discourse. The nature of 'evidence' and knowledge remains highly contestable within academia. Attempts to exclude knowledge on the basis of preferred methodological and epistemological bases of its production is another example of the governing rationalities of EBP that I present in my later analysis.

4. Enlightenment Scientific Method And 'Objective Truths'

Objective, robust, scientific research evidence – 'facts' and 'truths' – were heralded under New Labour from 1997 as a key reason for moving from an ideological policy-making approach to one based on 'what works' for social betterment. The idea of crafting policy for social betterment, based on some objective 'truth' (evidence) is a powerful idea. In UK politics it marked an 'end' to sharp swings from left to right of parliamentary electoral cycles, and heralded a new political battle for the 'centre ground': a 'third way' of doing political policy. The idea that objective truths exist to be discovered, and on which policy can be based, shares an epistemological heritage in the ideas and methods from Enlightenment science. The reverence in which Enlightenment science is still held adds a significant legitimating quality to evidence-based policy approaches. This is attractive to academics seeking funding and impact,

and to politicians not wishing to appear ideological in our apolitical modern world.

Although Stevens (2010) and others offer perspectives on political interference in evidence, the lure of neutrality in policy decision-making remains significant for politicians, policy makers, and public managers. It is also loved by the 'policy industry', conservative academics, think-tanks and so on who rely on commissioned work. Peck (2006) suggests these industry agents *"portray themselves as lonely voices of reason, as principled outsiders in a corrupt, distracted, and wrongheaded world"* (p.682). While Bilton et al (1987) note there is a strong draw of Enlightenment scientific positivism amongst not only politicians and professionals, but also from academics keen to produce 'real knowledge' and 'truths'; *"In general, sociologists have wanted to establish their discipline as scientific, and have therefore sought to conform to the dominant conception of science – that is positivism"* (p.606).

The great achievements of the natural sciences and the reverent consensus in which their rationalities, methodologies and conclusions are held has elevated the status of Enlightenment sciences and has a significant effect on how we interpret the physical world. The transposing of this status into the policy arena – producing 'facts' and 'best practice' through research evidence following assimilated scientific methodologies - creates significant advantages for government, elected officials and public sector professionals alike. Alvesson and Willmott (1996) note the effect of adding this status to public managers as, *"creating and legitimizing an image and ideal of managers as impartial experts whose prerogative is associated with, if not founded upon, scientifically respectable bodies of knowledge"* (p.27).

Solesbury (2001), Walters (2003) and Hope (2004) all suggest that having an 'independent' 'evidence-base' for policy decisions enhances the legitimacy of those decisions for the Government in the eyes of the electorate. For professionals, being able to legitimise their professional decisions with reference to a base of scientific knowledge of 'what works' also enhances their status and legitimacy. Commenting on the extensive debate within social science on the nature of knowledge, Learmonth and Harding (2006) argue that 'evidence' within the social sciences cannot be treated as it is in natural sciences. They contend that the consensus that exists within the natural sciences on areas such as experimental method, has not been achieved and nor is desirable for social research. However, much research used within evidence-based policy-making borrows from scientific rationalities and is "*presented as if it were independent of the social circumstances of its production*" (Learmonth and Harding, 2006, p.246).

The epistemological debate on the sociology of knowledge was of great concern to Foucault (1969; 1977) and others (See Harding 1991; 1992; Rosenau, 1992). In her excellent discussion of post-modern philosophy, Rosenau (1992) describes the shaking of belief in Enlightenment science for post-modernists finding an intellectual heritage from Nietzsche, Heidegger, Derrida, Foucault, Lyotard and others. She describes the exposure of modern science to the frailties of its own errors presented as truth-claims, citing cases such as thalidomide causing birth defects, the creation of nuclear weapons leading to 'mutually assured destruction', science-driven

industrialisation causing climate catastrophe and the failure to solve problems such as world hunger or economic inequality as examples.

The foundational philosophy of Enlightenment science, espousing the idea of the pursuit of objective truths to promote human flourishing through hypothesis and experimental testing is a foundational belief of EBP advocates. Starting from a position that all 'truths' are arbitrary and constructed through discourse, post-modern approaches consider natural science as totalising and illusory in its pursuit of an objective truth. To the post-modernist, all knowledge is contingent.

"post-modernists reject truth even as a good or ideal because it is the very epitome of modernity. Truth is an Enlightenment value and subject to dismissal on these grounds alone. Truth makes reference to order, rules, values: depends on logic, rationality and reason, all of which post-modernists question. Attempts to produce knowledge in the modern world depend on some kind of truth claim, on the assumption that truth is essential" (Rosenau, 1992, p.77).

Basing social policy on the premise that it in turn is based upon discovery of scientific 'fact' or 'truth', produced from reliable pseudo-scientific method, and so therefore somehow 'better', apolitical or more legitimate, is therefore highly questionable when considered from a wider perspective on the epistemological nature of knowledge. Hence, there is a significant tension for EBP between post-modern philosophical critique of Enlightenment rationalities, juxtaposed with the blind application of those rationalities in the development of the EBP project. The evidence-based policy-making ideal of 'what works', and its expansion into EBP, needs to gloss over or ignore such tensions completely to retain its coherence as a project.

Summary: Seven Areas of Concern with EBP

EBP comes to me as an issue of 'current concern' given my position within UK policing where EBP has become normalised, routinised and institutionalised. However, I am also aware of other criminological work and because of my understanding of post-structural political theory that elevates the role of discourse, I am deeply sceptical of that which appears naturalised through, masking political decisions. The literature presented in this chapter demonstrates there are enough points of debate and tension that are unresolved within criminology, more generally on the sociology of knowledge, and the relationship of researchers to the researched to require further investigation of the emergence of EBP as a 'normal' way of doing UK policing policy. Furthermore, the debate within EBP purist and realist academic work does not feature strongly in the institutionalisation of EBP – it is presentationally monolithic, disguising nuances. Foucault suggested that we should look at objects for research which are of 'current concern' and use such problematisations to construct our own 'histories of the present'. I consider EBP as a phenomena worthy of further research as an object of 'current concern' for the following reasons.

First, the 'truth claims' which the knowledge produced and relied upon within EBP ascribes as 'evidence' on which to influence policy should be a matter of greater contestation. These 'truths' can be viewed as problematic on a number of levels. Given my epistemological commitment about the impossibility of truth, why the EBP project is framed within a rationality of making fundamentalist truth claims requires further examination. The impact of such a fundamentalist approach to EBP on policy over the longer term should be a concern from the perspective of those who consider

such foundational beliefs to be contestable.

Second, the apparent 'lack' of critical thought, or consideration of material produced from critical criminologists being considered in the application and furtherance of EBP discourse requires interrogation. The notion of EBP as a 'good idea' seems to be acquiring a hegemony in many official circles, even by those who might be considered critical, or those realists who identify problems with evidence-based approaches (Ellefsen, 2011, as an example). This is potentially an observable impact of discursive disciplinary governance on actors and institutions, ensuring 'othering' of critique so consequentially rendering critical thought unable to influence policy development. The ability of critical voices to influence policy is likely to be increasingly diminished as EBP discourse becomes hegemonic in advanced neoliberal states. This likelihood is increased further as institutional modifications that are observable begin to mirror and reinforce EBP's prevailing pseudo-scientific and neoliberal discursive rationalities. The net effect of this approach is likely to be the silencing and neutralisation of critique 'from the edge' about policing policy, operational decisions and politics. This will inevitably hamper possibilities for social change in support of social justice and progress for the disenfranchised in society.

Third, the apparent alignment of objectives of those who comprise the *neo-liberal coalition* in promoting the growth of EBP is a further point of inquiry. There is a notable coming together of neo-liberal objectives within the academy, for politicians and police officers through EBP that is likely to ensure the industrial production of 'robust knowledge' in support of predetermined neo-liberal political positions. In my

assessment, this observable process of strategic alignment generate governance techniques that obfuscate the critical thought that could and should be applied to policing problems in the modern western democracies to address the deep social, political and economic inequalities driven by neoliberal policy (see also Hilyard et al, 2004; Squires, 2013). If one ascribes to the New Zealand Education Act view of the academic as the 'critic and conscience' of society, then bringing academia increasingly into line with statist objectives diminishes the possibility of this obligation (Hughes, 2000; Walters, 2003).

Fourth, why knowledge is increasingly becoming subjected to hierarchisation and taxonomic classification that favours positivist method is an observable trend that should be subject to challenge. EBPs progression supports and reinforces this governance technique. This ensures certain knowledges are valorised over others, and certainly contributes to ensuring some 'types' of knowledge (the pseudo-scientific) are included into the policy space over 'others' (broadly, qualitative). The marginalising impact on certain types of 'other knowledge' is of great concern, given this 'other' knowledge is more likely to produce critical authorship, challenge current policy and champion social progress for the marginalised. Who decides what is included as 'evidence' and what is dismissed is an aligned concern (see Harding, 1992). Who is allowed to contribute to the debate and whose voices are silent or excluded is important to understand by exploring the power relations producing discursive disciplinary processes of 'authorised knowledge' within EBP.

Fifth, the support EBP lends to the trend of commodified knowledge requires further

exploration. This commodification is promoted and reinforced through EBP discourse. Knowledge, it seems, is becoming *valued* only for its *utility*. That utility is judged as *valuable* (or not) within the discursive paradigm of neo-liberalism which ascribes value economically over other criteria. This is reinforced by universities in processes which grade and judge 'impact' and 'knowledge transfer', such as RAE (Hilyard et al, 2004) and REF (Slater, 2012). 'Good knowledge' or useful knowledge which drives status and rank for institutions and individual academics is that which is included in the policy space. Research outputs are assessed 'useful' to policy makers based on their perceived ability to drive key political narratives of 'value for money', 'economy' and 'efficiency' of increasingly squeezed public resources. Conversely, the commissioning and production of knowledge 'for its own sake', or research perceived to be critical of normalised discourses is slowing because of the progress of this commodification process as a governance technique (Walters, 2003). 'Critical knowledge' on policing is being subjugated and marginalised furtherstill by the neoliberal rationalities which underpin EBP. This is an acute concern given the role policing plays as the agency of coercive state control and its potential for misuse, or more cheerfully policing's potential for human improvement, and addressing of inequality by provision of safeguarding the vulnerable through social support. Cohen (1981) noted,

"The development of social scientific theory and knowledge takes place not simply within the heads of individuals, but within particular institutional domains... In criminology, an understanding of these insertional domains is especially important for knowledge is situated not just, or not even primarily, in the 'pure' academic world, but in the applied domain of the state's crime control apparatus. (Cohen, 1981, p.220)"

The role of policing in society *should* be a matter of political contest in modern democracies in my view. The commodification of knowledge reinforced by EBP that

values only the impact that knowledge might have on driving 'improvement' should therefore be challenged.

Sixth, this thesis is concerned with why policing came to be problematised within EBP discourse by the terms that it has? Why modern policing has come to be perceived through EBP's lenses as presenting problems of efficiency, professionalisation, public value for money, legitimacy that are prioritised for investment. This excludes problematisations of policing that can be found in classic critical criminological, or the more recently developed social harm literature? (for examples see Cohen 1980 on policing youth groups, Young 1971 on drug taking; Pemberton, 2007; and Hilyard and Tombs, 2007, on the potential for application of a social harm lens in criminological spaces). Such literature, and the problems it raises for policing, are largely absent from EBP discourse as 'authorised' EBP research knowledge concerns itself with more managerial concerns. The origins of EBP in traditional crime science based on delinquency, psychiatry, psychology, law and medicine championed in the US post WWII, brings further urgency to this as a point of concern given the widely-recognised problems in US criminal justice and statist version of 'crime' and 'justice' more generally (Walters, 2003). This is a view supported by Cohen's commentary forty years ago;

"In line with what happened in the United States over this decade, the content of this type of criminology has switched (and is likely to switch even more) in the direction of 'criminal justice': that is to say, an exclusive concern with the operation of the system. Research deals mainly with matters of decision-making, manpower, evaluation, and classification." (Cohen, 1981, p.236)

Understanding why managerialist concerns and statist agendas have triumphed in the problematisation of policing through EBP over more 'critical' concerns seems to

me a particularly important question to address. Burnham et al point out that,

“it is much easier to analyse the dominant and hegemonic discourses and to explain how they are organised, their content, their internal contradictions, why they are successful, how they are legitimized, and what the consequences of their dominance is likely to be, than it is to analyse the passive alternative discourses of those excluded from the policy arena” (Burnham et al, 2004, p.258).

Although my research shows the ‘passive discourses’ are excluded from policy making through EBP (those discourses are not brought forward in my textual sampling), they are clearer to identify through the work of critical and activist academics presented in this chapter, who do voice alternative conceptions of ‘crime’, ‘justice’ and ‘policing’ in the public realm. To that extent therefore, my project is viable because as well as identifying the dominant discourse (EBP) that is the principal focus of my work, I can position this well against the work that is excluded and ask the question why? Whose interests are served by this? Whose interests are served by elevating managerialist concerns of EBP over radical definitions of crime or social harm that might challenge and disrupt statist conceptions of ‘crime’ and ‘order’? Considering these questions helps me to understand the power relations at work in EBP’s discursive development; those forces of domination and resistance that combine to produce EBP’s discourse.

Seventh, this research examines what consequences might flow from following ‘evidence-based’ approaches to policing policy? Purist or realist, EBP presents itself as a neutral, benign force for scientific ‘improvement’. EBP also appears to be becoming normalised, naturalised and ‘taken-for-granted’ as an assumption of how modern policing should be constructed within institutional reform. It is precisely the nature of such taken-for-granted assumptions and problematisations that should form

the basis of objects of research for the discourse analyst. Where discourses begin to shape institutional change to take account and reinforce discourse, we need to examine the 'micro-practices' that result in order to understand what power relations have constituted these reforms in the terms that they appear. If EBP can be conceived as managerialist or neoliberal in the terms of its constitution, then it is likely that resulting story-lines, subject positions and institutional changes simultaneously reflect and reinforce those discourses that support their constitution.

Foucault's theoretical framework which I set out in detail in the next chapter is helpful in both formulating and addressing these areas of concern. Foucault's concepts add significant value to my analysis of data in subsequent chapters. Indeed, it is the knowledge I have acquired on such matters as truth, knowledge, power and subjectification that caused me to question the advancement of EBP around me professionally and gave rise to my project in the first place. To re-frame these issues of concern in Foucauldian terms, and demonstrate the relevance of taking a discourse analysis approach to my work in exploring them, it might be useful to expand some of the questions which my analysis endeavours to address. For example, how have we come to think, speak and act as we do currently? What are the effects, impacts and costs of thinking, speaking and acting in this way? What are the patterns can be identified in what is included in the dominant discourse and what is excluded? Whose interests are served by these inclusions and exclusions and what does this tell us about contemporary power? How might we think act, speak and think differently? What have been the observable processes of subject and object creation and what positions do subjects take for themselves and others against EBP discourse? What

institutional modifications are observable, produced and reproduced by processes of discursive formation and governance?

The challenge as a researcher in this tradition, it appears to me, is to reactivate the possibility of thinking, speaking and acting differently – to re-open that which is closed through normalised discourse. In doing so it is possible re-imagine the emancipatory potential of the discourse analytical approach. It seems clear to me that discourse analysis in the post-structural tradition offers the strongest possibility of exploring the concerns articulated in this subsection, and developing a new perspective on EBP: the objective of this thesis.

CHAPTER 2

Epistemological Considerations: Towards a Theoretical Framework

In this thesis, I aspire to examine EBP beyond its normative story-lines; the narratives weaved by EBP advocates about the potential scientific knowledges may hold for policing. Deliberately and by design I seek to avoid offering 'fixes' to the problems I identify within EBP's construction. Instead, I am concerned with why EBP has emerged at all as a response to a series of problematised issues such as legitimacy, efficiency, and professionalisation. I explore why this response is acquiring a hegemonic status within police policy-making, apparently unhindered in becoming encapsulated as 'the truth' about policing, buttressed by institutional reforms as time progresses.

My analysis illustrates how the current purist and realist EBP literatures 'fit' within managerialist and neoliberal discourses. This insight offers a potential explanation for the observable rise of EBP since the mid 2000s. Furthermore, realists make this contribution despite recognising the tensions, contradictions and problems that pursuing EBP presents. There is a lack of interrogation in the existing EBP literature of the ontological assumptions inherent in the construction of EBP as a solution to problematised policing issues, such as a lack of 'professionalism' or 'inefficiency' for example. Consequentially I argue that the current literature on EBP fails to explore alternative conceptions and perspectives about EBP from 'outside' of the disciplinary framing of governance techniques generated through EBP discourse .

Escaping the discursive entrapment of our current *episteme* is difficult, and potentially impossible. Foucault himself in his conceptualisation of epistemic discourse suggests that thinking outside of this is an impossibility, and that the historian can only (re) construct archaeologies within the discursive field of the episteme from which they are making their analysis. How the scholar manages (or not) to escape this discursive entrapment to offer any alternative perspective, remains an unanswered criticism of Foucault's ideas (Hajer, 1995). Therefore, I am not overly-critical of those who do not look beyond what is presented to them as 'natural' and 'obvious' about the modern world we inhabit through EBP. Exemplifying the 'natural' assumptions about our current world, we see that the rationality of EBP rests on strong, normalised and longstanding conventional foundations. The lure of Enlightenment notions of 'man's' progress; generating and deploying techno-scientific knowledge to shape policies which, due to their fundamentalist normative truth claims, 'guarantee' the progress of man in the Anthropocene remain appealing – and fundamentally 'modern' - ideas. The lure of this story for those charged with formulating policy initiatives, implementing policy, evaluating those initiatives, and 'authorising' knowledge can be understood as extremely difficult to resist. The story of scientific progress, and wanting to be part of it, assuring some immortality through crafting one's own part in the story – a place in History - is a *raison d'être* for many politicians, professionals, academics and policy makers alike. This lure seems to be reinforced by the absence of an alternative and coherent critique to EBP, which my literature review reveals.

To develop my analysis I rely on key theoretical concepts developed by Foucault. In combination these concepts have helped me to step outside from normative

rationalities about scientific progress that underpin EBP and offer the potential to facilitate the generation of alternative perspectives about EBP. There is a wide-ranging literature that uses Foucault's concepts to investigate problems relating to crime, policing, prisons and law and 'order' more generally. This literature tends to utilise some of Foucault's ideas as a frame for application to empirical issues broadly construed within the 'criminal justice' landscape⁴. There is also a vast secondary and tertiary literature that references Foucault's concepts in exploring a kaleidoscope of research problems, or that offers explanations of Foucault's work across a range of disciplines. I do not engage directly with much of this literature as they lack relevance for the purposes of my inquiry.

In my view some of the secondary and tertiary work misreads Foucault and exact interpretations of how Foucault's work is used and interpreted remains subject to much contestation. This chapter offers my own interpretation of Foucault's key philosophical concepts that underpin my research based on reading translations of Foucault's original texts. I considered that reading the translated primary material was important in giving me the opportunity to develop my own understanding and apply that to my analysis. I recognise fully reading the primary material in its original language would have offered potentially even greater insights, but my language skills prohibited that exercise. My interpretations, taken together, are presented as an explanatory section to describe the theoretical framework in which my research takes

⁴ For recent examples see: Dymock (2017) on visual punishment framing 'revenge pornography'; Flacks (2020) on necropolitics and the deployment of stop and search police powers as a form of punishment; Murphy (2020) on Foucauldian jurisprudence exploring law as a technology of governmentality providing identity construction through undercover policing; or, Thusi (2020) using work on 'bodies' to explore police discrimination in South Africa using sexual and beautified hierarchies for protection, subordination and brutality.

place – my own normative position.

This chapter describes the following key concepts, presented in six subsections:

- i. *Archaeology and Genealogy*
- ii. *Episteme and Discursive Formations*
- iii. *Hegemonic Narratives*
- iv. *Power-Knowledge*
- v. *Subject Positioning, and,*
- vi. *Techne, Discipline and Governmentality*

I should acknowledge at the outset that in producing this ‘list’ I recognise I propose an artificial taxonomy that Foucault would likely reject. Foucault was never particularly definitional on what he meant on each of these points. Indeed, Foucault interprets and reinterprets discursive elements in different ways in different texts over time, and so meaning is fluid across the canon of his work. Foucault was also explicit about the need to draw together these various elements to look for links and connections, to understand dynamics at play between say power, knowledge and subjects or ‘truth’.

“Connecting together modes of veridiction, techniques of governmentality, and practices of the self is basically what I have always been trying to do.”
(Foucault, 2011, p.8)

To this extent, my project may fall short if I do not draw these elements together to give a coherent alternative view of how the EBP project might be considered in my subsequent analysis. The sense of irony in attempting to bring an order to something which is, by design, celebratory about its diffuseness and diversity is not lost on me. However, I equally recognise that a ‘mixing’ of concepts presented later in the thesis

without further explanation is unsatisfactory as a point of departure for my research and may come across as 'jumbled' or difficult for a reader to follow. Therefore, I feel an incumbency to bring some clarity to each of these elements before embarking on an exercise of research that relies on concepts developed by Foucault.

i. Foucault's Archaeology and Genealogy

Foucault was concerned to move away from 'totalising' histories that seek to discover continuities, see time as linear and derive causation from presenting themes as homogenous. In his 'archaeology of medical perception', discussing the classification of disease, Foucault gives an example of totalising histories:

"The historical embraces whatever, de facto or de jure, sooner or later, directly or indirectly, may be offered to the gaze... In this homogenous space series are broken and times abolished: a local inflammation is merely the ideal juxtaposition of its historical elements (redness, tumour, heat, pain) without their network of reciprocal determinations or their temporal intersection being involved." (Foucault, 1963, p.4-5)

Instead, Foucault proposes a more specific type of historical inquiry – a 'general' history - that does not seek the continuities but instead looks for the detailed stories of individuals, institutions, language and individual ideas that constitute discourse. Foucault's approach consequentially presents history to us as 'messy', discontinuous, and a diverse series of stories, each quite unique. Done well, Foucauldian histories should have the effect of disrupting our 'modern' view, changing periods for study away from time and towards problems, language and ideas that order the world through moments of contestation and decision making.

Foucault sought to construct 'general histories'; mapping possibilities, looking for

divergence and moments of decision. Mapping these possibilities and alternatives allows construction of a transformative history, exposing contingency and those moments of decision that create the 'rules' by which we are governed; reopening the possibility of alternatives. It is precisely this approach that I take to my own research, explicitly examining the emergence of EBP as a modern phenomenon, rather than defining it by given dates.

Foucault's historical method can be determined into two concepts used by Foucault: *archaeology* and *genealogy*. These broadly configure against his earlier (archaeological) and later (genealogical) work. In his earlier work he was more interested in *epistemic* determination (Foucault, 1963; 1964, whereas his later work is potentially much richer in its analyses, emphasising aspects such as power-knowledge (Foucault, 1991; 2011). In his considerations after Kant on "What is enlightenment?", Foucault describes Enlightenment as freedom from tutelage, a tutelage which bonds us to current ways of thinking (Foucault, 1997). In this paper he articulates the importance of critique in this quest for freedom. Critique, not in search of 'universal' or 'underlying truth' as in the classical conception of Enlightenment science, but through his historical method as potentially libertarian by exposing contingencies of current ways of thinking about the order of the world.

*"historical investigation into the events that have led us to constitute ourselves and to recognize ourselves as subjects of what we are doing, thinking, saying. In this sense criticism is not transcendental... it is **genealogical** in its design and **archaeological** in its method"* (emphasis added, Foucault, 1997, p.125).

Archaeology as conceived by Foucault is therefore seeking 'instances of discourse' that articulate what we say, think and do; presenting discourse 'as we find it'. Whereas

genealogy exposes our own contingency, how we are now, and seeks liberty through re-opening possibilities of thinking, saying and doing differently; presenting the lineage of the history of ideas. It is in this possibility that, for Foucault, there is the hope of Kantian enlightenment. 'Enlightenment' is thus reimagined as the potential to remove the bonds of our subjectivity – subjectivity to discourse – and not the possibility of discovery of universal 'truths' which hallmark the normative promise and goal of classical Enlightenment scientific rationalities.

Foucault described his *archaeologies* (Foucault, 1963; 1964; 1969) as exploring 'history' to reveal epistemic shifts, ruptures or breaking points which help to explain the emergence of conditions of acceptability for a particular system. Without ever being as deterministic as Marx, I think he refers here to background assumptions, issues in a particular age that emerge or are created as presentationally 'normal', and subsequently define understandings and interpretations of phenomena through changes to language, subject positions and institutional reforms that normalise and formalise. The archaeological method is concerned with a highly-detailed presentation of 'things as they are', not seeking anything beyond the surface of what is apparent. This seems to me to be the essence of Foucault's application of archaeological method. It is not seeking to totalise or look for grand causal explanations of events. It is comfortable with diversity, discontinuity, and 'mess'.

Archaeology allows for us to begin to understand what Foucault called '*savoir*': underlying conditions in which knowledge can emerge or be made possible or intelligible in each period or domain.

“A more precise historical analysis reveals a quite different principle of adjustment beyond these adjustments: it bears jointly on the types of objects to be known, on the grid that makes it appear, isolates it, and carves up the elements relevant to a possible epistemic knowledge (savoir), on the position that the subject must occupy to order to map them, on the instrumental mediations that enables it to grasp them, on the modalities of registration and memory that it must practise and that qualify it as a subject of legitimate knowledge.” (Foucault, 1963, p.168)

Harding’s (1992) thesis on ‘obscure politics’ is also useful to consider here. It is worth reflecting that Foucault does not suggest *savoir* exists waiting to be revealed. The passage reveals that the historian must construct *savoir* according to their own position, with the tools available to them at the time they write. This determines those elements of *savoir* can be constructed or determined. Only by constructing *savoir* through archaeological method can we begin to see how phenomena ‘make sense’, or are intelligible, to subjects in their own historical context. To this extent, all things are constructed and derivative of their own time and space. Phenomena become unintelligible without an adequate understanding of *savoir*. However it is only ever possible to reveal partial understandings as the historian is restricted in this endeavour by what it is possible to think or say in their own age: inevitably constrained by available tools within their own discourse.

Returning to ideas about ‘truth’, it should be clear that the construction of *savoir* using archaeological method ensures it can only ever be a partial reading due to the constrained subject position of the historian. This is particularly important in considering any truth claim and a theme I return to when presenting my text analysis of EBP. It is a key insight which questions the foundational truth claims that EBP discourse relies upon.

To help to overcome the problem of discursive constraint on the historian, Foucault suggests comparing possible knowledges from different periods and cultures offers the historian the best hope of achieving a construction of *savoir*. An example may help to explain this historical relativism. In his first genealogical work, *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1975) charts the emergence of imprisonment, and specifically its emergence as a concept (which came to have the equivalence to punishment) in modern penal discourse. This is a relatively modern idea traced by Foucault to about the eighteenth century and yet it is now seen as an 'obvious fact' within modern penal rationalities constructed and understood in our current period. The idea of imprisonment therefore emerges in modernity and fundamentally differs to how punishment was conceived in earlier periods where death, mutilation, public humiliation and violence inflicted on bodies were preferred *modus operandi* in governing rationalities on punishment: in eras when monarchical power dominated western Europe. This example shows how Foucault's histories differ from 'history' as traditionally conceived. Foucault explored roles of people, institutional modifications, instances of discourse, and narratives that articulate what we do, say and think in given periods. The idea that archaeologies help us understand what is possible or intelligible to think, say or do in any given period is fundamental to a Foucauldian approach to research and are key features in my own method and analysis that follows.

Foucault describes his *genealogy* as a 'history of the present'. He alludes to the potential benefits of developing his archaeological method in "*different directions*" in the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969, p.212), where he seems to be considering the

possibility of expanding this analytical device to consider political power more explicitly. He hints at his later work in 'his task' writing briefly about sexuality to illustrate I think the moment in time when he was moving from archaeology towards his genealogical concept that he would later develop:

"But I can also see another possible direction for analysis: instead of studying the sexual behaviour of men at a given period... instead of describing what men thought of sexuality... one would ask oneself whether, in this behaviour, as in these representations, a whole discursive practice is not at work; whether sexuality, quite apart from any orientation towards a scientific discourse, is not a group of objects that can be talked about... a field of possible enunciations... a group of concepts... a set of choices... Such an archaeology would show, if it succeeded in its task, how the prohibitions, exclusions, limitations, values, freedoms, and transgressions of sexuality, all its manifestations, verbal or otherwise, are linked to a particular discursive practice. It would reveal, not of course the ultimate truth of sexuality, but... a certain 'way of speaking': and one would show how this way of speaking is invested not in scientific discourses, but in a system of prohibitions and values." (Foucault, 1969, p.213)

The passage indicates a concern with the effects of moments of decision on ordering, and its links through such moments to power. Foucault would become much more concerned with power and knowledge, and developed genealogy to accommodate these considerations in his later work (Foucault, 1978; 1997). Genealogy can be conceptualised as a step beyond archaeological method which presented research of things simply 'as they are', to one which takes this more analytical approach. I explain the concept of power-knowledge in greater detail below, but genealogy marks a shift from archaeological description of things 'as they are' (surface descriptions in order to reveal difference) to greater analytical potential through critical explanation which examines power relations observable in problematised research objects.

Foucault advocates that genealogies should be inspired by current concerns – issues of 'sensitivity or fragility' in the current period – and should seek to explore how we

arrived at this point (Foucault, 1975). What were the moments of decision that led us to where we find ourselves presently? This revelation of transformative possibility through genealogy potentially leads us towards no longer being, thinking or doing what we 'are, think or do' in the present. If one accepts our normalised state as constructed then it can be potentially reconstructed in an alternate way by tracing and exposing its contingency and reimagining possibilities.

This starting point for Foucault is being concerned with *problematizations*: Why particular things emerge and are presented as a problem in the terms that we find them? Foucault suggests that all of his great histories start from this concern – on sexuality, mental illness, medicine and health, or imprisonment. He advises us that he is uninterested in history of theories or institutions in favour of,

*“the history of problems, moreover, if you like, it is the **genealogy** of problems that concerns me. Why a problem and why such a kind of problem, why a certain way of **problematizing** appears at a given point in time”* (emphasis added, Foucault, 1997, p.165).

Foucault (1997) describes problematizations as periods of darkness from which new light is required and can emerge. In this process 'objects' became presented as problematic objects. One can conceive of the light as new knowledge. Genealogy follows Foucault's points on construction of archaeologies in that the scholar must seek complexity, difference, and points of divergence, rather than continuities. Scholars following Foucault are equally not looking for singular causation but looking for possibility, (re)opening the space of the possible, not closing explanations with hypothesis testing.

My own research therefore is seeking to determine different things about EBP to those following in the tradition of normative science. I seek possibility, insight and alternatives, not 'truths' which are demonstrably contingent. My work is then, unsurprisingly, a complex undertaking with many factors to be considered in constructing a genealogy of EBP through discourse analysis, which leaves open multiple explanations in the understandings of power-knowledge, subject positioning, discourse, institutions, language, texts, and so on. I have adopted a methodological approach to overcome this complexity and bring a logical structure to my work which I describe in the following chapter.

Foucault usefully describes genealogical undertakings as, *"attempts to restore the conditions for the appearance of a singularity born out of multiple determining elements of which it is not the product but rather, the effect"* (Foucault, 1997, p.57). In applying Foucault to a discourse analysis of EBP therefore, I conceive EBP as the 'singularity' which has appeared. In doing so I am required to consider the full range of Foucault's concepts to draw a possible explanation of how EBP has come to dominate the modern policing policy landscape. I should reiterate the purpose of this thesis is to make EBP intelligible, trace its lineage to expose any contingencies and (re)open possibilities which have been closed off - not to find a point of closure about it. Chapter's 4 to 6 present my empirical work, synthesised using Foucault's concepts to produce a discourse analysis. Taken together they can be read as a *genealogy of evidence-based policing* in the UK. Taking this approach to my research is justified on three main grounds as I see it.

First, archaeology and genealogy flow as a legitimate method for researching the tensions and issues inherent within EBP. EBP meets Foucault's 'test' as a problem which has emerged and is worthy of exploration in my view. Using the seven points of concern presented at the end of Chapter 1, EBP can potentially be alternatively conceived not as an objective project to pursue social betterment, but as a political project of 'its age' which serves in the (re)production of neoliberalism. The extensive critique of the effects of neoliberalism on those at the margins of society ensures that its application to policing, as an institution of state discipline and surveillance, meets Foucault's 'test' for archaeological research in my view: as an issue of current sensitivity, fragility or concern. Critical review using Foucauldian method might free us of the Kantian tutelage of subjectivity to given rules that are observable in the growth of EBP in modern policing. Genealogical research through discourse analysis opens up the possibility of transformative change through this critique.

Second, archaeology and genealogy appear to offer the best opportunity to chart the growth of the EBP movement and explore questions of power within its discourse. Using Foucault's archaeological methods allows me to present and separate out EBP's contingencies; applying a genealogical approach to look at individuals, institutions, language and ideas which comprise the discourse. This facilitates exploration of why 'policing policy', and certain aspects of it in particular, appear to have become problematised through EBP. It is the problematisations of professionalism, efficiency and other more trifling matters which strike the casual observer as odd subjects of funded research into policing, considering the very grave and serious issues which criminologists outside the EBP 'camp' raise: on topics such

as social harm, crimes of the powerful, and decarceration. Furthermore, a genealogical approach allows me to examine why EBP – based on evidence-based medicine and scientific enquiry – has emerged and developed traction as ‘the answer’ to these trifling problematisations. The genealogical approach also allows me to identify governance techniques within the discourse that discipline actors, neutralise challenge and help to sustain EBP.

Third, the ‘rise’ of EBP seems to be traceable at its earliest point to the 1970s in the US, and probably later in the UK context. Archaeological method allows me to conduct research over an extended time period by starting with EBP as a problematisation rather than a defined temporal period. Foucault’s great ‘*archaeological*’ studies examine significant changes from monarchical reigns through democratic governments and so on: great epochal changes across centuries. The *archaeological* approach therefore may seem less relevant for this study as the rise of EBP occurs within the same ‘*episteme*’, and I accept that the evidence-based policy movement in general, and the EBP movement in particular, are coincidental with the neoliberal period in western politics and society from about the 1970s. However, this historicisation is potentially important in explaining why rationalities have developed which support the growth of EBP in the UK context. Historicising EBP within the discourses of recent decades enhance the possibility of insight, but given its relatively recent emergence as a phenomena it will not be possible to draw longer term epistemic archaeological insights about EBP as Foucault was able to do in his presentations on the history of sexuality over Millenia, or madness across the centuries (Foucault, 1978; 1963).

ii. *Episteme and Discursive Formations*

Turning to the next of my attempts to single out elemental Foucauldian concepts, the complexity of this exercise becomes clearer still. In terms of ‘discourse’ I turn to definition shortly, but one of the first things to understand about discourse for Foucault was the need to historicise it. This, of course, leads us straight back into the previous subsection on archaeology and genealogy. Equally it is difficult to describe discourse meaningfully without a discussion or understanding of Foucauldian view on knowledge and power, or the subject, which I address subsequently. The interplay of elemental concepts is key to understanding Foucault’s thinking, but this subsection will remain focused on epistemic discourse formation.

This understanding of discourse as shaping what is potentially meaningful, knowable, and intelligible, ensures that discourse can be understood as operating through ‘techniques of discipline’ that govern actors. Discourse works at one level in a disciplinarily way by delimiting what can be said, thought, and done in each period in each domain. It is these periods and conditions which Foucault described as *episteme* (Foucault, 1963). Application of Foucault’s historical methods allow (re) construction of the epistemic conditions in which discourse forms through classification of knowledge (*savoir*) into *science*, and describe what actors in that place and time can view as possible (*connaissance*) (Foucault, 1969). Foucault described the reciprocal relationship between the object and subject through knowledge:

“it is the more general arrangement of knowledge that determines the reciprocal positions and the connexion between the one who must know and that which is to be known. The access of a medical gaze into the sick body was not the continuation of a movement of approach that has been developing in a more or less regular fashion since the day when the first doctor cast his somewhat unskilled gaze far off on the body of the first patient; it was the result of a recasting at the level of epistemic knowledge (savoir) itself, and not at the level of accumulated, refined, deepened, adjusted knowledge (connaissances).” (Foucault, 1963; p.168-9)

This illustrates how knowledge and discursive formations mutually reinforce to shape possibilities, and operates in this disciplinary fashion in each episteme. In the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), Foucault provides a useful explanation of this. He suggests that elements of discourse are combined that allow science to be constituted and he calls this *knowledge*.

“Knowledge is that of which one can speak in a discursive practice... knowledge is also the space in which the subject may take up a position and speak of the objects with which he deals in his discourse... knowledge is also the field of coordination and subordination of statements in which the concepts appear, and are defined applied and transformed... knowledge is defined by the possibilities of use and appropriation offered by discourse... There are bodies of knowledge that are independent of the sciences... but there is no knowledge without a particular discursive practice; and any discursive practice may be defined by the knowledge that it forms.” (Foucault, 1969; p.201)

Archaeology allows mapping of those discursive formations (elements) to understand the construction of knowledge about phenomena, offering insight into the discourse and its reciprocating knowledge. The objectives of my research; to examine the micro-practices of EBP discourse to offer an alternative view on its truth claims about its potential for social progress, is a key reason why discourse analysis, properly sited within its historical and spatial context, is the central methodological technique deployed into my research. If one accepts the radical relativism that Foucault brings to his work, then there is an absolute need to ‘historicise’ what is observable in EBP

to understand its development more fully.

The above passage shows that Foucault envisaged discourse to be understood as a much wider concept than simply 'language', although it does include language. Indeed, language is central to Foucault's work as it is through studying 'texts' – articulated by language – that one can reveal other aspects of discourse:

"Language is the first and last structure of madness, its constituent form; on language are based all the cycles in which madness articulates its nature."
(Foucault, 1964, p.94)

Discourse operates to 'rule in' and 'rule out' – to "*coordinate and subordinate*" – what it is possible to say, think or do. Foucault understood that through detailed study of texts – and therefore language - discourse can be revealed as elements of language, texts, practices, statements, individuals and institutions which combine together to produce *knowledge* and our way of seeing the world in given historical periods and places (Foucault, 1963; 1964; 1975). These elements of discourse become mutually reinforcing, supported by knowledge, but can be revealed through study of what Foucault describes as 'the archive' – a corpus of statements that determine what is visible and what is sayable (Foucault, 1969). By mapping and analysing elements of discourse through detailed study of the EBP archive, I have developed revelatory insights about EBP discourse; allowing its discursive elements to be identified, separated and re-presented as disciplinary governance techniques of discursive formation. EBP can be repositioned as a *science* with attendant properties of classification and governance in the way conceived by Foucault, and so my research (re)opens the possibility of change.

Truth therefore, for Foucault, was never an absolute. It is always constructed and accessed through the apparatus of discourse. Foucault was concerned in applying his historical methods to examine particular discourses that emerge and “*come to be seen as true*” (Foucault, 1997, p.179). We can only access objects through discourse, this access becomes littered with power relations. In his Preface to the ‘Use of Pleasure’ (1985) Foucault discusses ‘games of truth’ as the product of combined discursive elements which ‘produce truth’. Consistent to his earlier theoretical developments, Foucault suggests we can reveal games of truth as discursive systems through archaeology, and their relationship to power via genealogy. This insight is important to understand the foundations of my own analysis that follows on EBP discourse. EBP can be reimagined as a ‘regime of truth’ using my analysis. I argue this is useful to understand EBP differently: as a way actors use it to understand and interpret the world around them. However, EBP presents itself as a discoverer and diviner of absolute truths, following the rationalities and status of medico-positivist science as an arbiter of truth about the world. This is clearly problematic, given my epistemological commitments. The absolutism in the seeking and proclamations of truths seems to me a highly contestable endeavour requiring analysis through exploration of EBP’s discourse.

iii. Hegemonic Narratives

Summarising Foucault, Kennedy (1979, p.278) suggests that narratives function as a ‘taxonomy’; they serve to give things an order or place within discourse. To operate as a taxonomy there must be a process through which contestations occur to secure

meaning – moments of “*coordination and subordination of statements*” (Foucault, 1969, p.201) – where agreement is reached on the symbolic language of ‘things’ in any episteme. This process of creating hegemonic narratives serves to identify, ascribe meaning and differentiate. Narratives serve to produce ‘signs’ as representations of things within the discourse. Signs and names give things their place in ‘the order of things’ (Foucault, 1970). Hegemonic narratives are important in underscoring and shaping truth regimes that allow society to function based on shared understandings. This functional or facilitative aspect of discourse is equally important in reading Foucault as discourses’ disciplinary function. Read together, discourse elements combine to produce governance through both facilitation and discipline. So as well as operating to discipline and constrain subjects, discourse also provides an important functional role in facilitating communication between ‘discoursing subjects’. This fits well with Foucault’s understanding of power as possessing a recursive quality, which I expand upon below.

The process of defining hegemonic language can be seen as a series of moments of political contest and decision making. The processes of contest and agreement are clear political moments of inclusion or exclusion, where a version of ‘the truth’ is constructed that is reconcilable with other operant factors within discourse. This process might cause modification of other factors within the discourse. For example subject positions might become amended, or institutional modifications can occur to ensure discursive ‘fit’. These processes of hegemony describe how language serves to shape discourse, but is simultaneously shaped by the discourse itself: there is a reproductive, recursive relationship between language and other discursive

elements. Language, and processes producing hegemony, are therefore important in any reading of Foucault or application of his theories. Both are inextricably linked to Foucault's ideas about history and progress. History has not ended, it is an ongoing process in which meaning and truth is contested and ascribed, but only within the terms that are permissible in that period: they will change in future. Discourse thus serves at once as both a disciplinary and empowering governance that shapes the terms of this contest, but also allows the contest to occur at all. The outcome of the contest, and the resultant hegemonic narratives and meanings operate to further (re) shape discourse itself.

On Foucault's understanding of language and narratives, Kennedy suggests, "*statements... must be viewed within the context of power as objects and weapons of political struggle*" (Kennedy 1979, p.286). There are three important points that Kennedy highlights which are worth pausing upon. First, Foucault avoids the type of determinism or reductionism that he rejected in Marxian explanations of power: "*he is able to delineate a place for social structure in the emergence of knowledge, without reducing knowledge to the economic, political and social interests of its holders*" (Kennedy 1979, p.287). The circularity of power, its reciprocal nature, is critical to understand if one is to comprehend Foucault's key ideas. Second, Foucault denies capturing the 'spirit of the age' or the thought of the period which he would reject as a totalising view of history. He does however, still explore regularities in documents to draw out moments of choice in discourse or narrative alignments. I will explore how this has been developed by others into workable methodologies in the following chapter. Third, relativism is vital to understanding Foucault: "*Foucault insists that all*

knowledge is contextually determined, limited by its historically specific epistemic conditions of possibility” (p.288).

Returning to my comments above on archaeology, simply in particular periods discourse operates to discipline language and structures such that certain things we do, think or say can only be intelligible in that circumstance. Foucault’s work on insanity *“Madness and Civilization”* (1964) provides a useful example here;

“confinement was an institutional creation peculiar to the seventeenth century... in the history of unreason, it marked a decisive event: the moment when madness was perceived on the social horizon of poverty, of incapacity for work, of inability to integrate with the group.” (Foucault, 1964, p.59).

Taken outside of this contextual relativity, modern concepts of insanity – ‘madness’ - become incomprehensible. This theoretical insight is crucial to my analysis of EBP. Processes of hegemony can be revealed expressed through narratives that help to explain how EBP self-presents as trading in objective truths relevant to policy. Exploration of what is included and excluded in the development of the shared language of EBP helps to demonstrate its contingencies, and explore what is driving this peculiar approach to policy-making. Using Foucault’s approach to consider EBP in its proper discursive historical context suggests EBP may simply be ‘of its time’.

iv. Power-Knowledge

Foucault has a very distinctive view of power, which is critical to understanding his work. Foucault viewed power not as an oppressive tool whereby holders of power ‘wield’ it to subjugate others. Foucault viewed power as a dispersed productive force,

a kind of energy source which produces ‘things’, for good or ill. It is the interaction of these complex power relations that produce the world we inhabit and provide access or understanding to the world through discourse. Forces of contest and resistance to oppression are thus equally productive in shaping discourse as those doing the oppressing. Power then not only produces – knowledge, subjects, texts – but also reproduces the conditions leading to its production. Power has this recursive quality which maintains and shapes discursive formations, allowing them to adapt to challenge over time (Foucault, 1975). Understood in this way, power produces knowledge, and knowledge reinforces the power relations that produce it.

For Foucault knowledge and meaning is produced through discourse. This is one of my critical starting points for analysis of EBP discourse, as Foucault’s insights stand in contrast to EBP’s discourse on absolute and universal truths on policing policy. Foucault understood the nature of knowledge as radically contingent. This conflict between the nature of knowledge that is presented in EBP and as knowledge is understood by Foucault, is so crucial to my analysis that a deeper explanation of power-knowledge is necessary here to fully contextualise my concerns about EBP.

I have already described that for Foucault there is a symbiotic, recursive relationship between power and knowledge – they cannot exist without the other;

“We should admit rather than power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time, power relations” (Foucault, 1975, p.27).

I am persuaded by this conceptual understanding. Knowledge requires a system of power to validate it as legitimate according to the “*scientific discourse in a given period*”: knowledge must be ‘authorised’ to acquire its truth status. While power cannot exist without being validated by a requisite coherent system of knowledge. Hence, “*a nexus of knowledge-power has to be described so that we can grasp what constitutes the acceptability of a system, be it the health system, the penal system, delinquency, sexuality, etc.*” (Foucault, 1997, p.53).

Power then is not about mastery and coercion, but is an interrelationship which cannot be divorced from knowledge. This is a crucial insight for my analysis of EBP discourse. At its heart, EBP harnesses a particular form of knowledge (produced by positivist scientific methodologies validated by knowledge hierarchies) to political power in the form of policy making through institutional changes. The harnessing of knowledge (‘evidence’) to power through institutional reforms is therefore very important in understand how certain discourses come to dominate modernity as ‘true’. The foundation of the College of Policing, alongside various techniques of governance, institutionally harnessing research ‘evidence’ (knowledge) to policy (power) through EBP discourse unsurprisingly draws my interest as a Foucauldian scholar.

Power relations are seen by Foucault as being conveyed through ‘apparatus’ and ‘technologies’ to produce ‘discipline’ or ‘governance’ that in turn produce ‘docile bodies’ (Foucault, 1975). By this he is describing phenomena such as surveillance, normalisation and examination. The role of institutions and their practices

(techniques) in producing social regulation or governance of actors particularly interested Foucault, focussing on roles of prisons, schools and hospitals. Power relations are additionally conveyed through apparatus of 'discipline' or processes and procedures of 'normalisation'.

"Like surveillance and with it, normalization becomes one of the great instruments of power at the end of the Classical Age. For the mark that once indicated status, privilege, and affiliation were increasingly replaced – or at least supplemented by – a whole range of degrees of normality indicating membership of a homogenous social body but also playing a part in classification, hierarchization and the distribution of rank." (Foucault, 1975, p.184)

Foucault's insight into structure and ordering of the social through discourse provides a key justification for using genealogical methodology to (re) construct how current problematisations define subjects, objects and rules within EBP discourse.

The hegemony that is emerging around EBP can be seen as a system of discourse, met with limited critical challenge, that is broadly 'conceived to be true'. Hence, power applied through technologies of governance operate to support – and are supported by – particular types of knowledge. Institutions possess the power to 'authorise' certain types of knowledge as 'truth' which reciprocates by validating that power of authority in the discourse. I explore this in my analysis but institutional 'authorisation' and modification is evident in the emergence of EBP, and so Foucault's concept of power-knowledge is important in my final analysis.

Bringing together my understanding of episteme, discursive formation and power-knowledge I understand the (re) production of knowledge as both arbitrary and contingent (Foucault, 1969). I also understand the relevance of knowledge in

sustaining discourses that function to govern subjects in the modern world (Foucault, 1975). Hall summarises Foucault's relational understanding of knowledge well; *"It is discourse, not the subjects who speak it, which produces knowledge. Subjects may produce particular texts, but they are operating within the limits of the **episteme**, the **discursive formation**, the **regime of truth**, of a particular period and culture."* (emphasis original, Hall, 1997, p.79). This shows how what can be said, thought or done in a period is delimited by the nature of the discursive field. At the conclusion of 'Discipline and Punish' (1975), Foucault suggests his work provides: *"historical background to various studies of the power of normalization and the formation of knowledge in modern society."* (Foucault, 1975, p.308). In his later work, Foucault developed concepts of parrhesia and veridiction to examine truth. On veridiction Foucault explains that something is 'true' according to a world view, rather than because something is objectively 'true' (Foucault, 2011). This insight is particularly impactful on considerations of 'truth' and knowledge. Its impact is most acute for those projects that are built to rely upon a belief in human progress based on foundational truth-seeking, such as EBP.

v. Subject Positioning

Foucault's insight into power-knowledge and his explanations of the (re) productive nature of power within discourse means his analysis differs significantly from analysis that provides a significant role for subject agency in the production of knowledge through rationality. This is not to say however that subjects have no power or agency,

because of course they do. Keeping in mind the recursive nature of power, subjects can be conceived as at once produced by discourse and also having the power to produce themselves within discourse; by choosing subject positions themselves and positioning other actors. What subjects are able to say, think and do – the texts they produce – are all limited by discursive formations. Discourse operates such that only certain kinds of knowledge are possible as knowledge is created by discourse, not subjects. I have described this process more fully in explaining processes of contest and hegemony above.

Foucault views subjects as being impacted in two ways by discourse. First, the discourse defines subjects such that the madman, the criminal, and so on are produced as subjects by the knowledge produced through discourse. This provides taxonomic 'ordering of things' (Foucault, 1970). Secondly though, and this links strongly to Foucault's understanding of recursive power, the subject is enabled to position themselves within the discourse, such that subjects can make intelligible sense of the world within and through the discourse. From *Discipline and Punish* onwards, Foucault considered more closely the role of the subject in self-governance. The degree which one is able to rationally 'choose' a subject position or identity is never quite resolved. In his last works on sexuality Foucault discusses the 'ethical formation of the self', potentially simply through internalisation of social norms which marginalises the subject (Foucault, 1985; 1986). I expand on this below in describing governmentality but in short, subjects self-govern, they become self-subjective to their own knowledge.

Foucault (1997) suggests that genealogy can be most usefully applied to scientific organisations of knowledge where we can observe the 'genealogy of the subject' in taxonomies. This describes instances of knowledge serving to construct subject positions, such as the prisoner or the madman. I explore subject positions within EBP discourse in more detail in Chapter 5. In sum EBP discourse is creating observable 'new' subject positions, such as the 'pracademic' (Murray and Sherman, 2015) 'battler cops' or the 'professional police officer', against which actors position themselves and others and narrate their contributions within and against.

Other subject positions are visible and taxonomic that are being produced in EBP discourse: the 'policy expert', the 'impactive academic', the 'independent policy evaluator', the 'objective civil servant policy maker', the 'apolitical / non-ideological politician'. These subject positions have only become possible and intelligible through EBP discursive production in our present historical conditions (episteme), which accords 'value' to 'what works' evaluative knowledges. Actors are able to position themselves against these produced constructions, potentially through internalising the norms and value of these discursive formations. In adopting these positions, actors become 'subject' to power-knowledge; they accept or reject the rule and norms of the discourse from this positionality.

vi. *Techne, Discipline and Governmentality*

Foucault was interested in governance and government, but drew this as a very wide concept to include 'governance of the self'. In this respect, he drew much from the

ancient Greek idea of 'techne', rather than the more narrow frame in which we presently understand 'government' (Foucault, 1986; 2011). The state therefore becomes simply a rather than the form of government. 'Governmentality' can be understood in simple terms as the acceptance of – and subjectivity to – the rules and norms which govern a particular episteme. When understood in this way we can describe governmentality as a 'technique of discipline'. Discourse, knowledge and power coalesce with language and subject positionality to operate in a way that brings order to society.

"It seems to me that by carrying out this triple theoretical shift – from the theme of acquired knowledge to veridiction, from the theme of domination to that of governmentality, and from the theme of the individual to that of the practices of the self – we can study the relations between truth, power and subject without ever reducing each of them to the others." (Foucault, 2011, p.9)

This is not in an oppressive way as traditional explanations of power conceive, but following Foucault's understanding of power relations, occurs as a productive consequence of the interplay of complex power relations and is both constraining and empowering at once. It is only through detailed examination of discursive elements that the researcher can reveal these relations, norms, techniques of discipline, governance and therefore, power.

Lemke's work (2001) describes Foucault's examination of the archaeology of neo-liberalism, developing the concept of 'governmentality' which creates disciplinary order on populations. Governmentality can be seen as a 'technology of power' or 'discipline' that accounts for withdrawal of the state by shifting responsibility from the state and onto individuals. In the absence of state, individuals develop the mentality of government themselves: a governmentality. Institutions of society – schools and

colleges, factories, prisons, hospitals – become modified to deliver order through shaping what it is possible for subjects to think, say or do. In his work ‘Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison’ (1975), Foucault describes Jeremy Bentham’s design for the panoptic jail with a guard at the centre of the wheel with spokes of cells running from it such that the guard at the centre can, in effect, observe all prisoners simultaneously. The prisoners know this and therefore modify or regulate their behaviour accordingly. Prisoners, under fear of surveillance, modify – or ‘govern’ - their behaviour irrespective of whether the guard is present. In the modern age Foucault argues that individuals have come to regulate conduct themselves in a way that benefits the state and capitalism – a ‘governance of the self’ – and this becomes the ultimate expression of unobtrusive power.

“The practice of placing individuals under ‘observation’ is a natural extension of a justice imbued with disciplinary methods and examination procedures. Is it surprising that the cellular prison, with its regular chronologies, forced labour, its authorities of surveillance and registration, its experts in normality, who continue and multiply the functions of the judge, should have become the modern instrument of penalty? Is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?” (Foucault, 1975, p.228)

Under neo-liberal regimes intervention is not by the state itself but through specialised and often arms-length state apparatus, operating through discourse. The ideas of normalisation and surveillance are incredibly important here (Foucault, 1975). Lemke (2001, p.201) describes *“indirect techniques for controlling individuals without being responsible for them”*. Surveillance does not just mean cameras and observations however. In neo-liberal regimes, techniques of governance extend surveillance to promote self-government include areas such as narratives on ‘effectiveness’ or ‘efficiency’, subject positions such as model students or employees, ‘good parents’,

and the reform of institutional practice to support the discourse through distribution of resources or access to information. Raco and Imrie (2000) use Foucault's insights to explore the UK government's policy on the 'single regeneration budget'. By analysing discourse they identify techniques of discipline as 'appraisal' and 'management' including techniques such as output monitoring, achievement, spending, target, and action plans. These are normalised as 'best value', 'best practice', 'peer review', which emphasise 'responsibility'. Surveillance can root out 'poor performers' to reinforce hegemonic normalisation. All of these contribute to actors 'self-regulation' through governmentality.

As well as sharing much of the management language Raco and Imrie (2000) identify (and we can describe as neo-liberally 'modern' and in line with state objectives), my analysis of EBP discourse identifies a great number of similar operant techniques of discipline that sustain it through subjectification of actors. Through application of historical method and discourse analysis this thesis illustrates examples of actors being gripped by EBP discourse, a range of institutional governance techniques that extend 'surveillance', and so the governmentalisation of a range of actors who contribute to EBPs text archives in ways that support the discourse.

Summary

I have outlined above what I understand and interpret as Foucault's key concepts, and how I will apply my understanding of them to the key concerns that emerge from

my study. I rely upon these key concepts in my analysis and they have inspired my research. This chapter is therefore an important reference point for what follows by way of explanation in this thesis. It is important to reiterate that I understand what I have presented in this chapter is an artificial taxonomy. I have a clear understanding of the necessity of drawing together the concepts described above, synthesising them to explore and develop the interrelationships between them if I am to approach the level of analysis that does justice to Foucault's insights. Foucault explains the 'capital importance' of this interrelationship in effective critical analysis;

"the interplay of governmentalisation and critique has brought about phenomena which are, I believe, of capital importance in the history of western culture whether in the development of philological sciences, philosophical thought, legal analysis or methodological reflections. However, above all, one sees that the core of critique is basically a bundle of relationships that are tied to one another, or one of the two others, power, truth and subject" (Foucault, 1997, p.31).

Therefore, in my discourse analysis it is not enough to simply analyse say, language, without consideration of power-knowledge, or subject positionality, and all of it is meaningless outside of a study which attempts to historicise these concepts within the frameworks provided by Foucault to develop understanding of savoir, connaissance and episteme. My analysis therefore studies discursive elements together to provide a deeper insight of what EBP discourse might stand for, from whence it came, and who or what is served by it. The importance of doing so is in the hope of mounting challenge to what appears normalised, scrutinised and surveyed in the modern age through EBP. Foucault viewed his approach to discourse analysis as emancipatory in this regard. The next chapter describes in detail how I have developed a methodological approach from this theoretical framework to facilitate such my analysis.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

This chapter builds on the discussion above on epistemology to develop and explain a workable method I have used to conduct research compatible with a Foucauldian position. It is presented in three sections. First, I outline and discuss contributions of some the key scholars who have conducted their own research using methodological designs that are considered ‘discourse analytical’. These methods are more explicit in their level of detail about method than Foucault’s original texts provide, and more directly address the question of *how* one might conduct discourse analysis research from this perspective. I comment on each to determine what works well, is congruent with Foucault’s work and look for points of commonality to transpose into my own method. I also highlight points of contention in these approaches where I feel they have diverged too far away from my own reading of Foucault’s original work. Second, I present my own research design based on this discussion, explaining the approach I have taken to data collection and analysis. I include a note on the validity of how my bespoke approach might be assessed. Third, I explain how my empirical research and analysis is presented in this thesis.

1. Methodological Approaches Of The ‘Discourse Analysts’

Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) note a key challenge in developing research following Foucault is that he never clearly laid down a stepped methodological approach to his own work. His great archaeologies and genealogies, while heavily based on his own

empirical research and deep understanding of data, fail to provide a full account of *how* came to select the data he had, or how his approach could be replicated. Research design following Foucault's approach is therefore difficult. It is not simply a case of consulting Foucault's methodological statements and replicating them using my own data sets, as one might expect in a traditional positivist thesis. I am therefore left in a position of requirement to *interpret* a methodological approach to use in my own research from Foucault's presentations of his own empirical research. This is not a scholarly problem unique to my project however. A range of other academics have attempted to conduct research within the field of 'discourse analysis': researchers who have similarly followed the theoretical insights developed by Foucault to develop their own methods.

There are a variety of approaches that have been developed to discourse analysis. They variously place emphasis on differing aspects of that analysis, and that emphasis is largely determined by the epistemological beliefs of the scholar. Several scholars have attempted to categorise these typologies and a useful summary of this can be found in Burnham et. al. (2004). All of these approaches owe an intellectual debt to Foucault, and yet some move further away from his underpinning concepts than others. In my view some move so far away from Foucault's theoretical foundations in their extrapolations into method that they lose coherence with core Foucauldian concepts. I have found none that I could satisfactorily use 'pret-a-porter', for my research without alteration. For this reason, I have developed my own method, based on my interpretation of Foucault's texts. To arrive at this point I have surveyed other key researchers who have also conducted this exercise, and found points of

commonality which have allowed me to devise a method. This subsection describes that journey.

David Howarth (2000) proposes five 'types' of discourse analysis. Positivist scholars, often informed by psychology, who will focus on content to determine world views to legitimise action. Realist scholars assume 'facts' exist in the world and that they shape our discourse in a more deterministic way. Neo-Marxist scholars will explore discourse as a tool of the economically powerful to subjugate the working class. This accords an overly-deliberate quality of agency in its interpretation of power than my reading of Foucault would allow. Critical discourse analysts will favour interpretivism and emphasise the sociological over the economic in discourse development, while also retaining their understanding of power as a dominant and exploitative force. Finally, post-structuralist discourse analysis, after Foucault, which is concerned more with the contingency of discourse and how through historicisation we can reveal that contingency through its contradictions to explore its constitution. It should be clear from the preceding chapter that I am drawn to refine my own methodological approach in the post-structural discourse analytical tradition, and this is the principle focus of this chapter. It would have been remiss of me however to not at least reference the other types of discourse analysis that exist to situate where I consider my study sits within these possible approaches.

Even within discourse analysis that we might loosely term 'post-structural' there remain differences in interpretation and approaches which must be considered. Key amongst these differences is a theoretical divergence from what is considered to be

constituted by, or included within the term 'discourse'. Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) present a helpful discussion of this, categorising three types of discourse analysis in this tradition. They focus their study around the work of Norman Fairclough on 'critical discourse analysis' (CDA); Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe on 'hegemonic discourse theory'; and the work of those engaged in 'discursive psychology'. Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) suggest both Fairclough's CDA and psychological approaches afford a greater role for the non-discursive in constituting what might be considered the extent of the social. This allows Fairclough and others to 'import' non-discursive elements into their analysis; ascribing roles for ideology or economy as examples of separate, non-discursive entities. Such elements would be considered as discursive elements by others including Foucault, for whom nothing was intelligible outside of discourse. Laclau and Mouffe's approach follows more closely to the Foucauldian tradition of seeing discourse as constitutive of the social in its entirety. For Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) this disagreement on the 'scope' of discourse – what is 'within' or 'without' - emanating from researchers understandings of political theory, which separates the approaches.

The differences in epistemological commitments of researchers, upon which their methods are produced also changes the focus of analysis for each approach. Foucault and Laclau and Mouffe (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985) focus more on 'big discourse' and the abstract, whereas Fairclough (Fairclough, 1995) focusses on more detailed analysis of language and texts. Discursive psychology is also more concerned with individual speech acts and the 'everyday discourse'. Differences in epistemological frameworks have further impacts on other methodological issues

such as text selection and what can meaningfully be included for analysis. For example, importing elements a researcher considers 'non-discursive' into discourse analysis requires a degree of explanation and translation into discourse 'terms'. This presents an issue to writers such as Fairclough. Where discourse is understood as all-constitutive, there is less requirement for such an 'interpretation' to bring elements within the field of analysis as all things are (re)produced by discourse. For Foucault elements such as the economy can properly be considered and accounted for as an element of discourse. This more all-inclusive approach aligns most closely to Foucauldian theory in my view, and I take forward as the basis of my own research. I believe that discourse is constitutive of the social in its broadest sense, and so this frames my analysis without further need of explanation as to why things are or aren't included.

Although there are significant differences of belief and approach presented here *within* post structuralist discourse analysis, there are at least four very important shared understandings and similarities across these approaches. First, all discourse analysis shares a belief in analysing patterns within discourse and exploring how this serves to shape the involvement of people in everyday life. In this respect, all of the approaches understand that how we are able to talk about the world is both determined by it, but simultaneously constitutes the world around us too. It is here that we can trace lineage back to the reciprocal philosophy of Foucault and other continental post-structuralists: *"Truth is a discursive construction and different regimes of knowledge determine what is true and false. The historical rules of the particular discourse delimit what it is possible to say"* (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002,

p.13).

Second, truth can be conceptualised as an effect of discourse, rather than an absolutist idea to be discovered, tested and 'proved'. This is a key insight from discourse theories and critical therefore to my research and analysis of EBP. From this perspective, there is little point 'testing' whether EBP is true or false. It is clearly observable as a politico-social phenomenon of 'current concern' in the UK currently. The purpose of my research is to explore the questions about *why* it has come to be seen as 'true' within the contemporary discourse? What makes this so? How is it 'authorised' and sustained as a regime of truth?

Third, all of these approaches share some familial links; a DNA. All are broadly considered conceptually 'critical'. They are investigating discourse with a view to social change in a way considered politically progressive. In performing their versions of discourse analysis all are concerned with the 'taken-for-granted'; that which appears natural and normalised within discourse, and the potential effects this might have.

Finally, all concur with the Foucauldian view of discourse as both culturally and historically specific. All are also concerned with the application to which knowledge might be put in social activity and processes (see Burr, 1995, for a fuller explanation).

The approaches to discourse analysis I discuss below are closer in alignment to Foucault's later genealogical work in respect of their view that different discourses are

understood as competing for the right to 'authorise truth' and knowledge *within a period* (Hajer, 1995). This contrasts to Foucault's earlier archaeological approach, with the role of epistemic determination assuming greater prominence in a particular period. In his later work, Foucault began to address this by developing concepts on power-knowledge and so forth considering the role of agency, but it did not develop into a coherent theory of change in his lifetime. Theoretical work that has followed, notably from Maarten Hajer, has been focussed on explaining processes of social change more clearly (Hajer, 2003, 2003).

It is noteworthy that the attempts to develop methodologies from Foucauldian theory are often quite formulaic in terms of offering 'staged' or 'stepped' approaches to method. The remainder of this section focusses on presenting methodological approaches to discourse analysis which I consider are *within* the post-structural tradition and based on citations, are arguably the most influential on discourse analytical methods. To that end I focus on Stuart Hall's (1997) work on discourse analysis and identity; Norman Fairclough (1989, 1995) on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA); the work of Laclau and Mouffe (1985) on hegemony in their discourse theory; David Howarth, Jason Glynos, and Steven Griggs' (2016) development of post-structuralist discourse theory (PDT), which utilises significantly the ideas of Laclau and Mouffe on 'logics', and taken together has been described by Townsend (2003) as the "Essex School"; and, finally, on Maarten Hajer's development of Argumentative Discourse Analysis (ADA) (2002). There are arguments to include a wider range of work, but I believe these authors provide a useful summary of potential ways of approaching post structural discourse analysis, to arrive at my own working method.

Stuart Hall (1997) describes discourse theory as requiring moving through six elements, based upon his reading of Foucault. This provides an excellent schematic breakdown of Foucauldian theory into six main elements to consider in producing work in that style. While theoretically sound, Hall's work lacks the clarity and precision on method that I am seeking to resolve. For Hall, alongside identifying how 'truths' become 'authorised', acknowledging the temporary nature of meanings and insights as discourses adapt due to epistemic rupture, and revealing 'rules' on what is sayable and thinkable in a given period, are three important elements that allow me to think more clearly about specifying method. However, the three other elements I have discovered are commonly shared (albeit differently described) with other discourse analysts, and help form the core elements on which I have built my method. These are: to identify '**statements**' that articulate knowledge; identify '**subjects**' that embody the discourse; and the study of '**institutional practices**' that become reformed through discourse.

Norman Fairclough's (1995; 2003) work on developing critical discourse analysis (CDA) has attracted much attention from those seeking to utilise post structural discourse analysis. In common with other approaches in this field, *"critical discourse analysis does not understand itself as politically neutral (as objectivist social science does), but as a critical approach which is politically committed to social change"* (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002 p.64). To this extent, Fairclough concurs with Foucault's ideas about turning the attention of the discourse analyst towards researching problems 'of concern' to re-open the possibility of alternatives. Fairclough

suggests that in defining the research question, one should explore multi-disciplinary literature which has explored the phenomenon you are interested in researching. Chapter 1 of this thesis explores a range of texts from different disciplines who have contributions to make on evidence-based policy in general, and EBP in particular. To this extent it complies to Fairclough's suggestion.

In my view Fairclough is closer to Marxist determinist understandings of power in presenting discourse as ideological than a Foucauldian scholar would allow. For Fairclough, discourse is capable of being 'enlisted' in order to maintain unequal power relations between groups in processes of subjugation. This understanding of the operation of power does not wholly accord with my own reading of Foucault. I believe Fairclough presents a too-deliberative and conspiratorial version of power relations. Fairclough's critical discourse analysis also awards a much greater role for the 'non-discursive' in his approach.

"The important point about social practices from the perspective of this book is that they articulate discourse (hence language) together with other non-discoursal social elements. We might see any social practice as an articulation of these elements: action and interaction; social relations; persons (with beliefs, attitudes, histories, etc.); the material world; discourse." (Fairclough, 2003, p.25)

Fairclough's assertion of elements outside of discourse has been criticised as a theoretical weakness of his approach, lacking clarity on the distinction between what should be considered within and without the discourse (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002). Fairclough's work has been highly influential but he interprets discourse much closer to 'language' with non-discursive other elements, than I see discourse from reading Foucault. Fairclough's work stands in contrast to Foucault's more 'all-

inclusive' understanding of discourse in my view and so it is not an approach I can simply follow for my research.

A considered advantage of Fairclough's CDA method is that he conceives of 'doing' discourse analysis in a much clearer methodological approach than Foucault, with his concentration on 'big discourse' across the centuries. There are merits in the use of a larger number of texts for 'big discourse' theorists, *"but, unfortunately, (they) rarely give an account of what tools they have used in the analysis"* (Philips and Jørgensen 2002, p.147). Fairclough (2003), on the other hand, is much more explicit and is most concerned with: detailed analysis of texts at different 'levels': *"social structures; social practices; social events (actions and their social relations, identification of persons, representations of the world); discourse (genres, discourses, styles); semantics;; grammar and vocabulary; phonology/ graphology"* (p.36-7). This inclusion of 'other elements' – notably the 'macro-sociological' - may explain the broader appeal of CDA to a range of academics who have used Fairclough's methods. CDA contains inherent flexibility to bring in other 'external analytical elements' individual researchers may consider important, and so can be more comfortably adapted for utilisation in their own research.

In my view there is a weightier intellectual challenge in trying to decipher the works and methods of Foucault than to follow the 'stepped' methodological prescriptions set out by scholars such as Fairclough. Fairclough believes in a need for very detailed analysis of texts and this exacting requirement potentially limits the volume of data that can be included in studies following his approach. In comparison to analysts

dealing in 'big discourse', Fairclough is less specific on the requirements of *how* one explores the macro sociological social practices. This is potentially problematic as a complete working methodology, particularly as it requires the 'importation' and interpretation of elements seen by Fairclough as non-discursive. Despite the problems outlined with Fairclough's work, there is some utility in considering it in my own approach to research. Principally where Fairclough overlaps with others in examining social practices through the examination of 'texts', to reveal how issues are narrated. This study of texts forms part of my working method.

Post-structuralist political theorists Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985) wrote extensively on discourse theory, and were particularly interested in political power and how a particular world view – an ideology - might become hegemonic. Specifically, how discourse produces moments of inclusion and exclusion in political decision making, alongside processes of narratives becoming hegemonic. Laclau and Mouffe (1985, p.153-4) suggest three ways in which this operates as 'power relations': subordination; domination; and oppression. First, subordination operates where practices appear to need no debate because they are so obviously attuned to social norms. Any dislocation can be covered over by exercising 'legitimate' normalised authority. Second, domination operates by concealing dislocations through institutional practices which dominate subjects. This is most effective where actors are 'subject' to 'governmentality' – becoming dominated by the institutional norms and practices which silently and unobtrusively discipline their approach to thinking, language and practice. Third, oppression operates where dislocations in hegemony, or challenges even, are apparent within discourse but become highlighted as

challenging 'social norms' and are subsequently met with oppressive renewed energy to push back the challenge to maintain social norms and relations. There are echoes here of the work Sandra Harding (1991; 1992) has developed on scientific knowledges in respect of feminist approaches. I described this work in Chapter 1, but to recap the politics of hidden assumptions emanating from the narratives of 'authoritative voices' easily dismiss knowledge which fails to conform with the accepted norms and modalities within the dominant discourse. The theoretical work of both Harding, and Laclau and Mouffe, is useful in my analysis. It is potentially relevant in describing how discursive battles for hegemony might occur – political processes of power struggles that create normalisation and othering - rather than in an overall methodological approach to discourse analysis. Even within the complex work of Laclau and Mouffe however, it is possible to identify key elements that I can take forward in my own work. They are concerned with language; with how this impacts onto subject and subject positions, and how this becomes solidified hegemonically in institutional practices. This again finds its way into my research method.

There is some contestation (see Kendal and Wickham 1999; Phillips and Jørgensen 2002) on whether the way in which writers like Laclau and Mouffe and others have applied Foucault's thinking are entirely in line with his ideas. Kendal and Wickham (1999) suggest that some of this work does not truly reflect Foucault's own understanding of power as a productive force and, for example, reverts to a Marxist-style deterministic approach which sees power as something 'done' by one to another with unequal stakes in social and economic fabrics. Where writers begin with Foucault

as a referent but conclude with class-based analyses, or other forms of dominant / subjugated explanations of social phenomenon, this moves too far away from Foucault's own theories on power, particularly his later analyses in my view. However, I am content from my own reading that while Laclau and Mouffe's interpretation of contestation of power is class based in its final analysis, there is an alignment with Foucault's understanding of power in so far as there is a 'product' of the contestations they describe: hegemonic narratives. Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) support this view that the work of Laclau and Mouffe can meaningfully be considered in this tradition: *"in their theory of the social, they override Marxist essentialism by fixing the two categories – base and superstructure – into one field produced by the same discursive process."* (p.33). Although limited in supporting my quest for developing a working method, what is of value from the literature here is the concept of **hegemony**. Fairclough's own discussion of hegemony suggests,

"A measure of the successful universalisation of such a particular representation is the extent to which it figures in this way as a background assumption (and one might say as an ideology) in a wide variety of texts". (Fairclough, 2003, p.46).

Fairclough uses the example of a 'global marketplace' as an accepted reality upon which an educational text (a leaflet) is founded. I return to this in my discourse analysis of EBP. I contend there are a clear, observable set of ideological 'background assumptions' that underpin the EBP texts I have analysed. In short, EBP is underpinned by the ideology of neo-liberalism.

Laclau and Mouffe from their work at the University of Essex are cited as key contributors to the 'Essex School' of political discourse theory (Townshend, 2003).

David Howarth, Jason Glynos and Steven Griggs (2016) have built on the foundations of discourse theory laid down in the tradition of the Essex School, following Foucault, and have refined their own detailed methodological approach. Howarth, Glynos and Griggs propose an approach they deploy in their own work and label as ‘Post-structuralist Discourse Theory’ (PDT). They suggest PDT can offer a new approach to policy studies and evaluation which *“foregrounds the critical evaluation of policies and practices in order to explore underlying issues of power and ideology”* (2016, p.99). Given the objectives of my research to critically evaluate the rise of EBP, the PDT approach appeared to offer some promise to me as a potential methodological approach to my own research. Howarth, Glynos and Griggs (2016) suggest a five-stepped approach to PDT which I reproduce in full:

1. *“Problematism. Constructing the object of study as a problem, at requisite level of abstraction and complexity.*
2. *Retroduction. Production and testing of a tentative hypothesis to account for the problematised phenomenon by a to-and-fro engagement with empirical data.*
3. *Logics. Content of explanation: capturing the rules that govern regimes or practices, as well as the conditions and objects that make such rules possible. Focus on: **social logics** that characterize a practice or regime; **political logics** of equivalence and difference that account for emergence of practice or regime and its contestation and transformation; **fantasmatic logics** that account for the way particular practices ‘grip’ subjects.*
4. *Articulation. Process of linking together a plurality of logics in order to account for problematised phenomenon, modifying each element in the process.*
5. *Critique. Employing political and fantasmatic logics to explain and expose the contingency of processes and relations. Political logics reveal exclusions and foreclosures at moments of regime institution. Ideological closure is evident in fantasmatic narratives that naturalize relations of domination.”* (Howarth, Glynos and Griggs, 2016, p.100, emphasis original)

Howarth, Glynos and Griggs are particularly concerned therefore, after Laclau and Mouffe, with the operation of **political power relations** in the process of the creation of hegemonies we see in policy processes: *“policy discourses are particular systems*

of meaningful and articulatory practice, which are finite and contingent constructions, constituted politically by the construction of social antagonisms and the creation of political frontiers.” (Howarth, Glynos, Griggs, 2016, p.100). Their approach builds strongly on the development of logics of equivalence and difference from the earlier work of Laclau and Mouffe. It assists in thinking about how I might apply the very esoteric work of Foucault to ‘real world’ policy issues in a conveniently set out methodological approach.

There are theoretical elements of the PDT approach that appeal, such as their notion of policy discourses as particular types of articulations of practice and the impact this can have. The objective of the PDT task being to reactivate options which have been closed down in the hegemonic political struggle that sees problematisations emerge in the terms they have in the present is also congruent to my understanding of Foucault. If one accepts a theoretical perspective on change in discourse analysis (see Hajer, 1993, 1995), then discourse can only ever temporarily fix meanings. In this respect, as EBP progresses towards hegemony in UK policing my research can meaningfully be cited as an attempt to offer a different view.

However, I do have some concerns with the “retroduction” element of the PDT approach. Chiefly this concern comes from what I see as an apparent aping of positivist scientific approaches in their working method. I suggest this stands in juxtaposition to the philosophical underpinnings of Foucault’s position on knowledge production and classification through science. The desire of Howarth, Glynos and Griggs to pursue refined ‘hypotheses and testing’ feels like it may be an attempt to

move PDT towards causation and the discovery of 'truth' about why something has emerged: to make it sound more 'scientific'. If one accepts there is no final arbiter of absolute truth then it is difficult to conceive of how one measures the test of the hypothesis against the empirical data in the way described?

More worryingly, given some of my core concerns about EBP as a constructed 'science', the inclusion of the retroduction element may be perceived as an attempt to increase the status and creditability of PDT. An attempt to 'elevate' PDT by 'borrowing the status' of positivist science. This is referenced by Bilton et al (1987) and is a key criticism in the selection of 'evidence' and 'authorisation' of knowledge we see at work in 'evidence-based' approaches to policy. For my methodology, research design and analysis to remain consistent with my theoretical understandings set out in the preceding chapter therefore, I must take great care in this respect. I am not seeking the 'truth' or even 'facts' about EBP as a project. I simply aspire to present an alternate view about how it may have emerged by utilising Foucault's tools and discourse analysis. However, what is useful in the approach is again the commonality of elements to include that shares heritage with others. Setting aside my concerns on the scientification they suggest, in sum, Howarth, Glynos and Griggs (2016) commend exploration of language (articulation), the position of subjects and the impact of statements on subjects (logics), and the role this plays in institutional change (critique). This finds commonality across Foucault's work, post structural discourse analysts and I can develop into my own method.

Finally, Professor Maarten Hajer (1993, 1995, 2002, 2003) has written extensively on

discourse analysis and developed some key theoretical concepts which are most closely aligned to my reading of Foucault. Hajer considers study of discourse as a key tool in understanding problematisation of issues which so concerned Foucault:

“Discourses frame certain problems; that is to say, they distinguish some aspects of a situation rather than others ... As such, discourse provides the tools with which problems are constructed. Discourses at the same time form the context in which the phenomena are understood and thus predetermines the definition of the problem” (Hajer, 1992, p.45/6).

Given all I have already said about my concerns with the framing of EBP; its emergence as ‘the answer’ to the progress of modern policing, and its seemingly unfettered rise, then exploration of discourses which have given legitimacy to this rise and frame its development are critical areas of exploration in my research. Hajer’s work seems to provide a useful ‘fit’ and consistency with my reading of Foucault, and so I use a number of Hajer’s concepts in my method. In his seminal 1993 work on acid rain, Hajer sets out an approach to analysis that he describes as formation of ‘discourse-coalitions’. Hajer proposes that discourse coalitions form around ‘story-lines’. Hajer describes this as a ‘miracle of communication’ as story-lines permit various groups of actors who will hold very different views about the world or the matter under debate to come together around a singularly simplified ‘problem’, such as acid rain. These coalitions do not represent political coalitions in the traditional sense. Moreover, they are very important in problem definition. In this way, the example of acid rain became emblematic and climate scientists, industrial groups and lobbyists, governments, and ‘environmentalist’ NGOs such as Greenpeace are drawn together around the ‘problem’. These processes help to define the ‘problem’ and give it a legitimacy. Following this approach we can trace actors who use these story-lines in what they say and how they operate using historical method. These story-lines are

‘organised’ therefore around a discourse – with discourse here understood in its broader sense; beyond mere ‘narrative’ or language. I find resonance in Hajer’s approach, both in my reading of Foucault and in considering my task of analysing EBP.

Hajer (2003) suggests that certain discourses come to dominate politics when two factors are met. First, ‘discourse structuration’ is achieved when actors “*are persuaded by, or forced to accept, the rhetorical power of a new discourse*”, and second, when the discourse begins to be reflected in institutional practices. Hajer refers to this second element as ‘discourse institutionalisation’: when policy begins to be conducted within the bounds of ideas of the discourse.

Hajer’s work on developing what he describes as Argumentative Discourse Analysis (ADA) appeals as it is consistent with my own reading of Foucault’s recursive view of power allowing discourse to be understood as both enabling and constraining simultaneously. Hajer is not simply concerned with language and narratives, but the social and political context of that language and how these combine to form discourse. This approach offers deeper insights into policy and politics. ADA is therefore less concerned with the *counting* of language than it is with the context in which these stories appear: “*the stories are in fact the political mechanism in themselves: without these stories no consensus; without narration, no cognitive shifts*” (Hajer, 2002, p.62). From Hajer’s position, analysis of the story-lines of a given issue, and the positions which actors and institutions take against these stories begin to reveal key aspects of the issue which are hidden without that analysis.

The 'argumentative' aspect Hajer introduces through ADA is key to his approach. The positioning of subjects and institutions against the narratives is as important as the story itself. Again, this has synchronicity with Foucault's approach to historicisation; to reveal aspects of problematisation of issues by considering a fully rounded approach to discourse, rather than simply language. Hajer is transparent about developing ADA to address what he perceives as a gap in Foucault's theoretical insights as lacking a coherent understanding of how change might be possible. Hajer attempts to fill this identified gap using ADA, exploring the minutiae of everyday practices to reveal the battle (or *argument*) for discursive hegemony between discoursing subjects as a theory of political and social change.

Central to Hajer's political analysis therefore is the idea of *argument*. The ideas of constructed and mediated 'reality' are crucial to understanding his position; *"the argumentative approach conceives of politics as a struggle for discursive hegemony in which actors try to secure support for their definition of reality"* (Hajer, 1995, p.59). The theoretical devices developed by Hajer in developing articulations of 'problems' are important and reflect Foucault's reflexive understandings of power. Hajer suggests that the argumentative turn occurs within a context of both institutional practices and social structurations that act to both *"enable and constrain agency"*. Thus, *"society is reproduced in this process of interaction between agents and structures that continually adjusts, transforms, resists or reinvents social arrangements"* (Hajer, 1995, p.58). It is clear from this quote that understanding political processes of change underpin Hajer's work. Hajer's ADA conceives of

discourse as interconnecting story-lines, discourse structuration and discourse institutionalisation: *“the argumentative interaction is a key moment in discourse formation that needs to be studied to be able to explain the prevalence of certain discursive constructions”* (Hajer, 1995, p.54).

My research illuminates and reveals the underpinning story-lines of EBP. I demonstrate how the discursive formations of subjects and institutions around these story-lines become explainable in our present historical context. Foucault suggests we need to examine these minutiae practices to reveal aspects of problematised issues. Hajer develops this theme, drawing on Ulrich Beck’s theories of ‘sub-politics’, arguing we need to examine communications by and between actors, position papers, and that this assumes even greater importance in social phenomenon under investigation where firm legislative regulation is absent. Beck’s (1992) work suggests that actual politics is now done in committees of ‘experts’ and in structures outside of traditional formal politics of parliaments, politicians and so on. For Beck (1992) and Hajer (1995), ‘old politics’ is increasingly becoming theatre – a window dressing – to the sub-political decision making that drives policy. Although Hajer’s work relates to environmental politics, it seems clear that EBP fits Hajer’s criteria well for application of his ADA approach. EBP is not (yet) a regulatory mechanism. It remains a concept, a collection of ideas, a place of sub-politics, and in this it seems fitting to expose its story-lines and discursive disciplines to the revelation and scrutiny of discourse analysis.

Hajer sets out the methodological problem for scholars wishing to use ADA as a

methodological technique thus: *“The real challenge for ADA is to find ways of combining analysis of the discursive production of reality with analysis of the socio-political practices from which social constructs emerge and in which actors are engaged”* (Hajer, 2002, p.62). Hajer offers that *“ADA is not simply about analysing arguments – it is much more about analysing politics as a play of ‘positioning’ at particular ‘sites’ of discursive production”* (2002, p.62). Hajer’s later publication (2003) considers the utility of ADA as an approach to policy studies in an era when the role of the state has been reduced. Hajer suggests the study of discourse, rather than institutions and the role of formal actors within the policy cycle, has come to assume a greater significance and importance to understanding the use of political power in the early twenty first century. An historical period which is hall marked in western democracies by a decentralisation of political decision making and therefore, policy.

There are strong comparators in Hajer’s work to my own field of research, where EBP is conceived less as a formal central dictate of political policy – old politics. EBP is more a burgeoning hegemony amongst constituent actors in an informal constitution across a range of institutional theatres – an expression of sub-politics. Analysing discursive phenomena using concepts from Hajer on ***story-lines, discourse structuration, and discourse institutionalisation***, reveals aspects of EBP which otherwise appear normalised through dominant discursive construction. What Hajer’s work does not do is set out ‘how’ to do research from an ADA perspective. It is to this challenge I next turn my attention.

2. Methodological Considerations On My Own Research Design

Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) provide a useful discussion of research from post-structural perspectives. Whatever the finalised research design looks like they suggest,

“The starting point is that reality can never be reached outside discourses and so it is discourse itself that has become the object of analysis ... the analyst has to work with what has actually been said or written, exploring patterns in and across the statements and identifying the social consequences of different discursive representations of reality.” (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002, p.21).

The study of texts and statements and their social impacts are therefore important in post-structural discourse analytical approaches. Kennedy (1979) refers to Foucault's archaeological method as one of 'systematic reflection', and this seems important in determining a precise data collection plan and method with which to go about the task of developing my discourse analysis of EBP. To develop a model that provides for systematic reflection, facilitating use of Foucauldian concepts to develop my analysis further Kennedy (1979, p.274) suggests that there are four identifiable rules in Foucault's work which govern:

1. What can be said in a particular domain;
2. The status of speakers – who is 'authorised' to use a discourse;
3. Institutional matrices which govern the use of discourse;
4. Relationships between speakers and objects within the discourse.

For Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) and Kennedy (1979), texts, statements, institutional arrangements, and relationships between each of these elements offer a route to access discourse. I have therefore developed a research design and data

collection plan that fully considers each of these elements, but also provides a means to synthesize them into a collective, whole-picture, understanding to offer a new perspective on EBP. Foucault describes this methodological issue thus:

“What we are trying to find out is what are the links, what are the connections that can be identified between mechanisms of coercion and elements of knowledge, what is the interplay of relay and support developed between them, such that a given element of knowledge takes on the effects of power in a given system where it is allocated to a true, probable, uncertain or false element, such that a procedure of coercion acquires the very form and justifications of a rational, calculated, technically efficient element” (Foucault, 1997, p.50).

I have therefore considered my methodological conundrum as two distinct questions. First, how do I collect data in a way which is reflective of what has been said about EBP, identifies subject positionalities, and considers changing institutional reforms? Second, how do I approach this very ‘big idea’ of presenting the inter-connectedness of these elements into a coherent piece of work?

Having considered this very carefully, and looked at how others (Hall, 1997; Hajer, 1995; Fairclough, 1995; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Howarth, Glynos and Griggs, 2016) have approached the task, I decided to approach this problem from the other way around. Rather than aping Foucault by producing a ‘whole’ – a genealogy - I have determined what ‘steps’ I need to take in ‘systematic reflection’ to allow me to produce a meaningful historicised interconnected discourse analysis.

Reflecting on the work presented above therefore in developing a workable method, I have arrived at three key discursive elements to build my discourse analysis upon:

1. Story-lines;

2. Subject positioning; and
3. Institutional modification.

I outline my rationale for focusing on these elements, and my understanding of each of them below, before describing my method.

First, '**story-lines**' is the language used by Maarten Hajer in his argumentative discourse analysis (ADA) (Hajer, 1995). Story-lines shape how actors interact with discourse and position themselves and others (Hajer, 1993). Story-lines come to dominate political spaces through twin processes of 'discourse structuration' and 'discourse institutionalisation' (Hajer, 2002). Hajer argues analysis of these story-lines help us to understand other elements of discourse. It is for this reason story-lines assume a key analytical focus in my research. It is my belief, that story-lines can be understood as a shorthand reference to *language* or *narratives* about objects and subjects, which operate to discursively discipline what can be said, thought or done. Hajer describes story-lines as "*essential political devices*" for their structuring quality on actors and institutions. They simplify messy realities to facilitate a coming together of subjects as issues become problematised and defined.

Hall (1997) references language extensively in his own work on identity and describes the use of 'statements' and 'articulation of things' in his 6-step approach to discourse analysis. Hall's second element covers rules about inclusion and exclusion of what is sayable or thinkable in given periods and so this too, accords to the importance of language in this approach. Fairclough's (1995) CDA approach requires a detailed

study of language through text. Although less systematic and exacting in their requirements than Fairclough (1995), Laclau and Mouffe's (1985) processes of hegemonic narrative, moments of inclusion and exclusion and drawing of political frontiers across narratives are all crucial components in understanding their analytical approach. Howarth, Glynos and Griggs (2016) 6-stepped approach the post-structural discourse theory (PDT) has language running through it as a key consideration in their conceptual devices, such as articulation and the development of 'logics'. So too in Phillips and Jørgensen's (2002) attempt to synthesize discourse analytical approaches. All four of their suggested tools for analysis (comparison, substitution, exaggeration of detail, and multivocality) require considerable analysis of story-line, language or narrative as a key detail. Burnham et al (2004) also note the importance of story-line, language or narrative in discourse analysis, *"(discourse analysis shows) identity and policy are constructed through a process of narrative adjustment"* (p.257).

Story-lines are therefore established as my first included element for empirical focus. This important analytical element is variously monikered, but it is found extensively in the research of writers in this tradition as a crucial element of discourse analysis. It is without doubt that Foucault, post-structural continental philosophy in general, and discourse analyses in particular are all concerned with the importance of **language**. Indeed, many outside of academy assume 'discourse' analysis refers simply to the study of language, taking discourse in its ordinary colloquial meaning. I believe including story-lines as one of my three key elements conforms with rule one of Kennedy's (1979) 'four rules' about Foucault's work I quote above: *"what can be said in a particular domain"*. I have therefore identified key story-lines of EBP discourse in

my data analysis.

Subject positionality is the second key focus of my empirical work. In my assessment, there are two interconnected aspects to this. First, this should be understood as the way in which discourse operates to *create* subject positions. This is clear in Foucault's (1964; 1975;) work on creation of the 'madman' in medical discourse, or 'the prisoner' within penal narratives for example. A second connected aspect of subject positionality that I include and examine is the way in which actors position themselves and others against those positions that discourse creates. Particularly how those positions intersect against storylines and institutional changes which combine to 'authorise' certain actors to speak the 'truth' (Foucault, 2011).

The importance of a subject positionality element finds support in discourse analysts who follow Foucault in their methodological designs and theoretical considerations. Hall (1997) speaks of identifying subjects personified by the discourse which produces them, and how these subjects acquire the power to 'authorise' truths and knowledge. Fairclough's (1995) CDA is concerned with actors within discourse as they 'practice discourse', both through text production and the consumption and analysis of social practices at macro and micro sociological levels. Howarth, Glynos and Griggs (2016) approach to post-structural discourse analysis (PDT) also accords importance to subject positionality in their approach. Their considerations on 'fantasmatic logics' are specifically concerned with the way that subjects become 'gripped' by particular practices and storylines. Hajer suggests that actors organise around storylines into 'discourse coalitions' and so by tracing the role of actors in

storylines we can offer a perspective on discourses. Echoing Foucault's later work on subjectification (Foucault, 1986; 1986) Hajer considers specifically a role for subjects in 'discourse structuration' which he describes as a process of actors 'accepting' the power of new discourses and understanding how actors are positioned as discoursing subjects who can participate in the political battle for hegemony.

Subject positionality is therefore established as the second key focus of my empirical research. The inclusion of this element finds support in Kennedy's (1979) suggested Foucault's 'four rules', particularly rule two and four: the status of speakers with 'authority' to use discourse, and the relationship within discourse between subjects and objects.

Third, I include and explore '**institutional modification**' as the final key component of my empirical work. In Foucault's archaeologies and genealogies considerations of institutional reforms over time was crucial. Foucault wrote extensively on the development of prisons, educational and medical institutions, amongst others in his empirical analyses of discourse (Foucault 1963; 1964; 1975). Once again, I find support for including consideration of the role of institutions within discourse from the various discourse analytical approaches I have outlined above. Hall (1997) identified a need to examine how knowledge becomes 'authorised as true' in given periods. The role institutions play in this, alongside subjects, seems centrally important to discourse analysis. Hall also describes a need to examine and account for institutional practices which become modified to deal with subjects produced within discourse. Fairclough (1993) and Laclau and Mouffe (1985) are all interested in institutions and

their role within discourse. Laclau and Mouffe were interested in how institutions worked within discourse to 'legitimate' certain truth effects, and the way in which institutional practices adapted to 'dominate subjects', resonating with Foucault on self-governance (1975; 1986).

Hajer (1993; 1995) too is concerned with institutions; describing the process of 'discourse institutionalisation' where the conduct of policy becomes dominated by the ideas contained 'within' a certain discourse. Hajer's work, I believe, echoes Foucault's (1969; 1970) classical conception of discourse disciplining what can be 'said, thought or done' at a given time. Institutional modifications therefore are my third included element for empirical research and analysis. Including this element in my research finds additional support from Kennedy's (1979) 'four rules' after Foucault. Rule three explicitly covers the way in which 'institutional matrices' govern discourse. Rule four on the relationships between subjects and objects within discourse also requires consideration of institutional modifications to present a full analytical consideration in my estimation.

My empirical research focusses principally on textual analysis of 'the EBP archive' as an approach to these three elements. Detailed study of texts is a common feature of discourse analytical approaches. There are some important points of clarification that I need to establish on text selection, collection, analysis of data, and coding. I next turn to explain *how* I have developed my research design based on the three elements for analysis I have outlined above: storylines; subject positionality; and institutional modification.

Text Selection

In determining which texts to use in my research I have researched approaches to this matter, taken by discourse analysts. Fairclough (1995) notes the importance of this requirement on the researcher to clearly establish how ones analysis reaches the conclusions it does, to be able to step through the claims made in an orderly way, rather than simply selecting texts which support a predetermined view. This is an easy criticism of discourse analytical approaches. Fairclough (1995) suggests that selection of texts needs to be decided based upon the research questions, prior knowledge and position of the researcher, including any access to data the researcher may have. Given my reflections on my own subject position as both academic and police officer, it is clear to me that my understanding in terms of prior knowledge of EBP, and where to access data may be richer than other researchers approaching as a pure 'outsider'.

Keith Jacobs (2006) paper on discourse analysis and its utility for policy research suggests that discourse analysis that is based on the Foucauldian understandings of power as a recursive and productive element has great potential in unlocking the relationships between power and language. Taking the historicised approach which Foucault advocates helps us to understand how 'regimes of truth' are articulated within discourse and to do so requires: *"a close scrutiny of texts and performative language offers a valuable resource for the applied social science researcher, by*

enabling important insights about the conduct of urban policy" (Jacobs, 2006, p.49). Jacobs also reiterates Fairclough's warning – that discourse analysis approaches lack policy relevance or practical application, and that they display bias in selection of texts which fit the researcher's lines of argument, ignoring other texts. However, Jacobs concludes that discourse analysis has significant advantages over other research methods – *"discourse analysis has considerable capacity to generate particular insights"* (2006, p.48) - but that to overcome the criticisms he identifies the discourse analyst must have a rigorous justification for using this method, selecting texts, explaining how they are analysed, and acknowledge the limitations of this type of research.

On the selection of texts to examine, I have considered this very carefully. Jacobs (2006) argues the need during text selection to ensure the research is balanced and fair, reducing where possible bias towards the researchers own arguments. Drawing on the work of Burnham et. al. (2004), we are also warned about the need for rigour in taking a discourse analysis approach: *"the researcher must ensure analysis is rigorous, systematic and convincing, that an appropriate selection of texts has been chosen for analysis, and that significant research questions have been addressed"* (2004, p.248).

Reviewing methodological literature on discourse analysis therefore, I must be rigorous about the texts I use in analysis, and ensure the selection is comprehensive to justify that use. The benefits from using this approach, despite its pitfalls, are to illuminate the key ideas within dominant discourses, identify it's story-lines, actors and

institutions that legitimate those ideas. What Foucault (1997) described as the emancipatory potential of such an approach - its revelatory possibility – further justifies my use of discourse analysis as a suitable methodology to explore the concerns I have with EBP. The incumbency on the researcher taking this approach is to adequately historicise and I have spoken extensively about my understanding of this in Chapter 2 on Foucault's approaches and distinction between archaeology and genealogy. To this extent therefore I set no time frame on my approach to data collection, giving me freedom to include historicised appropriate texts. I am more interested in EBP as a phenomena and why it should have emerged to dominate in the way it presently does, than to set an arbitrary date which may skew my approach or understanding of EBP discourse.

Morrell's (2006) study of NHS reform under New Labour has been helpful in thinking about my own approach to the large volume of potential material available for text selection and examination in my own project. Morrell identified three key actors in the NHS reform movement for his text selection; choosing patients, staff, and pronouncements from NHS foundation trusts. Mirroring Morrell's approach therefore and applying it to my work, I have chosen to examine texts on EBP that emanate from four particular groups of actors and institutions. From my 'insider' position and apriori knowledge I consider there are four core groups which produce texts pertinent to EBP:

1. **Academic texts** on EBP;
2. **Operational 'policing' texts** from police forces and official staff associations which reference EBP (National Police Chiefs Council, Superintendents

Association, Police Federation);

3. **Political and official texts** on policing (College of Policing, Home Office, Her Majesty's Inspectorates of Constabulary, and Policing and Crime Commissioners); and,
4. **Special interest groups** who promote the development of EBP (the UK Society of Evidence-Based Policing).

To select texts I have used internet search tools to identify texts produced by, or commented on, by those within the four groups identified above. I used exactly the same search term for each round of data collection; searching for '*evidence based policing*' to identify relevant texts. It is worth explaining that I interpret 'text' in the post-modernist sense of the word and take it to be a very inclusive term covering what is written down, what is uttered in speech, what is found on websites and other forms of media (see Rosenau (1992)). I have included below a figure to demonstrate the overlapping and inter-relationships between groups in the governance of UK policing, and included a short commentary on each as I detail the process of text selection below.

UK Policing Organisations



Figure 1: Schematic of UK Policing Organisations

I have included a table below to demonstrate the search results numerically from each of my searches, shown in the 'first search' column. I have also included numbers of texts selected after applying a criteria and rationale for selection, and finally numbers of texts that went on to be fully coded. The full reference details of the actual texts analysed I have included in the 'primary references' section at the end of the thesis under their relevant 'group' heading.

Grouped actor(s)	First Search Using 'Evidence Based Policing'	Selected Texts For Analysis	Coded Texts
Academic	62147	40	28 (n.b. coding stopped at saturation point)
Operational Policing	1695	36	16
Political Governance of Policing	43	6	6
Special Interest Groups	0	0	0

Table 1: Search Results for Text Selection

Academic Texts

To select academic texts I used a range of proprietary search tools, such as Web of Science and Google scholar to understand the field, key contributors, and those with highest influence based on citation indices. This process was also undertaken as part of my review of EBP literature before beginning the empirical research. As a result I had a comprehensive understanding of the EBP academic field before beginning my data work. I conducted some initial searches to understand what might be retrieved from each and there were considerable overlaps between what was returned. I elected to use the “*Findit@Bham*” library search tool hosted by the University of Birmingham. I conducted the key search in my selection of academic texts to analyse on the 15th November 2017 using the search term ‘**evidence based policing**’ and captured the results. It is worth stating at the outset that I have deployed the same search term - ‘*evidence based policing*’ - across systems collating texts in all four of my core groups.

The tool allows searches against papers, e-copy items and books. I searched for 'everything' which returned 62,147 results. The tool orders results by 'most relevance' so those featuring higher up the list are considered more relevant to the search term than those appearing well down the results list. I reviewed the first 50 entries and rejected ten using a criteria which assessed relevance, content and availability. There was also a high degree of overlap between the 'relevance' search using this tool and the papers I knew were most cited from other tools. For example the top two most cited works on 'evidence based policing' on "*Web of Science*" (Sherman's 2013 paper and Lum, Koper and Telep's 2011 paper), alongside many others in the 'most cited' list appeared in my top 50 selection from the "*Findit@Bham*" search. I selected texts for relevance by subject using my prior knowledge of key contributors, but also by reviewing abstracts and key authors. For example, I excluded "*Recruiting and retaining America's finest: evidence-based lessons for police workforce planning*", by Jeremy M. Wilson, as this paper is about the application of evidence-based approaches to personnel management, rather than specifically about EBP. I included as relevant Lum et. al. 2011 work on "*The Evidence-based Policing Matrix*" due to the involvement of the authors significant and ongoing public contributions to progression of the EBP project. The work of Nick Tilley and Gloria Laycock's work on "*Working out what to do: evidence-based crime reduction*", could have been included using a similar rationale, but there was no electronic version of this book available making analysis more difficult so I excluded it as I had ample material available electronically, including other contributions from both authors. I therefore reduced the number of

texts from this search by author relevance, subject relevance, written or available in English, and availability of an electronic format.

I therefore selected for analysis 40 of the top 50 returned suitable academic texts, covering the principle contributing academic authors who have been influential in the development of EBP discourse. Of note, the 'pracademic'⁵ which Sherman and Murray (2015) propose are also well represented within the 40 articles. These are largely co-authored papers between academics and police officer graduates of the Cambridge Police Executive Programme, alongside some senior figures in UK policing that feature prominently in the sample, reflecting EBP's academic-practitioner partnership. I have not limited the selection to UK-based papers to reflect the global interest in EBP academically. The texts do reflect the nationalities and research projects where EBP is taking hold, and these overlap considerably with the worlds most advanced neoliberal economies. There is also overlap with where Societies of Evidence-based Policing are thriving amongst police-academic partnerships (UK, US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand). A number of the 40 selected texts overlapped with those texts I had already engaged with in producing Chapter 1 of this thesis, exploring EBP debates and tensions. I left those in the texts selected for analysis on the basis they would get a different type of analysis, reading and treatment as a primary research source than they had when compiling a secondary literature review. The 40 texts I used are listed in the 'primary sources' academic list within the references at the end of this thesis.

⁵ A hybridised police officer-academic subject position argued for in developing EBP, following the medical 'professorial' model of academic and clinician combined in a single teaching, research and practice role. I discuss this further in Chapter 4 on subject positions of EBP.

A second and important noteworthy point to make is the search terms '*evidence based policing*' brought back texts that are 'concerned with' EBP; they are 'inside the EBP bubble'. All of the texts returned from searches can comfortably be positioned within the 'purist' or 'realist' dichotomy of academic positions on EBP that I propose in Chapter 1. There is also a notable inclusion at the top of citation indices of mainly 'purist' texts, highlighting the impact and influence they have had on shaping EBP discourse for non-academic actors and institutions. This demonstrates a couple of important points. First, that my hypothesis that researchers concerned with EBP fit into one of the two camps I propose may be accurate. They either advocate for EBP in the purist sense and seek to develop EBP based on scientific rationalities and hierarchies, in line with the wider 'what works' ethos. Or else, they advocate 'realist' revision; acknowledging the issues that the purist approach presents, but recommending solutions to fix these issues, and so remain wedded to the continued development of EBP as an approach (such as arguing for inclusion of 'evidence' produced by more diverse, broader, or non-positivist methods). Second, none of the 'critical' sociological or criminological literature I summarise in Chapter 1 of this thesis was returned in my sampling. This is no doubt because there is a gap in critical, or theoretically-informed literature to date that has explored the emergence of EBP specifically. This is a gap my research begins to address.

It has occurred to me subsequently to completing my data analysis that my results could potentially have improved their internal validity by applying the same search terms more systemically into multiple search engines and then merging or

deconflicting the lists produced more 'systematically'. My feeling is that whilst this would have potentially boosted the methodological reliability of my datasets when applying a pseudo-scientific lens, from my a priori knowledge of the EBP field I am confident that the texts returned from the '*Findit@Bham*' search are fully representative of the influential current academic literature in this field, the key authors were returned, and the analysis I have conducted is representative of the state of EBP discourse. If I were to repeat the exercise and take forward any learning it would be to do as I describe and deploy the search term into multiple search tools, but I believe the nett effect of this approach would be marginal, if distinguishable at all, on the final analysis. However, I do recognise the importance of operating within normalised pseudo-scientific discourse to ensure my future academic work has an improved internal methodological validity, if only to avoid easy critique of my research from those more wedded to positivist methodologies.

Operational Policing Texts

To ensure I captured the impact of EBP discourse on operational policing in the UK, I decided to explore texts generated by the staff associations and the College of Policing. The College was created by act of parliament in 2012 as part of government reforms to 'professionalise' policing and promote EBP. By law in the UK, policing is not allowed to be unionised. Officers are classed as 'crown servants' rather than employees and have no right to strike or contracts of employment. Staff associations

therefore lobby and support officers, performing a similar but distinct role from that of trades unions. Staff associations also engage in public comment on policing issues, lobbying, consultation, production of policy papers, host annual conferences and so on. They are equally split into three different groups based on rank: The National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC); the Police Superintendents Association (PSA); and the Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW). NPCC represents chief officers; the PSA represents senior operational leaders in UK policing; while PFEW represents all officers below the rank of Chief Inspector. The NPCC hold a dual role as representing chief officers, but also operating in a coordination function for UK policing across thematic operational and policy matters.

Scoping the NPCC website revealed it to be full of information, including minutes of meetings, policy documents and news items. It would be impossible and unnecessary to mine every piece of data on here within the scope of what I am trying to achieve. There is also no useful way of searching their site on key words. NPCC represent the most senior figures in operational policing setting strategic direction for forces, so I felt it important to include them in my text selection. I therefore decided to look at their published documents and selected the most forward-facing document to explore and determine influence of EBP discourse within it. The document I chose was published in 2015 and set strategic vision for policing over the next decade: *“NPCC Vision for policing 2025”*. Of interest is that it was jointly published with the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) who were established in 2012 to provide locally-elected direct political oversight of the work of individual forces and Chief Constables. The vision document I searched using a PDF search tool and it contains 21 separate

references using my search term: *“evidence based policing”*. It contained enough text to analyse which has added value to my other material and draw out comments about the position and influence of EBP discourse holds now and into the future.

The web pages of the Police Superintendents Association are similar to NPCC in terms of volume of material; it is vast. Helpfully though, the PSA site contains a key word search facility. I deployed my standard search term – *“evidence based policing”* - to see what was returned. On 3rd February 3, 2019, *“evidence based policing”* produced 23 results containing one or more of my search terms. Reviewing the results, the search obviously returned lots of references to ‘policing’, but not necessarily related to EBP, and so I could easily discount a number of these ‘hits’ for the purposes of my text selection.

It is worth noting, the 23 text hits were returned in the search because they also contained liberally scattered references to looking at ‘the evidence’ in relation to issues such as pensions, pay and conditions; referencing the wider discourse about evidence-based policy, and reflecting the material discursive conditions of sub-politics in which their political policy lobbying and advocacy now takes place (Beck, 1992). There are also self-references to its own member surveys as providing ‘credible evidence’ of its policy positions, echoing the wider discursive ‘evidence-driven’ political environment in which it advocates. Once refined down purely to EBP-related texts, I was left with 6 pieces of text which directly reference EBP and add value to my analysis. These six texts are listed in my ‘primary sources’ in the references at the end of this thesis.

The Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW) web pages are similar to both PSA and NPCC in terms of volume of material. Helpfully, their site contains a key word search facility. I deployed my standard search term “*evidence based policing*” on 3rd February 3, 2019, and produced 135 results containing all of the search terms, with a further 1117 containing at least one element. I have then examined each of the 135 results to assess them for relevancy to EBP, or determine whether they simply contain those three words randomly in the text. To give a feel for this, the top 9 results contain no texts of relevance to my inquiry. 43 entries were also pertaining to a survey across all forces on welfare, which although it contained all three words from the search terms these entries were in no way reflecting the concerns of my research into EBP.

However, it is noteworthy that in scanning the texts I excluded for further analysis, there is commonality with the PSA search results. Even though they don’t relate to EBP per se, they often relate to the requirement to find ‘strong’, ‘credible’ and ‘robust’ evidence, or ‘the evidence base’ to support policy positions which PFEW are advocating for in the policy arena. Such comments are littered very liberally across their texts, and is equally applicable to officer pay and conditions, fitness testing or leadership, as it is to policy decisions on things like the use of body worn video, spit hoods, taser, stop and search, and other policing issues on which PFEW engages on behalf of its membership. This demonstrates the depth of discourse more broadly in the UK public sector about policy being ‘evidence-based’ and demonstrates ‘what works’ retains importance for political decision makers and policy officers. This

process produced a list of 9 PFEW texts selected for analysis which I have listed as 'primary source' references at the end of this thesis.

Finally, I deployed my search term "*evidence based policing*" into the search tool on the College of Policing's website. This returned 1536 'hits'. Scanning these hits revealed the vast majority of them may be relevant which presented a significant logistical issue in dealing with the volume of potential material. This was exemplified by me completing this search last and already having sufficient material to complete my data analysis within the scope of a single-volume thesis. I scanned the main hits and they significantly supported the coding and analytical work I had already completed using other datasets. They added nothing new, but supported with more textual examples points I had found in the analysis I had already undertaken.

Accepting the problem of bias, I elected to use the website as a database to find textual examples which supported my other coding and analysis, while retaining an open mind if I came across outlying or different discursive elements which needed me to reconsider my analysis, coding or so on. To add some weight to this decision, it was quickly apparent that many of the 'hit' texts the search brought back I had already captured in earlier searches. For example, of the embedded documents on the College's website on page 1 is a reproduction of Sherman's paper on the "*Cambridge Triple 'T' Approach*" to "*targeting, testing and tracking*" interventions which lies at the cornerstone of the 'purist' EBP approach. This paper I had already captured and coded as part of my academic text selection as the most cited work on EBP (Sherman, 2013). This type of revelation also reinforced some of my existing

analysis about the closeness of police-academic research partnerships and provided examples of institutional modification represented by the 'new' College which is produced by , and reproduces, EBP discourse. Texts I have used from the College I have referenced in the 'primary sources' references at the end of this thesis.

Political and Official Texts

I looked in three key areas for these texts. I scoped text from the Home Office, Her Majesty's Inspectorate, and Police and Crime Commissioners (PCC). Policing in the UK has traditionally has a three-way governance arrangement between the Home Office who set national policy on behalf of HM government and the Home Secretary; Police authorities who were a mixture of appointed individuals who over saw local forces; and Chief Constables who provided leadership, strategy and direction of their individual forces and retain operational independence. This model of policing governance had endured for many years until the introduction of locally elected 'Police and Crime Commissioners' in 2012 to replace Police Authorities who lacked democratic mandate. The role of the PCC is to take account of national policy, but also campaign and win election with local initiatives which should be incorporated into a statutorily-required Police and Crime Plans for each of England and Wales' 43 police forces. PCCs were part of the Conservative governments drive to improve local democracy and accountability as part of its devolution agenda under Cameron and Osborne.

I first scoped Home Office texts but it quickly became apparent this may be difficult to include in my analysis. There is no search facility for the Home Office as a specific department on-line and it redirects to a search facility which covers all of Government; the gov.uk webpages. Applying my '*evidence based policing*' search term into this brings back too many results of irrelevant policy areas (mainly public health) to make for a meaningful analysis without the investment of considerably more resource than that available to me. From further scoping there is also no single policy document or similar that I can identify to adequately give a Home Office view on EBP. The lack of documentation from the Home Office is also perhaps indicative of EBP discourse as a new 'sub-political' 'reality', rather than a more traditional 'old political' central policy dictat (Beck, 1992). I also already had plenty of material from elsewhere to conduct meaningful analysis and I am content I have drawn out government encouragement of EBP from other source texts. For example, the creation of the College of Policing with its mission to 'professionalise policing' in promoting EBP by statute, indicates the government's position and role in 'authorising' EBP as 'true' as its discourse develops.

The second political / official texts I scoped were Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services. The HMICFRS do have a search tool on their website which I searched using my generic search term '*evidence based policing*'. This search brought back 22 pages of hits. Scoping the hits it was quickly apparent that selecting relevant texts would prove difficult. Very few contained references to EBP in the way it is described in this thesis. As a regulatory inspection body there are littered references in their reports to needing to take account of

‘evidence-based’ approaches. Once again, I felt I had enough material to meaningfully draw insights into EBP without further analysis of HMICFRS texts.

My selected politico-official analysed texts therefore are predominantly taken from PCC-published Police and Crime Plans. I decided to take a sample from the 43 plans available. I selected the three largest metropolitan forces in the UK (the Metropolitan Police, West Midlands Police, and Greater Manchester Police), and then selected three smaller forces which were geographically diverse, selecting Norfolk, Gloucestershire, and Northumberland. I downloaded the 6 selected Police and Crime Plans and used my standardised ‘*evidence based policing*’ search term within the documents to find any references for analysis.

As a ‘bonus’ document for inclusion, from politico-official sources, when researching the operational policing text from NPCC, I came across the “*NPCC / APCC Vision for Policing 2025*” document. This is a co-produced future thinking document between the National Police Chiefs Council and the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners. I have included my analysis of this document in my reported data and it can easily be presented as from the political or operational text selections given its co-authorship and endorsement.

Special Interest Group Texts

I decided to limit my scoping of texts from what I describe as ‘special interest groups’ again just to the UK. I focussed on the UK Society of Evidence-Based Policing

website. The SEBP was formed in collaboration between police officers and academics initially linked through the University of Cambridge Police Executive Programme. SEBP has broadened out over the years to bring together other police officers and academics who have interest in promoting EBP. There is fairly limited information on their website but this is helpful given the volume of material I had already captured to analyse. There is no search facility on their web site, but it does contain useful 'text' to help 'triangulate' coding and other emerging insights from other analysed texts. In common with the College of Policing web site there is also a fair degree of repeated, 'echo chamber' texts contained that I had already coded. It is also useful to note which material is signposted and web-linked from the SEBP pages. For example, various 'matrix' toolkits, links to the Campbell Collaboration reports and so forth are present. In line with my approach to the College of Policing webpages therefore, I have used the pages of SEBP website as a 'text' from a special interest group as a database. Where I have drawn examples to use in my analysis I have referenced them in the 'primary sources' references at the end of this thesis.

Coding

Returning to Morrell (2006) and his approach to NHS discourse analysis, he identified and overlaid three 'motifs' as lenses through which to examine texts: selecting 'choice', 'freedom' and 'clinical governance'. These lenses came from their commonality with other political projects of New Labour and were used by Morrell to demonstrate the creation of credibility, novelty and legitimacy to the NHS programme. My own "motifs", which I call 'story-lines' after Hajer, emerge from the empirical work

I present in the following three chapters. It is worth recalling Fairclough's work here: coding is not completed in a vacuum devoid of external influence. I approached my coding with initial views about what I was likely to find based on my subject position within policing, and also based on the preparatory work I had completed scanning and reporting on secondary 'evidence-based' literature. My thoughts on coding had in effect already begun and to recap I had already identified four key themes from the broader 'evidence-based' literature:

- The emergence of a neoliberal coalitions;
- Political selection of evidence;
- Academic selection of evidence; and,
- The valorization of 'scientific' positivist methods over knowledge produced using other research methods.

Without prejudicing my empirical findings, I posit three main 'story-lines' were apparent within EBP discourse before I began coding. These were: the discourses of neoliberalism; managerialism; and medicalisation. I explore these in full alongside my other considerations in presenting my empirical findings in the following chapter on 'story-lines'. I developed elements of these discourses to explore ways to code and analyse my data.

I began coding by initially identifying story-lines, given their central importance in discourse analysis as underpinning other discursive elements such as subject position and institutional change. In this respect, story-lines are a good place to start

and I would advocate this for anyone wishing to replicate this method. Hajer is not specific on how one might identify a story-line from other elements, although he gives good descriptive information on what they are:

“(story-lines) are analysed in connection to the specific discursive practices in which they are produced. This methodology will help to explain the political dynamics in the environmental domain.” (Hajer, 1995, p.72).

Story-lines are shared by actors, they bind actors to political issues, and those actors vie for control of the story-line. The analysts task is to identify those story-lines and how they influence changes in institutions and other discursive elements, and how these reflexively impact on story-lines. In my own research I have taken the identification of story-lines from my apriori knowledge on EBP, enhanced by my reading of material in preparation for undertaking research. I have sort to identify story-lines that are the ‘essence’ of EBP, are symbolic of its discourse, and are shared by a range of actors. Seen in this way, it is unimportant that a text from EBP relates to say domestic abuse or metal theft for example. What is important is the normative assumptions and story-lines that abound the piece and bind it to other EBP archival texts through share story-lines: the commentary on efficiencies, or how policing responses might become more ‘professional’, or how the story-line is narrated as a piece of ‘real science’, echoing pseudo-medical language are all story-lines that are the essence of EBP discourse.

I experimented with using software tools (Atlas ti and Nvivo) – to help me to organise, code and sort the texts for analysis. I did this importing my selected academic texts initially and conducted a ‘first pass’ at coding using NVivo to identify ‘high level’ story-lines. While I could see the potential benefits of this approach, I found I preferred the

more old fashioned approaches I have used previously when conducting policy analyses and so returned to hard copy and annotation for further coding. This approach helped me to get closer to the material and removed the barrier that I felt was created by accessing the material through proprietary software and technology. It allowed me to drill down into more minute details of story-lines and made the process more organic. I therefore conducted a 'first pass' of some key academic texts, highlighting sections that exemplified or were 'typical', shared story-lines found relating to EBP and began to annotate the texts with titles for the story-lines. For example, within 'medicalisation' I have identified more complex supporting story-lines which underpin EBP, such as 'randomised control trials', 'treatment', 'symptoms' and 'dosage'. As these coded story-lines were generated, I went back to second and sometimes third passes of the previously coded texts to see if I could identify the same story-lines. In practice, often as one story-line became extremely relevant to a particular text, one would recall reading sections of an earlier-coded text that were directly relevant to that emerging story-line, but potentially may have been passed over as a small singular example previously. The second, third, and subsequent-passes of texts allows for a rich set of story-lines to be coded and emerge, with relevant and typified examples that represent the story-lines identified to be presented in the following analytical chapters.

I began with the selected academic texts, as these contained the richest writing of all my texts selected, and so formed the basis of the coded story-lines I have been able to identify. I found having done 20 or so academic texts, from both 'realist' and 'purist' positions, the story-lines identified became repetitive. When I had coded 28 academic texts the story-lines had reached saturation point and no new story-lines were

emerging, only further repetitive examples of those story-lines already established within my coding framework. I therefore stopped coding further academic papers at 28 of the 40 texts I had initially selected. There is an extensive methodological literature on coding, sampling strategies and on saturation points, which I have not engaged with extensively as it is focused largely on positivist work, moving towards quasi-scientific quantitative approaches. However, I should acknowledge the work of van Rijnsoever (2017) on these points for qualitative researchers to justify my approach. Van Rijnsoever suggests researchers should choose from 'random', 'minimal information' or 'maximal information' strategies in sampling and reaching points of saturation on coding. These three options relate to the volume of material coded as a subset of the whole and the probability of discovering new codes at each step 'at random' or with a priori knowledge.

Van Rijnsoever argues the knowledge the researcher brings to the field is very important in determining an approach, and that sampling should be done in anticipation of the probability of revealing new codes. For 'minimal information' strategies, one might expect 25 to 50 pieces to be coded to reach saturation, while for 'maximal information', saturation can be expected between 10 and 20 sample pieces. Randomly finding codes with no prior information range from 50-100. Without being prescriptive, van Rijnsoever suggests a minimal strategy is usually most appropriate for qualitative studies, but whichever one chooses requires some argumentation. Given my a priori knowledge on policing and EBP I feel that coding 28 academic texts (with 50 done in total) drawn from the 4 core EBP groups I identify, ensures my research provides excellent coverage of the material according to van Rijnsoever's 2017 thesis. He concludes, "*Whether saturation has been reached*

remains in the argumentative judgment of the researcher. These guidelines can aid the researcher in making this judgment and the readers in assessing it.” (van Rijnsoever, 2017: p.15).

From reading the other texts (although not formally coding them), it is my judgment there is nothing missing from stopping at the saturation point that I did. The thesis may only have been improved further by including a selection of textual examples from a wider range of texts. While adding potential richness to my points, I believe that nothing of substance on what is identifiable and sayable in my analysis of EBP would have changed by completing any additional coding or sampling work as saturation has been reached.

Another key methodological point to make is on taking my coding into the texts from the additional three groups text sampled were taken from. As I moved to select and examine other texts from other groupings (operational policing, for example) I was obviously drawn to examples in those texts that spoke to the story-lines I had already identified and coded, but kept open the possibility that new story-lines might be identified. This did not occur and all I discovered was reinforcement of story-line coding and repetition, with a notable influence of purist language and ideas. To this degree, I believe it is difficult to describe the first pass, second pass, third pass process as an accurate description of my coding of the text samples I did as the research progressed beyond the academic papers I did first. Inevitably the researcher will approach the reading and coding of the later texts in the analysis with a sophisticated understanding of what they are expecting to find based on saturated texts in other groups. This was the case in the work I did, and while the additional

texts added substantially to my analysis and understanding on the depth of discourse penetration into subjects and institutions, adding colour and further examples to my analysis, there were no additions made to the story-lines coding framework emanating from operational policing, political governance, or special interest groups. Indeed, latterly completing the work on the College of Policing and Society of Evidence-Based Policing webpages I used them as databases to simply draw further examples for analysis into my established codified themes on story-lines, subject position and institutional change, adding richness. Where the analysis of these texts did amend the coding framework was in drawing through more clearly institutional changes within the institutions from which they emanated. For example, it became clearer in reading PCC-produced texts that there was an increasing 'requirement' for policing policy and investments in particularly policy areas (such as youth crime) to be 'evidence-based'. 'Evidence-based requirements' was thus added to my coding framework later in the process, although there is reference in academic texts I had formerly sampled and coded encouraging this as an institutional modification academic proponents of EBP had wished to see.

An aligned point is that the texts I coded or reviewed later in the process were more diverse than the fairly similarly-written and presented academic texts I began the process with. The academic texts, in general, were more comprehensive in their weighing of arguments, than the later texts which ranged from speeches, to policy documents, position papers, and political / electioneering documents for wider public consumption. Often the latter documents contained short sentences, paragraphs, or 'soundbites'; less developed and lengthy extracts on the points pertaining to EBP,

than the academic papers and articles of typically 8-10000 words. It is unsurprising therefore that much of my coding framework was developing in my mind from initial reading of the academic papers first, before I got to those other texts. These other texts have added much to my analysis in revelation of governance techniques, micro-practices and governmentality operating on actor contributions, but have added little to my coding frameworks.

My approach to coding has also supported me to develop themes against my other two established analytical referents: subject positionality and institutional modification. This more 'long-hand' approach I also found easier in bringing in text examples from text selections that were not usually-formatted academic papers, such as media comments, speeches, policy documents and so on. Again, from my literature review and *a priori* knowledge there were several subject positions I expect to discover within the textual analysis. I expected to encounter for example: the 'successful' 'impact academic'; the 'independent' 'evidence-based' politician; the blue collar cop and white collar policing professional. All of these subject positions are clearly identifiable in my analysis and presented in detail in Chapter 5. Once again the approach I took in exploring the 'everyday' details and articulatory practices allowed me to refine these down furtherstill.

There were numerous examples of institutional modification of which I was fully aware before beginning my research. In fact, some of the changes I was seeing around me in my 'insider' policing subject position inspired me to conduct this research. Some I fully expected to feature within my analysis of collected texts. For example, the

creation of the College of Policing with its core mission of ‘professionalising policing’ by deployment of EBP is an excellent example of the type of institutional modification I was expecting to find in my data. Once again, however, the detailed methodological approach I have taken to textual analysis has allowed me to refine this to a much greater level of detail and chart changes not only in policing but also in academia and political governance, which I present in detail in Chapter 6. Below is table that demonstrates my coding framework developed using my method. This is also forms a structure for how I present my results in the next three Chapters and their subsections of my thesis.

Discursive Element	Main code	Sub-code
Story-lines of Evidence-Based Policing	<i>Policing Improvement</i>	iv. The 'cops' need 'enlightening' v. 'Improvement' as economic efficiency vi. 'What works'
Story-lines of Evidence-Based Policing	<i>Real Science</i>	iv. The nature of 'evidence' v. Medicalisation vi. Treatment Dosage Randomised Controlled Trials (RCT) and Experiments
Story-lines of Evidence-Based Policing	<i>Development of Evidence-based Policing</i>	iii. 'Implementation' iv. 'Critique'
Subject Positionalities of Evidence-Based Policing	<i>Subject Positions 'within' Policing</i>	i. Battler Cops ii. Professional Officers
Subject Positionalities of Evidence-Based Policing	<i>Subject Positions Within Academia</i>	i. The Magicians ii. The Priests iii. The Gurus iv. The Prophets
Subject Positionalities of Evidence-Based Policing	<i>Subject Positions of Politicians</i>	The independent, non-ideological, politician
Institutional Modification as Discourse Institutionalisation	<i>Academic Institutional Modification</i>	i. New university courses ii. New publications iii. New EBP 'knowledge' partnerships iv. Research funding v. New Research Centres and Conferences
Institutional Modification as Discourse Institutionalisation	<i>Institutional modification in Policing</i>	i. College of Policing ii. Evidence-based research driving policy
Institutional Modification as Discourse Institutionalisation	<i>Institutional modifications in political governance of policing</i>	Evidence-based 'requirements'
Institutional Modification as Discourse Institutionalisation	<i>Societies' of Evidence-Based Policing (SEBP)</i>	

Table 2: Coding Framework

Analysis

I have already outlined how I approached my data collection and analysis. While my text collection was quite a standard formulaic process, the analytical element of the texts became a much more organic process. I have described an almost-constant 'to

and fro' with the data as new discursive elements emerged I needed to constantly re-check against the texts I had already coded and analysed. This is a common feature of conducting discourse analysis and it is difficult to know when to stop (Fairclough, 2003). This process also supports my use of 'hard copy' methods which allow greater proximity and interrogation of the material, than electronic coding which adds a third element between researcher and primary texts in my opinion.

I have described a diminishing requirement to 'code' the selected texts I worked on latter. While this could be construed as hinting towards methodological weakness in terms of approaching each new text with the same clean mind and vigour one approaches the earlier texts, there is an inevitability as the project progresses that one arrives to the coding process with a fully formed framework and so generally adds less and less to that framework as one goes. Texts analysed latterly tend to simplify 'fit' material within the established frames to greater or lesser degrees. The significant value added from later texts was in identifying institutional change, and colouring with further examples both story-lines and subject positions. Although this is potentially also an outcome of how I approach my four groups text samples, beginning with the richer narratives of the academic texts. Applying this method to another policy area, with less academic textual sampling, or doing the academic sampling later, it may be that a less 'complete' coding framework might be possible from the first texts coded than was my own experience.

In producing text examples in my analysis, I have included what I consider as 'typical' of what is to be found, and I have followed Fairclough's advice on producing text in

larger chunks than one would normally discover in a literature review paper where quotes are included as citations or to emphasise points. This is because the texts themselves *are* the main body of data in my work and including longer extracts allows the reader to read, consider and interpret for themselves what I present. Such agency for the reader is important in post-structural philosophy. My reading and analysis is simply my own, it does not make it true.

As I argued at the top of this subsection, in the post-structuralist world of discourse analysis the lines between theory and method become a little blurred. I have tried in this subsection to provide clarity about '*how*' I approached my discourse analysis in obtaining data and analysing it. I have done this by breaking it into the three key component parts of discourse that emerge as common form interrogation of discourse analysts methods. In order to develop my empirical findings into an interconnected whole which resembles a Foucaultian genealogy it is necessary to synthesize these component parts back together. I have attempted this in the following presented chapters, weaving analytical comment across the three components and also offering commentary that seek to address the seven areas of concern with EBP, adequately historicised. I have retained the more simplistic 'three elements' overall structure to presenting these chapters for ease of reading and assessment. Therefore, in the following three chapters, I continue to utilise key concepts from Foucault which I outlined in Chapter 2 of this thesis in my discussions of the material. In addition, I also use concepts from other discourse analysts to assist in developing a deeper understanding of EBP; relying on discourse structuration and discourse institutionalisation from Hajer's (2002) work in particular.

A note on validity

What should be clear from the discussion presented above is that there are divergent views on what counts as a valid approach to discourse analysis. There is no consensus on 'how to do' discourse analysis. Partially this arises from epistemological beliefs of those who practice this work in the agency of individuals in interpretation of what they see. This leads to a weakness or potentially criticism of discourse research from those wedded to ideas about its 'utility' for use in policy (Jacobs, 2006). Harding's analysis (1992) also lends concern about how easily dismissed knowledge produced from this perspective can be by 'authorising voices' within the dominant discourse. Foucault himself acknowledged his methods as an underdeveloped 'science' which might struggle for legitimacy:

"Is it archaeology trying, by means of a retrograde movement whose legitimacy it would no doubt be difficult to establish, to regroup in an independent discursive practice all the heterogeneous and dispersed elements whose complicity will prove to be necessary to the establishment of a science?"
(Foucault, 1969, p.198)

This complexity emanates from the fundamental rejection by post-structuralist discourse analysts of positivist scientific methodologies of hypothesis, experimentation and testing using largely formulaic quantitative methods in the pursuit of objective scientific 'facts'. This latter approach has come to dominate our thinking in the modern age about 'robust' academic *evidence*. This belief underpins the evidence-based policy movement. Whilst therefore explicitly rejecting the taxonomic and hierarchised criteria so revered within dominant discourses on scientific knowledge, post-structuralist discourse analysis is left with the fundamental

problem of how the knowledge we produce can be assessed as academically valid research?

Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) suggest,

*“In this situation of no agreement, the single most important criterion is to explicate and follow the criteria of **validity** to which one adheres. By defining the standards the research aims to meet, the research invites discussion and critique of the knowledge produced on its own premises”* (emphasis original, Philips and Jørgensen, 2002, p.173).

Potter and Wetherell (1987) address this issue directly in their work on discursive psychology and suggest that we should use two criteria for assessing the validity of discourse analytical approaches: *coherence* and *fruitfulness*. The *coherence* test appears to come from what Philips and Jørgensen describe above – does the research stand scrutiny against its own terms? Has the researcher set out their own rules of method and followed them systematically? Is there an ‘inner consistency’ that runs through what the researcher states as their epistemological beliefs and framework and the methodological processes that follow that ascription? The *fruitfulness* test appears more to lie in whether it can be said that the research conducted has indeed produced new knowledge and a new perspective. Does it make a valid contribution?

I applaud the approach of Potter and Wetherell for assessment of the academic credibility of discourse analytical projects and welcome that scrutiny of my own research. I believe my research to be coherent within the terms explained in this and the previous chapters. So I suggest my research judged on its own terms contains the internal validity of *coherence*, the ‘inner consistency’ Phillips and Jorgensen

describe, in containing a 'flow' from why the object of research has been selected (EBP), what the epistemological commitments of the researcher are, and the method selected is suitably coherent to these commitments. My interpretivist approach fits well with Foucault's writings, and the methodological approach I have developed is consistent with Foucault's ideas, has commonality in key elements with other researchers in this tradition, and has been applied to my selection and analysis of data in a way that is replicable and understandable. Nothing in my work stands out in 'not fitting in with' this consistency. On the *fruitfulness* test, I also believe my research has high validity. My research makes theoretical, methodological and empirical contributions that I expound in the conclusion of this thesis.

Phillips and Jørgensen (2002) develop this further to suggest there might be three tests to apply. First, analysis should be *solid* in so far as it is based on a wide range of texts. Again, I believe my research contains not only texts from a wide-ranging set of actors of relevance to EBP discourse, but also contains a wide-ranging number of texts produced by those actors. Second, the analysis should be *comprehensive* in fully answering and exploring the research questions that it aims to. While I avoid the use of 'research questions' per se as thoroughly scientifically 'modern', I do elucidate seven key areas of concern arising from my assessment of EBP as a research object. I believe the analysis contains in this thesis meets the *comprehensiveness* test in full, interrogating the areas of concern set out about EBP through the analysed texts. Third, the analysis and presentation should be *transparent*. This seems to follow Fairclough's advice on text selection and presentation. Texts should be able to 'breathe' and set out in enough detail to allow readers to assess the validity of claims

made about them through the discourse analytical approach by the researcher. I believe this chapter has done enough to set out the terms of internal validation of my research, and I have been *transparent* about the process of research undertaken. I have done my best to ensure I have selected textual examples that illuminate discursive elements and are ‘typical’ of EBP discourse. There is limited deviation in my textual sampling to ‘put the other side’ of EBP. Moreover, I contend there is limited literature currently available which does that. To this degree a ‘deviant case analysis’ on EBP is impossible to undertake at this point as the literature on EBP is hegemonic in recommending EBP as a ‘good idea’, even from realist perspectives that point out EBP’s frailties. Although not brought through in my textual sampling, to aid transparency I have tried to include other perspectives gleaned from a wider reading of critical literature that I have presented in Chapter 1 (for example, on social harm theory) in my analytical comments.

Concluding remarks / shaping the thesis

This final short subsection sets out what follows in the remainder of this thesis. Building on the idea of the interconnectedness of elements of discourse to which I have alluded in the chapters on epistemology and methodology, Hajer’s (1995) approach to ADA has merit in offering some key elements to work through in a fairly logical way which both concord with Foucault’s work, but importantly offer a simplicity of approach analytically and presentationally for the reader. I acknowledge the problem that I am aiming at a complete analysis and would ideally construct a thesis in the Foucauldian-style of a grand archaeology or genealogy, but this would be

potentially difficult to assess as a thesis submitted for doctoral research, and is perhaps a piece of work for me to complete in future.

The interconnected nature of identified discursive elements described in Chapter 2 cannot be over-emphasised, and to arrive at a complete understanding of my research it is necessary to consider this interconnectedness of elements, not treat them individually through an artificial taxonomy. Hajer (1995) highlights this interconnectedness within discourse, describing the task and power of the discourse analytical approach here:

“To deconstruct a policy discourse and find it is to be understood is the unintended consequence of an interplay of actors is one thing, more interesting is to observe how seemingly technical positions conceal narrative commitments, yet more interesting still is to find out which categories exactly fulfil this role, and which institutional arrangements allowed them to fulfil that role, i.e. how this effect could occur and which course of affairs is furthered in this way” (Hajer, 1995, p.55).

That said, it would be unhelpful to those reading my work to combine these elements in presenting them, and it would render my methodological approach difficult to assess – or not *transparent* enough to meet the validity tests I have set out. Following Phillips and Jørgesen (2002) therefore, for purposes of solidity, comprehension, and transparency I present my analysis in three distinct (but interconnected) chapters on story-lines, subject position and institutional modification.

Chapter 4 presents the findings and analysis from my empirical work on ‘**story-lines**’. Chapter 5 presents the findings and analysis from my empirical work into ‘**subject positionality**’. Chapter 6 presents the findings and analysis from my empirical work into ‘**institutional modification**’ of EBP. Chapter 7 draws together the key points and

summarises reflections based on understandings from my textual analysis - returning to address the seven issues of concern about EBP set out in Chapter 1. The conclusion also includes suggestions of future research that could be undertaken to address questions my work illuminates.

CHAPTER 4

Story-lines of Evidence-Based Policing

In Chapters 2 and 3, I have described the importance of narratives in discourse theory. Taking ‘discourse’ at its common meaning it can be interpreted as ‘communication’, a way of speaking or writing about a given subject. It comes from the Latin *discursus* – literally, ‘running to and fro’ – and from this the modern English verb ‘*discussion*’ has emerged. For post-structural scholars discourse is an extension of this concept and for the purposes of my research discourse is a much broader concept than simple dialogue. Although language remains important to my analysis, I am also interested in the individual and institutional practices within discourse. This understanding is developed after Foucault and Hajer;

“Discourse has been defined as a specific ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categorisations that is produced, reproduced, and transformed in a particular set of practices and through which meaning is given to physical and social realities” (Hajer, 1995, p.60).

In my own understanding, all is constituted within discourse. This means it is only through the study of ‘sets of practices’ that comprise the discourse that we can effectively research problematised issues or social phenomena. This nomenclature of ‘discourse’ however does reflect, and so must be acknowledged by any student of the discipline, the importance of both language and narratives. Thus it is the narratives – or *story-lines* – of EBP that this chapter is dedicated to presenting. Hajer (1995) identifies ‘**story-lines**’ as a key component of discourse analysis. I will adopt Hajer’s terminology in my analysis to ensure I am consistent and precise in presenting the findings of my empirical survey.

Before I present my findings, I should say a little more about Hajer's understanding of story-lines. Hajer suggests Foucault fails to provide an adequate explanation of change is concerned with establishing a more theorised approach to how change occurs, and how permanence can be secured within discourse. Hajer develops several complementary concepts in his work that support understanding of the functionality of story-lines within discourse: "*Story-lines are essential political devices that allow the overcoming of fragmentation and the achievement of discursive closure.*" (Hajer, 1995, p.62). Here Hajer articulates his ideas about change and permanence within discourse, introducing the idea of story-lines as important in this process. For Hajer, story-lines become mediated over time through *argument*, and so perform a function of facilitating dialogue on issues between competing groups and actors. Story-lines are therefore fundamentally linked to processes of hegemony and 'fixes' of meaning. Hegemony is important as it is through this process that meanings are attributed to problems and ways of speaking, thinking and acting are constructed within discourse, allowing society to function through normalised 'truth regimes'.

Story-lines can be understood as facilitating mediated dialogue – argument – in a common understanding of the problematised issue. Hajer's theoretical work on Argumentative Discourse Analysis (ADA) describes story-lines as performing a 'communicative miracle'. By simplifying complex issues, story-lines allow discoursing subjects from different perspectives to come together around political issues. In his research into 'acid rain' Hajer charts how 'acid rain' as a story-line became a motif of environmental politics. Clearly, a hugely complex issue but the utterance of the story-line 'acid rain' allowed for shared understandings which disguised complexity. Acid

rain became a simple metaphor for a much broader set of issues that came to represent environmental decline and politics.

Hajer's twin concepts of **discursive closure** and **discourse coalitions** are important in understanding story-lines. Discursive closure is the process through which story-lines mediate competing explanations to arrive at common understandings of problematised issues. The story-line performs a simplifying function that eliminates and obscures difference in favour of hegemonic problematisation. Through the process of discursive closure, story-lines come to determine what is included in this common understanding and what is excluded or mediated out. The complexity of issues, the difference and contingency presented in original research for example, becomes obscured by mediated story-lines over time that provide simple metaphors disguising complexity through simplistic understandings. This process also allows for subjects within discourse to appear 'expert' and claim positions beyond their own understanding, experience or competence simply by uttering elements of an acknowledged, established or 'authorised' story-line. Hajer explains this mediating function of story-lines for subjects; *"uttering a specific element one effectively invokes the story-line as a whole"* (1995, p62). Overcoming complexity is a key function of story-lines within discourse, allowing for 'discursive closure' of issues. They are linked to processes of hegemony and normalisation that sustain truth regimes.

The use of story-lines, or elements of story-lines, by actors rationalises specific approaches to what those same story-lines allow us to view as a 'coherent problem'. To this extent, story-lines are also a significant element in the problematisation of

issues, which concerned Foucault. Story-lines also serve to position subjects within discourse, and are seen by Hajer as a critical vehicle for change as they possess the property to become mediated through argument and make things 'true'. This seems at odds with Foucault's earlier archaeological work with epistemic conditions constraining what it is possible for actors to bring to that argumentative space. However, Foucault's later genealogical work into power-knowledge seems to create greater room for agency and so is closer to Hajer's theoretical developments.

The last of Hajer's concepts on story-lines which I wish to briefly explain is the notion of **discourse coalitions**. Hajer describes story-lines as providing a 'discursive cement' that operates by binding actors together over a given issue: complex issues which become simplistically represented metaphorically through a story-line. In coming together on the problematised issue, discourse coalitions are formed through the argumentative process of mediated story-lines. Hajer is keen to differentiate his discourse coalition concept from Sabatier's (1987) concept of *policy coalitions*. Policy coalitions develop around a *position* on a given policy or political issue and exist to skew power towards a conjoined or agreed agenda through activism or lobbying. Sabatier's policy coalitions focus on coming together over common political policy interests in the traditional understanding of political functioning. Whereas Hajer argues discourse coalitions form around story-lines, a common interest in problematised issues, rather than through vested, agreed or common political interests. Discourse coalitions will form from actors with very different agendas – governments, scientists, polluting industries and Greenpeace all form a discourse coalition on acid rain for example. Hajer's discourse coalitions are therefore much

broader coalitions than political or policy coalitions, as Sabatier conceives. This is because discourse coalitions draw together actors who share interest in an issue. They are drawn in by the story-line - even if they come to that issue with different or competing political perspectives. Actors come together therefore in Hajer's understanding, because they share what Hajer describes as 'discursive affinity' on a given issue. Even where actors do not understand the complexity of the issue they will still be drawn together simply on the basis the story-line 'sounds right'. Hajer suggests the acid rain story-line performs this function in discourses surrounding environmental politics.

My research suggests that a discourse coalition is observable, centred around the story-line of 'evidence-based policing' and that this is producing discursive closure, securing hegemony which positions actors and institutions. EBP is constructing policing as a set of problematised issues in a very particular way. The story-line of 'policing improvement' for example, is a storyline which draws together actors into the EBP discourse coalition simply on the basis it 'sounds right' - that policing should or could be improved. Hence, actors will be drawn into arguments on EBP – forming a discourse coalition developing around it - based on this storyline, almost regardless of their political position on policing. Once engaged, the complexity of this social and political phenomena becomes obscured; simplified into the story-line of 'policing improvement' on which all are agreed.

To some degree my own research can be seen as drawing me into the EBP discourse coalition as I enter the discursive fray with this thesis, drawn to the EBP story-line.

According to Hajer, my research could be mediated 'in' by adaption of the EBP discourse, or else 'othered' by processes of discursive governance. I suggest the latter more likely than the former.

This chapter presents analysis of EBPs story-lines found in the texts derived from the four core groups identified in my methods section: academia; operational leadership of policing; political leadership of policing; and special interest groups. The academic texts I divide into two broad 'camps': the purist and the realist. This binary split is self-evidently an over-simplification. There are clear nuances within what each camp has to contribute, and wishes to emphasise, but nonetheless as a general descriptor this dichotomy has stood scrutiny during my empirical research with all EBP texts.

This chapter is presented in three sections organised around EBP's main story-lines and their subsets: 'policing improvement'; 'real science'; and 'development of evidence-based policing'. I have identified multiple story-lines in conducting my analysis, but feel they can be categorised under these three 'umbrella' story-lines, which I use to present each subsection. For example, under the subsection of 'policing improvement' I suggest related story-lines that narrate the very particular type of improvement which EBP conceives and are broadly managerialist: 'the cops need enlightening'; 'improvement as economic efficiency'; and 'what works'. In each subsection, I present excerpts from original texts selected from each of the four core groups to illustrate my discourse analysis, which are 'typical' to represent the story-line.

1. *'Policing Improvement'*

In the introduction of this thesis there is a passage from Sherman on the potential benefits of EBP under the College, likening them to the invention of the printing press. Purist EBP literature is highly patronising about those without their ontological preferences. Story-lines on robust medico-scientific research abound. The 'pressing need' to 'professionalise' policing is ever-present, problematised, normalised and only achievable using the higher knowledge of the scientist. The poor unfortunate world of policing, tragically stuck in the dark ages in the modern world with its anecdotal knowledge-frame, screams out for 'enlightenment' through the application of science.

Such narratives accord strongly with the need for managerialist improvement desired by the state. The drive for 'efficiency', 'performance' and 'value for money' from its policing services, driven in the longer term by the neoliberal turn in global politics and economics, New Public Management in particular, and in the shorter term (since 2007/08) by austerity. This has sharpened the focus furtherstill on maximising resourcing efficiencies and persists as a public policy priority in the UK. There is therefore an overlapping coincidence between the positivist data-driven insights produced by the story-lines of EBP advocates, and the data-driven requirements of neoliberal managerialism as it is applied to 'policing improvement'.

Foucault's theoretical understanding on the nature of discourse and the operation of power suggest that in advanced neoliberal states we might expect to find instances

of that dominant discourse reflected in story-lines, subject positions, and institutional arrangements. This is explained by the way in which dominant discourses of given epistemic and geographic boundaries shape political and social phenomena through governance techniques (story-lines, etc.). Discourse is (re)productive and that process serves to reinforce the relations which give rise to it in the first place, legitimating it as 'real' and reinforcing it as a truth regime. Perhaps then rather than viewing the overlap between advanced neoliberalism and the 'policing improvement' story-lines identifiable in EBP as coincident, one could propose that there is some support for Foucault's analysis from the empirical information presented in this thesis: that EBP is generated from neoliberal discourses.

'Realist' writers are invariably critical of the approach taken by 'purist' adherents of EBP; citing the 'McDonaldisation' of policing (Goode and Lumsden, 2016) – and therefore policing research partnerships – that promote the overlapping marketised strategic objectives between EBP and government agencies. There is, of course, academic disagreement about what methodological stance 'valid' EBP research should take. Experimental / medical approaches are the requirement for inclusion as 'authorised knowledge' in the purist EBP model. Whereas a more 'mixed' methodological approach is supported by the realists who advocate for inclusion of macro sociological and qualitative theoretical studies, alongside the quasi-medical forms of knowledge. Frequently though, both purist and realist studies conclude a need for longer term, more negotiated, inclusive, collaborative arrangements in police-academic partnerships.

There is a common narrative between academic EBP realists and purists about the need to 'improve policing' through research. Both accept and problematise policing as a stale occupation, ridden with cultural issues which require scrutiny and 'improvement'. This shared belief in this problematisation ensures within EBP discourse, policing has become normatively problematised as a social phenomenon for research, but in a very particular way. They agree, it seems, on the story-line of the pressing need for '*policing improvement*' and so coalesce around this story-line, while disagreeing on *how* this should be researched or, more accurately, how much certainty can be attributed to research knowledge produced in different traditions. This nuance in the academic debate becomes lost in the agreed simplified story-line of 'improvement'. On launching the Cambridge Journal of Evidence-based Policing in 2017, Sherman wrote,

"Our primary aim is to promote evidence-based practices in policing. Our strategy is to publish the kind of research that can assist police professionals across the democratic world to reduce crime and harm in their communities, while increasing the legitimacy, legality, and fairness of their police agencies. Our policy is to broadly communicate the expansion and application of knowledge by both police professionals and scholars." (Sherman, 2017. P.1).

Framed in this way, it is very difficult to argue against the proposition of 'improvement'. Who could possibly not wish to see fairer policing that reduces harm in communities? 'Improvement' is a powerful story-line indeed, which has drawn together a significant coalition internationally. However, it is only as one dives deeper into the detail of *how* this improvement is framed, and how it might become realised, that problems are presented from a critical perspective. The use of terms like 'fairness' and 'legitimacy' or 'harm reduction' are powerful and yet empty at the same time. They lack precision and yet are accepted into the problematisation of modern policing under EBP

discourse without further definition. It is unclear what this problematisation means by 'harm' as an example. The Cambridge Harm Index (CHI) is widely cited in EBP as an attempt to actuarially measure 'harm' based on sentence length as a guide to seriousness. This is very closely aligned to state-defined versions of 'crime' and 'harm', and contrasts significantly with definitions of 'harm' those interested in promoting Zemiology might wish to include (see Hillyard and Tombs 2007; Pemberton 2007; 2015). The utterance of EBP and 'improvement' has become a story-line that disguises complexity and richness, and it is purist versions of this that are influential on non-academic actors. From examples on the 'improvement' story-line, I suggest that the improvement which EBP is predicated upon is not scientific or politically neutral social good, but a reinforcement of neoliberal managerialist ideals into policing policy. This subsection presents analysis of three story-lines under 'improvement': the cops need enlightening; improvement as economic efficiency; and 'what works'.

i. The 'cops' need 'enlightening'

Chapter 5 offers analysis of a subject position as a construction of EBP discourse that I describe as the blue collar '*battler cop*'. I explain this much greater detail in the relevant section but it illustrates the way in which policing is problematised within EBP discourse. The discourse structuration EBP (re)produces is important to understanding the story-line of improvement. There is a straightforward dichotomy created within EBP discourse about police officers: between the 'mass' of blue collar, poorly educated, working class, street-based, '*battler cops*' who stand in the way of 'improvement'; and, the white collar '*professional officer*' who champion EBP, are

educated, possibly a 'pracademic', and understands the 'evidence' of how policing can be improved. In short, the 'mass' of police need 'saving' by scientific betters, whether they be pracademics who have found evidence-based enlightenment, or the criminologist academic. Both it seems can 'improve' policing, according to the story-line, in ways the simple, unfortunate battler cop cannot conceive. There are less specific references to this in the texts but it is the overriding impression one gets from reading them. It is implied when one reads between the lines. It is an 'underlying assumption' of normalised EBP's story-lines.

"Some researchers suggest that police professionals see little value in adopting evidence based approaches to tackle policing challenges." (Huey et al, 2017, p.544)

Writing in the Canadian context, although referencing 'police professionals' in this passage, Huey et al clearly reference the obstruction of the '*battler cops*' here; resisting the enlightened EBP (prac)ademics. Their paper goes on to explain that there are some green shoots of hope with several '*professional officers*' discovered in their research who may champion evidence-based approaches going forward.

Also in the Canadian context, Brown assesses the potential for EBP in that jurisdiction, reinforcing the story-line of a 'lack' in current policing and the 'cops need enlightening',; (re)producing the discursive problematisation in doing so:

*"My hypothesis, entering into the study, suggested that the Canadian policing research landscape today is likely much different than some years ago, in that, as observed by scholars in other western democracies: (i) the well-documented insularity and secrecy in police organizations (Chan, 2007; Loftus, 2009) has diminished; (ii) police leadership has become more educated, visionary, and progressive (Fyfe & Wilson, 2012; Punch, 2010); and (iii) there has been a realization in both policing and academic spheres that **improvements in the policing of society, and within police organizations***

themselves, can come from increased cooperation between police and academics.” (emphasis added, Brown, 2017, p.531)

It is noteworthy that Brown’s use of story-lines again reproduces the discourse structuration of ‘*battler cops*’ and ‘*professional officers*’. In his article on UK metal theft, Ashby contributes to the story-line on policing improvement, speaking about the ‘enlightenment requirement’ in policing. His article is predicated on the understanding that policing perceives there to be a significant involvement of organised crime in metal theft which statistical analysis might challenge.

“These examples illustrate the importance of empirically validating police perceptions of a crime problem.” (Ashby, 2016, p.142)

Once again, we see the assumed position in the story-line of ‘police perceptions’ being outgunned by science. This contributes further to the discourse structuration of the ‘*battler cop*’ position I describe in the following chapter, but also reproduces the ‘cops need enlightening’ story-line.

“The conflation of frequency vs. seriousness of offending is a common flaw in discussing crime ‘risk’ in the UK, as elsewhere. Whether or how much the two dimensions overlap is not a matter for assumptions, but a question for empirical research by police and scholars.” (Barnham, Barnes, and Sherman, 2017, p.117)

This passage represents my description of the ‘improvement’ story-line. Who it is that is discussing crime risk in the UK is unclear, but it seems obvious we should include policing. There is also the implied understanding that the police make assumptions about crime risk that can be ‘improved’ – or ‘enlightened’ - by the application of (prac)ademic science.

“For forces wanting to capitalise on what research has to offer, these officers and staff constitute an invaluable organisational asset.” (Goode and Lumsden, 2016, p.9)

Writing from a realist academic position and advocating for police-academic partnerships, Goode and Lumsden illustrate the assumption in the improvement story-line that research can ‘improve policing’. The passage lauds the position of those ‘*professional officers*’ undertaking evidence-based research or education, by implication indicating the ‘lack’ and need for enlightenment; reproducing discourse structuration of the *battler* and the *professional*.

“With privately owned HMOs, persuading the landlord to evict may be more problematic. In Eck and Wartell’s experiment, when police officers were faced with persistent drug-related crime or activity, they would mobilize nuisance abatement enforcement via the compliance department, thus allowing for fines to be imposed and even the closure of the properties concerned. Yet building a case in court may require more than a record of repeated crimes on the premises. It is for this reason that this article focuses entirely on evidence-based targeting. It is not evidence based, for example, to form an impression that HMOs have elevated rates of crime. An evidence based approach to targeting gathers comprehensive evidence, and compares all possible units of analysis, to reveal those units with potentially the highest return on investment (Sherman, 2013). This study is designed to do just that, and only that, as a contribution to the evidence for targeting police resources.” (Bowden and Barnes, 2015, p.58)

In this selection the dichotomous relationship is once again drawn between the ‘battler cop’ and ‘professional officer’. Bowden is a serving police officer – a pracademic - and co-authors this piece with Barnes, an academic at Cambridge. It is highly critical, zealous even, about the lack of application of science and evidence to policing decisions based on crime counting. This is throughout the improvement story-line as the unfortunate, unenlightened, position of the *battler cop* in need of ‘enlightening’. The passage also demonstrates the very specific type of policing improvement which is problematised within this story-line: EBPs drive to be more ‘efficient’ in the use of police resources. The story-line on ‘improvement’ is often framed within this wider economic narrative of efficiency. It is narrated in different ways – value for money,

resource allocation, efficiency, austerity acceptance, productivity, and so on – but the principal referent of the ‘improvement’ story-line is neoliberal economics. As an aside, what is interesting here is also acceptance of statist underlying assumptions that policing *should* be engaging on issues of ‘nuisance’ or housing evictions, which is debateable within wider criminological literature that remains unexplored in the paper.

‘Within’ policing one might expect to uncover a story-line of resistance to this trope that policing ‘needs enlightening’. A fight maybe, against ‘outsider’ academics criticising police culture or performance that is in need of ‘improvement’. However, it seems the opposite is true, certainly as it is narrated in the texts analysed that discuss EBP. We see strong references to the improvement story-line as a justification for the augmentation of EBP as an approach from a range of ‘internal’ policing stakeholders. This illustrates how actors are potentially governed by ‘problems’ constructed as ‘normal’ within dominant discourses by acceptance of story-lines. As Hajer points out, *“the underlying idea was whether or not a situation is perceived as a political problem depends on the narrative in which it is discussed”* (Hajer, 2002, p.63).

The Association of Police and Crime Commissioners (APCC) and National Police Chiefs Council (NPCC), as two senior internal stakeholder policing institutions published their ‘Policing Vision 2025’ document in 2015, which speaks about the future direction of the service and states;

*“The use of **evidence based practice** and the Code of Ethics will be embedded and inform day to day policing practice. By 2025 British policing will have risen effectively to new challenges and will continue to be highly regarded by both the British public and internationally as a model for others.”* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.5)

While unremarkable as a statement, it's clear linkage of 'evidence-based practice' to 'progress' cannot be missed with careful reading: (re)producing the story-line problematising 'policing improvement' and 'cops in need of enlightenment'. This is an important endorsement from two powerful political institutions, buttressing EBP in shaping future practice because of the acceptance of the need for 'improvement'. Commenting on the vision document, the President of the Police Superintendents Association (PSA) suggested;

*"I want to see a **well-researched and evidence-based futures strategy** that considers the threats, risks and opportunities for policing. The service, academia and the science and technology fields, and policy makers need to join together in producing a vision and a plan that can guide critical decision-making and will remain relevant and fresh through regular re-assessment... This approach will help policing to **get ahead of the curve, rather than playing catch up as we are today.**" (emphasis added, PSA, 2016)*

The PSA represent senior operational leaders in policing and once again the passage can be interpreted as not only reproducing the story-line of 'improvement' problematised through EBP discourse, but also accepting the notion that policing is somehow 'behind', backward, and 'needing enlightenment' which can be delivered by an evidence-based approach. It seems then that internal stakeholders in policing accept the justifications for EBP emerging from the problematisation of policing as 'requiring improvement'. The repeated use of this story-line by officers and officials disguises the complexity of the statement, or the nuance that can be found within the academic literature. There is little or no 'evidence' produced that articulates or explains this problematisation. I am not suggesting there are no problems in policing – there clearly are – but there is an acceptance of the need for 'improvement' and 'enlightenment' without any adequate explanation of why this is the case or how it

might be delivered. What it is that's perceived as problematic and how EBP might help appears to be missing from the story-line.

This is a good example of why the policing improvement story-line is a useful analytical lens in the way Hajer conceives of story-lines as political devices that obscure complexity. 'Policing improvement' is simply a discursive construction, and EBP discourse is defining how this is narrated. When one considers the myriad problems facing policing that require improvement, those of evidence-based persuasions appear to have a very different agenda to those who are more critical or theoretically informed. Consequently, the emerging EBP methods, research agendas, and fixes may be seen as irrelevant or abhorrent even to those seeking radical improvements in policing. The 'improvements' required in police-community relations, investigations into corporate harms, advocacy for decarceration or decriminalisation of other types of behaviour would have little interest in 'improving' the efficient use of policing resources seen through EBP's managerialist story-lines lens. Acceptance of the 'cops need enlightening' story-line as 'policing improvement' without further elaboration disguises these subtleties and builds consensus that 'something must be done' through this discursive device.

This story-line is also found in the political leadership of policing;

"Evidence based policing builds innovative, effective and practical solutions to improve policing. Scores of research projects are underway, all aiming to identify ways of working that will make our communities safer." (WMPPCC, 2016, p.28)

The improvement story-line is specifically referenced in this section, but it also draws a clear link to the 'fix' which lies at the core EBP discourse. It draws a link between the enlightenment of EBP and 'improving' 'community safety', without any discussion of what that 'safety' looks like and for whom. Suffice to say that reading the wider document means the framework of community safety being conceived conforms to statist rather than radical definitions. Speaking on the launch of the College of Policing in 2013, lauding the 'historic moment' of policing's first 'professional body', the then-President of the PSA described her perception of 'the problem' which needed fixing;

*"Whilst there should always be room for individual and bespoke solutions to local policing problems, it's a **poor indictment** that the spreading of good practice has, until now, been so **piecemeal**. Part of the College's responsibility will be to identify **"what works"** and then share that knowledge to all forces so they can implement it. These won't be just **'someone's good ideas'** – they will be **scientifically researched and evaluated methods** as the service moves towards a more **'evidence based policing'** approach."* (emphasis added, PSA, 2013a)

From reading this passage it seems 'the problem' might be construed as a 'lack' of institutionalisation of 'the profession', a lack of 'professionalism', and a criticism of the longer-standing traditional, artisanal, craft-based approach to policing. The solution is very clear though to this 'problem' which 'needs improving' – it lies in promulgation of the EBP approach to bring 'enlightenment to the cops' through knowledge scientifically validated as 'robust'. There are further examples in the analysed texts from the Police Federation of England and Wales (PFEW), which represents front line officers. Again, you may expect a resistance here to a suggestion their craft requires improving yet there are examples of recommendations that PFEW modifies internally to accept an 'evidence-informed approach' to setting its policies. For example, in a policy statement on dealing with volume crimes that advocates using the 'best available evidence' (see PFEW 2017c; PFEW 2015).

It seems the acceptance of their craft as problematised requiring enlightenment and improvement is acquiring hegemony. However, this normalised simple metaphor disguises the complexity of debate and what the *actual issues* that 'need improvement' might be. The acceptance of the problematisation of policing as needing improvement which the 'enlightenment' story-line confirms, leads to conclusions about 'evidence-based' fixes which may be perverse but are difficult to dispute once the problematisation narrative becomes normatively reproduced by actors. My textual analysis finds accord for accepting the story-line on 'the cops need enlightening' in a range of source material from very different actors. Through EBP, the coming together of debating academic sides on 'policing improvement', alongside the traction this has gained with government bodies, operational policing and police leaders means this can be presented as an observable discourse coalition formed around EBP.

ii. *'Improvement' as economic efficiency*

This is a critical story-line in my view to understanding the rise of EBP as a political project. It is unsurprising that the economic story-line, couched as use of resources, reduction in crime and demands for more efficient use of public money, has gained such traction since 2007: a period of economic austerity in UK public policy following global banking crises. Within the UK context, policing has faced 20% cuts between c.2008-2019, reducing front line officer numbers and several Chief Constables vocalising the problems of meeting demands for service considering changing threats

from areas such as terrorism, cybercrime, historical abuse inquiries, knife violence and the turn to investigate the exploitation of 'vulnerability' more generally (BBC, 2018). The academic EBP texts analysed, purist and realist alike, are littered with economically-framed examples of story-lines calling for the need to drive efficient use of police resources through EBP approaches. There is an underlying assumption here that the police are currently 'wasting' resources on inefficient activity with no 'evidence' that such activities 'work', alongside a normative acceptance of ever-reducing budgets. The APCC / NPCC 'policing vision 2025' document talks directly about financial efficiency in an evidence-based way;

*"Most forces do not have a **thorough evidence-based understanding** of demand, which makes it difficult for them to transform services intelligently and **demonstrate they are achieving value for money.**" (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.7)*

The document continues,

*"**Building an evidence base** on staff wellbeing, procedural justice and **maximising discretionary contribution** so that those who work in policing can be supported and valued through change." (emphasis added, NPCC, 2015, p.9)*

This section is interesting in narrating the 'evidence-base' specifically about money and efficiencies, but I am also interested on the linkage of the 'evidence-base' to '**maximising discretionary contribution**' in the passage. This problematises 'effort' and 'culture' of those already working in policing as 'needing improvement'. It is couched in terms of economic efficiency, and (re)produces the *battler cop* subject position. It suggests a need to 'squeeze' workers harder. This can be read as founded upon the Taylorist assumptive view that workers are 'lazy, stupid and inefficient', and so 'require improving' by their managers who are 'paid to think' as 'scientific betters'.

The emergence of EBP, with its truth-claiming promise of improving efficiency based on the best possible scientific evidence, is clearly attractive to senior operational and political leadership in policing. Both find themselves under pressure from increasing demands for service and a HM Treasury requirement to deliver ‘more for less’. I believe this is one of the reasons that has drawn actors towards EBP as a solution. The PSA President, speaking on the launch of the College of Policing is clear about this,

*“Forces must work with the College of Policing and develop a ‘what works’ approach to **improve resource deployment and efficiency**.”* (emphasis added, PSA 2013b)

From this passage there is a clear narrative that developing ‘what works’ and EBP approaches is not simply about policy improvement, it is also about delivering more efficient use of public money. In the texts I have analysed, the term ‘resources’ is used as a shorthand for human resources / people: a euphemism for money. The link between the growth of EBP and the promotion of NPM managerial ‘leanness’ cannot be underestimated. Particularly since the growth of EBP roughly coincides with public sector ‘austerity’ from c.2008. In a section taken from the 2016 Norfolk Constabulary Police and Crime Plan, whose stated aim is to *“deliver an efficient policing service, achieving **value for money** for all Norfolk residents”* (emphasis added), there is another reference to the economic efficiency story-line:

*“Use of **evidence-based policing** approaches to drive through an **efficient and effective** policing service for Norfolk (NC)”* (emphasis added, OPCCN, 2016, p.38)

The analysed texts therefore from ‘within’ policing are littered with examples linking EBP approaches with the desire and ‘need’ for economic efficiency as part of the

‘improvement’ story-line. There are three separate documents returned from an ‘evidence-based policing’ keyword search in the archives of PFEW that return approaches linked to: ‘public value’ reporting; lobbying for more policing resource based on an ‘evidence-based approach to demand analysis; and a PFEW-academic partnership with the University of Nottingham taking an ‘evidence-based policing’ approach to advocate for more resources based on welfare surveys of officers feeling under pressure due to a lack of resources (see PFEW 2017, and 2017a as examples). As well as containing examples of over-reaching claims about basing policy on ‘proof’ and ‘facts’ determined through EBP, these reports importantly demonstrate the ‘economic efficiency’ story-line as an important aspect of EBP discourse. ‘Economic efficiency’ is a key story-line of academic EBP texts, specifically referenced by Sherman when commenting on his own ideas,

*“Sherman’s model described a future world in which as many police practices as possible were employed or discontinued based on good evidence about their **cost-effectiveness**.”* (Sherman, 2015, p.12, emphasis added)

Peter Neyroud, writing in 2009 about the work of the National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA) and the importance of linking its improvement strategy to EBP references the efficiency story-line.

*“Furthermore, in times of growing financial stringency, good quality evidence and the ability to demonstrate a **cost-benefit analysis** in favor of an advocated approach are going to be increasingly important for policing (Perry, McDougall, & Farrington, 2006).”* (Neyroud, 2009, p.440, emphasis added)

Huey et al reference back to the poor ‘*battler cops*’ again, blundering on ignorantly as they do their best to deliver policing, and foregrounding the potential cost savings attributed to EBP approaches through more ‘efficient’ and intelligent use of allocated resources,

*“Drawing on years of testing policing innovations, Sherman was keenly aware that many policing strategies had been built on un-tested assumptions (including individual or cumulative experience, anecdote, and so on), with the result that many agencies had **squandered resources** on strategies for which there was little, if any, evidence that they **worked**.”* (Huey et al, 2017, p.545, emphasis added)

Writing on research into deployment of a mobile police offices into remote communities in Queensland, Australia, to improve police ‘legitimacy’, it is noteworthy that the conclusion is presented within an economic frame rather than a legitimacy framework, which arguably might be more relevant to a paper on police-community relations and legitimacy of policing:

*“we are left with a positive view that the MPCO can be **effectively and efficiently** deployed to locations with the intent of maintaining or increasing public perceptions of police legitimacy. Can the MPCO be a vehicle for crime reduction? This can only be truly answered with further research that addresses the limitations identified through this trial and also considers a process evaluation that includes the **cost– benefit analysis** of a mobile police office in comparison to other policing offices and strategies such as neighborhood police beats.”* (Bennett, Newman and Sydes, 2017, p.426)

Once again within the improvement story-line there is normative assumption that the police are wasting resources (money) on activities that ‘don’t work’, whereas the application of EBP research could ‘save’ policing, improve it, and allow the delivery of ‘more for less’ under austerity. Typically, EBP academic research builds on this normative assumption and so (re)produces the improvement story-line without considering the political choices made in austerity, or questioning the benefits of the activities being scrutinised in non-economic terms. The analysed texts also ignore calls from more ‘critical’ scholars who seek radical ‘improvements’, or suggest how police legitimacy might be increased alternatively; perhaps by a focus on structural violence, decarceration and decriminalisation for example, or in the prosecution of

death, injury and environmental ‘crimes’ attributable to the activities of global corporate capital. The ‘improvement’ story-line of EBP thus supports political positions which are neoliberal in their construction, providing ‘evidence’ of ‘waste’ and inefficiency in public services, and providing evidence-based solutions which promise to deliver ‘more for less’. The normalisation of the ‘improvement’ story-line through EBP discourse therefore, (re)produces a wider public discourse from neoliberal political economy, and also (re)produces a statist status quo on ‘crime’. The story-line obfuscates these nuances. This is more problematic still when this story-line is (re)produced through institutionalisation which ‘authorises it as ‘true’, which I present in Chapter 6.

iii. ‘What works’

A key aspect of EBP, and so a key story-line in its discursive development, has been its ability to evoke the wider discourse of ‘evidence-based policy’. The ‘what works’ agenda, particularly in the UK context, has been a feature of public sector discourses since the New Labour government from 1997 (see Solesbury, 2001; Hope, 2004). It is well beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss all that this entails, but suffice to say that the discourse of ‘what works’ has become a key feature of public sector life in the new millennium in western neoliberal democracies in search of a ‘better performing’ public services through NPM. Utterance of aspects of the ‘what works’ story-line for actors hence evokes the normalisation and expertise that this story-line has acquired over the decades. This supports Hajer’s (1995) perspective that simple utterance of an element of normalised story-lines immediately evokes the credibility and

association with the entire discursive arrangements pertaining to that bigger 'accepted' discourse.

*"The U.K. College of Policing, tasked with promoting evidence of **"what works"** in policing, often hears the sceptical question put in a different way: "How is this evidence going to help the constable on the midnight shift next Saturday in Brixton?"*" (emphasis added, Sherman, 2015, p.18)

As well as evoking the wider 'what works' agenda through utterance of the language, this passage also shows how 'what works', and so EBP, are viewed as having 'impact' to 'improve' the lot of the practitioner: the *battler cop*. We see reference to the 'what works' story-line routinely in the EBP texts analysed from within policing. For example, in the APCC / NPCC 'policing vision 2025' document contains several 'what works' references;

*"Working with partners such as the College of Policing and Police ICT Company to secure a **solid evidence base of 'what works'**, addressing sources of demand, and developing and encouraging uptake of existing and emerging technologies."* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.10) and,

*"Using an improved understanding of vulnerability, both in physical and virtual locations, as a means of improving and differentiating service and protection. This may mean adapting to **evidence of what works** locally in targeting vulnerability and areas of high demand and need."* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.7).

The 'what works' mantra seen in these two small examples renders it applicable to a range of problematisations – technology, demand and vulnerability - all underpinned and contributing to the (re)production of EBP discourse by associating it to 'the evidence'. The following text from the PSA website combines the 'what works' story-line with the 'improvement as economic efficiency' story-line;

*"Forces must work with the College of Policing and develop a **'what works'** approach to improve resource deployment and efficiency."* (emphasis added, PSA 2013b)

Use of 'what works' adds powerful credibility to actors' statements in the way Hajer suggests story-lines operate. Invoking the power of the wider and more normalised discursive elements of 'what works' lends status to the newer and emergent discourse of EBP. It is also a frequently cited term in academic texts;

*"The need for improving the knowledge, on which preventive efforts are based, was particularly stressed. According to the action plan, preventive initiatives must be based on available knowledge about **what works** and what does not work (Regjeringen 2009:38)." (emphasis added, Ellefsen, 2011, p.104)*

This passage from Ellefsen's article demonstrates evocation of the 'what works' story-line, which is observable running thematically through EBP discourse. This passage also references other story-lines of policing improvement; on the privileged status of scientific knowledge, which I present in the following subsection.

The narration of EBP around story-lines of policing improvement, but a very specific type of managerial improvement based on economic efficiency, is problematic on several fronts. First, it problematises issues with policing in economic terms and this is a political construction. There is a whole 'critical' literature such as proponents of Zemiology and social harm theory, or penologists calling for decarceration, or criminologists who argue that the ontological nature of crime is ill-conceived in its current format (see Tombs, 2016; 2018; Young, 1971, as examples). This theoretical and empirical literature which highlights deeper macro-sociological problems is necessarily written out by the 'improvement' story-line that elevates constructed econo-managerialist policing 'problems' within EBP discourse. In problematising the issue of police 'squandering resources' and trying to 'help' by improving their efficiency, the improvement story-line normatively accepts and extends normalised

neoliberal discourses. These problematisations become projected into 'improving policing' without consideration of wider structural problems, or the political choices that cause elevation of neoliberal concerns becoming problematised within policing research.

Second, in normalising these problematised issues EBP ignores the reasons policing efficiency is under scrutiny. Demand is ever-increasing on policing at a time when the UK government has reduced its resource base by 20%. The UK has seen steady increases in migration, population growth, changing nature to the threats from terrorism, historic abuse cases, changing perceptions on vulnerability crimes, and the threat from cybercrime. There has been limited debate in the UK about the police coping with this extra demand; whether this focus is on the right areas, and in an age of austerity, what must police 'stop doing' to meet these new demands in the absence of fundamental structural changes or further investment.

Third, policing faces an age-old problem of being the service of first and last resort. Where people are homeless, in mental health crisis, have broken down on the highway, falling out with their neighbours, or trolled on social media, they often call the police. Much of this demand is nothing to do with the core law enforcement functions of policing, and is often because other agencies do not provide an effective 24/7 service. Making the police more 'efficient' is unlikely to deal with these systemic issues in wider public and private services. This situation is exacerbated by public sector austerity. For example, where youth services have been decimated through cuts to local government more teenagers are 'hanging around' and there are potential

links to knife violence. 'Teenagers hanging around' is consistently a source of 'annoyance' when the public are surveyed, and successive UK governments have brought this 'problem' within the purview of policing through 'anti-social behaviour' legislation (for discussions see Squires, 2008; Betts, 2011). There are numerous other examples of the consequences of cuts that impact on the first and last resort service. Community mental health cuts leads to people in crisis, the police get called. Cuts to social care mean more children and adults are left vulnerable, meaning more crime, and policing picking up the pieces. In 2013/4 'low and medium' risk offenders in the UK were moved into a privatised probation services under the 'transforming rehabilitation' agenda. We have yet to see any performance reporting on reoffending rates because the information is now considered 'commercially sensitive', but suffice to say for now that anecdotally, jobs have been cut, service levels reduced, and there is an increase in crime following the marketisation of probation services. Of note, by 2020 the government has decided to bring back probation services into public ownership by 2021. Where this fails or creaks, policing picks up the consequences. I have found no research on any causation between austerity in public services and the growth of EBP, but they do share a similar time period.

EBP, with its narrow, problematised focus on what *policing* is doing, accepts – or more accurately, fails to question - these wider structural problems, rather than challenging the nature of the problem and exploring alternative approaches. To this extent one can conceive EBP as a product and reproducer of these issues through its discourse. In calling for realist revision of EBP, Greene describes this narrowing as the 'black-

boxing' of policing: what policing does and what are the outcomes, ignoring the complexity of politico-social phenomena which may impact.

"The current trend in police research emphasizing experimentation and evidence has a central tendency to "black box" policing itself, focusing almost entirely on outcomes, without appropriately linking treatment to consequence. As a result, what we know about the police continues to be fragmented and more importantly ways of viewing or better understanding the police, involving less than experimental methods, are somewhat crowded out in present day discussions." (Greene, 2014, p.216)

Systemic problems in youth service provision or mental health services are written out of EBP story-lines on improvement as the discourse positions them 'out of scope'. It is just possible that wider ontological considerations or structural reforms might help policing and other public services to 'improve', yet such considerations are largely absent from EBP story-lines.

It is my contention therefore that because neoliberal economic improvement story-lines of 'what works' contribute much to the development of EBP discourse, that reported research exploring systemic problems is simply ignored. Worse, as I highlight in the data on discourse institutionalisation, critical research is becoming increasingly squeezed out as research funding and access to policing data is channelled towards EBP. The development of the 'policing improvement' story-line is supported by the normalised story-lines of NPM. To this extent, the emergence of EBP in this millennium has found a 'natural fit' in wider western public sector discourses that have been dominated by managerialist neoliberalism since the 1970s. This has helped the 'improvement' story-line of EBP appear 'natural' and normalised; fitting the neoliberal story-lines which have provided fertile ground for EBP to nurture its seeds. The problematisation of policing resources as a key issue in the story-lines

of EBP ensures that the important political debate over what type of policing should be delivered in the modern world, and in the context of what systemic approach to public services should be taken, is a political debate that is subjugated to the economic. The mediation of these story-lines that (re)produce neoliberal discourse ensures neoliberal governance techniques are transposed through EBP, excluding radical alternatives that may well ‘improve policing’, such as those proposed by Tombs (2016), Young (1971) and others.

2. ‘Real Science’

The story-line of science, and specifically positivist science, is particularly strong in the development of EBP story-lines most notably amongst purist scholars.

“In summary, a more scientific approach to good evidence in policing and its interpretation and dissemination could be a key aspect of improving policing practice (Weisburd & Neyroud, in press).” (Neyroud, 2009, p.440)

I suggest the function of the ‘real science’ story-line is important in adding legitimacy and status to EBP. By appeal to the wider discourse of positivist science, EBP positions itself as an emergent but ‘serious’ scientific discipline, producing ‘serious’ scientific knowledge, robust and independent, with its attendant truth claims and ‘guarantees’ of improving its subject matter through rigour. Although there is nuance here between purist and realist actors within EBP, there is general agreement on using knowledge in EBP that is capable of standing ‘above’ ‘other knowledge’. Less robustly produced knowledge is easily disregarded for inclusion into policy simply on the basis that it lacks the necessary scientific rigour according to EBPs own standards. This story-line is heavily represented in texts produced within EBP,

especially in the purist texts. EBP presents itself as a new and standalone discipline of 'police science', with the hard-edged connotations and truth claims associated with 'real science'. The functioning of this story-line hence serves a dual purpose: it elevates the status of those 'within' the EBP discipline, while simultaneously excluding knowledge produced without it. Excluded knowledge is more likely to be sociologically and theoretically informed, and so more likely to challenge neoliberal norms than reinforce them (Walters, 2003; Hilyard et al, 2004). To this extent therefore I suggest the 'real science' story-line functions as a governance technique, disciplining actors. This the 'real science' story-line is found across texts from a range of actors, including within policing. This impact on policing actors demonstrates the influence and spread of the purist ideas about EBP. It simultaneously diminishes the contribution of craft-based knowledges on effective policing, while valorising those 'newer' knowledges produced by EBP (prac)ademics as somehow 'better'.

As with the 'improvement' story-line there are several identifiable sub story-lines presented below. Taken together, they construct the story-line on 'real science'. These include sub story-lines about the nature of evidence; medicalisation; and, randomised controlled trials and experiments. Once again, the inter-connectedness of discursive elements is clear throughout the texts, so I highlight where these story-lines support the construction of subject positions and discourse institutionalisation.

i. The nature of 'evidence'

This story-line is probably the most mediated and debated within the EBP academic literature. Whilst there is considerable overlap and agreement to be found between the purist and realist camps on improvement story-lines, there is a split on the *nature* of evidence that might be usable to deliver this improvement. More specifically, the debate occurs most sharply on *how* such evidence or knowledge is produced. It is an important composite story-line of the 'real science' story-line.

When I began my research in 2014 this divide on includable knowledge was sharper, particularly in the purist literature, exemplified by the Cambridge school. EBP is built on hierarchisation of knowledge. This has influenced and been adopted by the College of Policing's What Works Centre for Crime Reduction (see Chapter 6). Knowledge hierarchies and categorisations have long been an interest for Sherman, who contributed to the development of the Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods in the 1990's and whose ideas on grading 'evidence' – or knowledge – according to the method of its production permeate EBP discourse. This purist version of EBP has significantly influenced policing internally, extending purist ideas into the College and practitioners through the Cambridge Masters Programme. The approach apes medical and positivist science and considers randomised controlled trials as 'gold standard' knowledge, relegating qualitative and interpretative methods down the list rendering them unsuitable for application to EBP approaches.

By 2020, there is potentially a 'softer' interpretation of includable knowledge identifiable in the texts. The realist literature argues equally strongly for EBP, despite being highly critical of EBP's more purist formats. Realist texts argue for the inclusion

of 'other evidence' produced from more mixed methodological approaches to develop more 'rounded' policy. I suggest both approaches are ill-conceived, and the discursive structuration produced through EBP discourse renders such debates meaningless. Such governance techniques need to be revealed and understood to allow for alternatives to emerge, developing the emancipatory potential of discourse research as Foucault conceived.

The dichotomy I present between purist and realist has morphed during my research, and this is interesting in itself to map the story-line. Purist and realist camps share a commitment to 'robust' evidence as a basis for policy and decision making, and so equally contribute to developing this story-line in this respect. Both laud the triumph of research-produced knowledge being deployed to enlighten policy makers and practitioners. However, a noteworthy trend as my research has developed has been a seeming 'softening' of purist ideas in the face of realist critique. I believe this is an example of story-line mediation through the argumentative process which Hajer describes in his ADA theory; concerning discoursing subjects mediating story-lines over time to secure hegemony. A discourse coalition has identifiably come together on the common ground understood as 'evidence-based policing', but then adjusted the story-line on 'real science' such that both realist and purist perspectives can now be accommodated within the singular story-line which champions inclusion of evidence into knowledge about 'what works', which is agreed as 'robust' or 'scientific'. Two examples below taken from Sherman's work as the most cited author on EBP illustrate this mediation of the 'nature of evidence' story-line over time.

Writing in 2017 on the launch of the Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing, Sherman states,

*“The Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing publishes peer reviewed, **scientifically rigorous** original research, in clear and plain English, written by and for practitioners of evidence-based policing. Our primary aim is to promote evidence-based practices in policing... Evidence-based policing is the systematic practice of applying research to the making of decisions in policing. It is simultaneously a body of knowledge that can be applied in practice, and a body of knowledge about how to apply that knowledge in a wide range of strategic, tactical, organizational, and political contexts. Its **primary focus** is the use of **quantitative** research to inform decisions... **In addition**, the Journal will publish **qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods case studies** of efforts to introduce evidence-based policing in police agencies around the world.”* (Sherman, 2017, p.1-2, emphasis added)

There would be agreement from all sides of EBP discourse about the need for ‘scientific rigour’ in original research upon which it relies. The Journal is attempting to speak to the wider EBP discourse coalition audience, not simply the purist scholars. However, it is equally clear that Sherman retains his sincerely held belief about the value which quantitative, quasi-scientific, experimentally-produced research has over other methods, in that the ‘*primary focus*’ of his new journal should be on ‘*quantitative*’ research. It is noteworthy that by page two, as you get further into the text, the door of the Journal as a purist bastion seems to be prised ajar somewhat for the realist researcher to include their work produced by ‘qualitative, quantitative, or mixed method case study’. It remains to be seen, and is probably a further piece of research, to assess how much of this editorial policy comes to pass in the papers published in this journal over time, i.e. whether mixed method and qualitative research are included in the ‘body of knowledge’ being constructed. However, even this softening of what might be permissible to include in the body of knowledge being ‘authorised’ in an EBP Cambridge Journal seemed unlikely from Sherman’s earlier work highlighted below.

Writing in 2015 on blockages to ‘totally evidence-based policing’ and recommending how EBP might be more fully embraced, Sherman is more zealous about the robustness of what should properly be ‘authorised’ knowledge. He includes a citation of his own work from 2002 which suggests that inclusion of less scientifically-robust knowledge may in fact hamper the cause of EBP through false truth-claims;

*“Once the initial emotional barrier is breached, there is a further obstacle that EBP faces: the inherent complexity of understanding and applying **good evidence**. When “evidence” becomes fashionable, skilled officials may use the word promiscuously, asserting what the evidence says without ever citing their sources. That is exactly what proponents of EBP must challenge on a daily basis, unless a “total evidenced” culture of policing makes clear from the outset that **all evidence is not created equal**. As management professor Denise Rousseau told the Academy of Management (Rousseau, 2006, p. 258): “Proponents [of evidence-based management] are sceptical about experience, wisdom, or personal credentials as a basis for asserting what works. The question is “What is the evidence?”—not “Who says so?” (Sherman, 2002, p. 221). The answer, as the criminologist Lawrence W. **Sherman indicates, can be graded from weak to strong, based on rules of scientific inference**, where before-and-after comparisons are stronger than simultaneous correlations—**randomized, controlled tests stronger than longitudinal cohort analyses. Strong evidence trumps weak, irrespective of how charismatic the evidence’s presenter is**. Sherman sums it up: “**We are all entitled to our own opinions, but not to our own facts**” (Sherman, 2002, p. 223).” (emphasis added Sherman, 2015, p.13-4)*

This passage allows me to interpret quite a lot about the constructed nature, and assumptions upon which EBP discourse rests. It encapsulates many of the story-lines we see in the wider discourse, but particularly on the nature of knowledge. First, it implies the problem with implementing EBP lies in the ‘blockers’ of those poor *battler cops* who lack the intellect to ‘understand’ the opportunities evidence brings, and indeed the evidence itself. It operates therefore to discursively structure subject positions.

Second, it supports Hajer's idea about evoking whole discourses through simply uttering elements of story-lines. Sherman is concerned about those who do not have the understanding of the evidence invoking 'evidence-based' claims and therefore, EBP's broader discourse. This signifies a profound intellectual elitism that characterises purist EBP, based on the belief in 'their' science as producing the 'best knowledge' to the degradation of theoretically informed work, and denigrating anecdotal craft-based knowledge. By implication, it elevates the status of the *professional officer* or *pracademic* by (re)producing the discourse structuration identified in this subject position.

Third, the intellectual elitism of the purist school is extended not only to those who might produce and use the knowledge, but also to the *knowledge itself*. The idea that "*not all evidence is created equal*" typifies the foundational beliefs on which the 'nature of evidence' story-line rests. There is a story-line here that the purist EBP academic is engaged in 'serious' research, producing 'robust evidence', and so are trading in 'truths' and 'facts'. The use of the word 'facts' is deliberate: it represents an absolute presumption of the purist EBP (prac)academic. There is no room for consideration that their 'evidence' may be constructed or contestable. Its presentation as 'authorised' independent 'facts' therefore take on a political function – they create and sustain EBP as a truth regime about policing. The corollary means that all other knowledge produced outwith positivist quantitative method is justifiably othered. The '*nature of evidence*' story-line can therefore be understood as a governance technique that includes and excludes types of 'evidence' that support certain political positions over others. This is especially problematic given the attendant discourse

institutionalisation presented in Chapter 6 which 'authorises' EBP 'evidence' as 'true' through discursive technologies such as knowledge hierarchies transposed from purist ideas into institutional realities.

Fourth, the reinforcement of the 'what works' discourse by referencing it within the passage has the impact of bringing credibility to EBP as a 'new independent academic discipline'. Use of the more accepted and normalised 'what works' discourse, simply by uttering those words, adds legitimacy to EBP's truth claims. Aligning EBP to 'what works' discourse by evocation of its story-lines has the effect of 'borrowing status' from the more mature 'what works' construct.

Fifth, we are given insight into the deeply hierarchical nature of knowledge which is central to EBP discourse. The later citation from 2002 described what might be considered 'better knowledge' than others. There is clear bias to favouring the quasi-scientific quantitative methods, which characterise experimental criminology, as more highly prized within EBP than knowledge produced by other means. It is clear what this categorisation of knowledge excludes.

Finally, there is an assumption within the 'nature of evidence' story-line that 'evidence' which is produced according to the higher-scoring methodological categories devised within EBP discourse attracts the status of 'truth' or 'fact' about policing. This assumption is directly contradictory to the insightful literature on the sociology of knowledge (Harding, 1991). Indeed, claims on truth and fact have become a stretch in recent decades - even for the natural sciences. Karl Popper's falsification thesis on

science proving itself wrong over time has generated a humility to scientific claims that is not apparent in the truth-claims which are the trading stock of purist versions of EBP. In its older purist form, this 'nature of knowledge' story-line cannot conceive of the possibility that EBP researchers are not discovering 'facts', but may in fact simply be producing 'less false' knowledge, may have misinterpreted the problem, or that the evidence they commend, produce and rely upon may simply be wrong. These claims also serve to exclude academic research, produced from different traditions, or craft knowledges which make less ambitious claims, are likely to be more challenging of systemic problems, and may have valid contributions to make to 'improve policing'.

This story-line is particularly problematic due its ability to capture the attention of professionals and policy makers through the language of its truth claims. The notion of 'robustness' is not just a feature of academic debate but is found in the language of police 'insider' texts, demonstrating the influence of the purist ideas beyond academia.

*"Working with partners such as the College of Policing and Police ICT Company to secure a **solid evidence base of 'what works'**, addressing sources of demand, and developing and encouraging uptake of existing and emerging technologies." (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.10)*

*"Most forces do not have a **thorough evidence-based understanding** of demand, which makes it difficult for them to transform services intelligently and demonstrate they are achieving value for money." (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.7)*

It seems insufficient to reference EBP story-lines such as 'what works', without additional adjective descriptors. These two examples contain the noteworthy inclusion of the words 'solid' and 'thorough' alongside 'evidence'. These function importantly

for the reader in my view, adding weight to the truth claims of the statements. Not simply 'evidence-based', but an additional claim for privileged status of the knowledge accompanying that claim which has a 'solid', 'thorough' or 'robust' underpinning.

The development of the 'nature of knowledge' story-line is consistent in its appeal to broader discourses on 'what works' and on enlightenment scientific method. Evoking these wider discourses with more longitudinal 'normalised' acceptability by using shared language, EBP's story-lines function to add support and credibility to EBP's legitimacy as a scientific discipline. Despite an apparent softening of boundaries on includable knowledge in more recent years to accommodate the burgeoning discourse coalition represented by changes over time in Sherman's work above, there remains a strong element of governance in the 'nature of evidence' story-line connected to quasi-scientific method, grounded in positivism.

Foucault (1969; 1975) is obsessive about the way in which classifications from natural sciences came to shape the world through governance techniques in modernity, and so we should treat attempts to do so with caution. Even those texts which critique such stringent demarcation of the boundaries and classification of what knowledge is 'authorised' to be included in EBP, speak to the story-line of knowledge hierarchies in their critique. The 'nature of evidence' story-line functions to govern possibilities for how actors talk about EBP, as this critical realist EBP passage illustrates;

"As the doyen of evidence-based practice and policy, the medical community has voiced some dismay and concern about the failed promise of EB. Similarly, the criminal justice, crime prevention and policing field has also given rise to tensions for EB. There are some disagreements about the role of the experimental method as pitted against other types of evidence, including practitioner wisdom (Rosenbaum, 2010). What counts as evidence is

contested: 'In health care especially, a hierarchy of evidence for assessing effectiveness has been developed... In the criminal justice field what counts as evidence is much more hotly contested' (Bullock et al, 2006, 142). But despite the apparent clarity of the evidence hierarchy in medical sciences, the randomised controlled trial (RCT) is still critiqued, for example in the satirical paper calling for an RCT of parachutes to determine their effectiveness to prevent death from jumping out of an aeroplane (Smith, 2003). More seriously, it has been argued that EBP 'devalues tacit forms of knowledge, practice based wisdom, professional judgement and the voices of ordinary citizens' (Marston and Watts, 2003, 158)." (Ritter and Lancaster, 2013, p.461)

The 'nature of evidence' story-line therefore, while remaining central to EBP discursive development and influential on policy makers and practitioners, it remains contested ground amongst academics. There are indications that it may be adjusting from purist towards accommodation of realist perspectives. That said, and for the purposes of this section, it can be seen to operate in a disciplinary way to frame arguments for adjustment around this story-line, and this governing influence extends to institutional changes I expand upon in Chapter 6.

ii. *Medicalisation*

Purist versions of EBP models its inception and development on evidence-based medicine. Again, there is nuance from realist EBP academic texts, but medicalisation is influential in the texts on practitioners and policy officers who utilise EBP discourse. There are a variety of reasons for this in my view and it is important to examine the story-line that has been constructed around the medicalised language apparent within EBP discourse. Positioning itself within the discourse of enlightenment science, there is arguably no science held in higher esteem than the 'progress' that has been made by medical sciences. If one is seeking to develop a new academic discipline,

assimilating it to medical science; aping its practices, institutions, subject positions, language and story-lines, lends one's project an assumed status. We see this strongly in EBP. EBP is aspirational in its conception. EBP prizes a 'Royal' College of Policing, in line with the historic and esteemed medical royal colleges, and the suggestion of policing 'professorships' as subject positions conceived after medical professors who are research active while practicing 'clinically' simultaneously (Murray and Sherman, 2015). Peter Neyroud (2014) has called for policing to be a "science-based profession", and the President of the PSA refers directly to the 'medical model' in welcoming the launch of the College as a 'historic moment';

*"The term 'college' does tend to conjure up images of academia and professors in stuffy libraries but this is misleading. The College of Policing is not simply about research and study. Professional bodies have existed in other organisations for years and we should not fear them. They have existed within **the medical profession** for more than a century. They allow experts from across a particular field to come together and agree on procedure and guidelines. The College of Policing will provide this opportunity for policing."* (emphasis added, PSA 2013a)

Foucault's "Birth of the Clinic" (1963) warns us to treat with caution that which presents as pathologising issues and proffering 'treatments' to repair 'normality'. It is concerning therefore that the street-based vocation of policing is seeking to position itself into something different through EBP: something more medico-scientific. There is a very consistent use of language and story-lines from medical science within the texts on EBP, most strongly in the texts of purist EBP academics and police officers where it exerts the greatest governing influence. It is strikingly odd that texts which describe issues which are self-evidently nothing to do with medicine, should choose to borrow medical language in their presentation. It seems to me that what Bilton (1987) describes as social scientists seeking to confer greater status and credibility

on their own research by aping positivist science is what is observable in the proliferated medical language of EBP. There is a strong overlap between the previous 'nature of knowledge' story-line and the valorisation of experimental methods which produce medical knowledge. Notably, the gold standard randomised controlled trial traces a lineage and application to pharmacology particularly, but also assessment of medical 'treatments' more generally. These approaches to medicine are not without criticism (see Greene, 2014 for a 'realist' discussion), but nonetheless medical approaches remain held in high regard and medicines associated status is a considerable asset to establishing EBPs credibility as a discipline.

In considering why EBP has not been widely ushered into practice, Sherman draws the analogy to the great intellectual policy battles of the past: of enlightened medical scientists trying to overcome superstition. I believe choosing to write so extensively on medical history is a deliberate literary device to evoke medical scientific discourse, and so confer an elevated status for EBP:

"This theory suggests that the art of police practice will only be harmed by attempts to code and classify it statistically—with less favorable treatment of citizens, victims, or suspects. Similar alarmist claims, however, were made about research destroying the "art" of medicine in 1828 when Dr. Pierre C. A. Louis tested the practice of bloodletting of patients to cure them of pneumonia; his study found that bloodletting only hastened patient death (Morabia, 2006). Other high-minded opponents of EBP believe that all police should develop a skilled intuition as the basis of decision making; they fear that evidence will kill off such intuition." (Sherman, 2015, p.13)

Sherman's work is littered with medical language, supporting the EBP claim of heritage of medical science's fact-based approach, rather than social science or criminology's more contestable knowledges:

*“The best **vaccine** for this problem is to educate the culture of a police agency to understand and appreciate science.”* (emphasis added, Sherman, 2015, p.20)

*“The answer may depend on how we **diagnose** the causes of resistance to EBP.”* (Sherman, 2015, p.13, emphasis added)

Medical analogies and aped medical language of the medicalisation story-line are widely found in texts from purist EBP academics and police officers, elevating the credibility of their own research by ‘borrowing the status’ of medical science. There are several examples from the texts I have analysed:

*“With or without licensing and regulation, it is important for police to know whether or not HMOs have an elevated risk of crime. Targeting police resources on repeat crime locations may be far more effective if a structural cause can be identified and remedied. The first step to correcting such a cause is to identify the “**epidemiology**” of repeat indoor violence, much like **doctors** can identify cigarette smoking as a target for reducing **cancer**.”* (emphasis added, Bowden and Barnes, 2015, p.55)

Lum, Koper and Telep (2010) in a paper advocating for an ‘EBP matrix’ (hierarchy) applaud the work of the Campbell Collaboration, as mirroring the work of the Cochrane Collaboration on synthesising studies in evidence-based medicine.

The medical story-line can be found in the realist texts, cited often in a ‘reactionary’ sense to purist work. However, from policing ‘insiders’ texts I also found references to medicalisation, showing the influence of purist ideas on the discourse. ACC Megicks calls for increased use of EBP in a special session on EBP at the 2016 PSA annual conference, reported as *“the evidence for smarter policing”*;

*“**Medicine has only been doing this for 30 to 40 years, but doctors** would not dream of trying something that has not been tested to see if it works. It has taken a long time for policing to get there, but we are now in the foothills of it. That is the Cambridge University ethos: encourage people to get out there, try things, experiment, learn, see **what works**. Policing has a huge potential to further*

*develop a **systematic evidence base**. It is possible to look at everything we do and work out the **most effective way** of doing things, which has got to lead to **better, more effective policing**.” (emphasis added, PSA 2016a)*

Alongside the obvious references to medicalisation, the reference to Cambridge is interesting and reinforces the import of the Police Executive Programme and Master of Studies in Applied Criminology and Police Management from Cambridge University. These programmes remain widely supported by policing professionals and organisations in content, students and associated funding. It is noteworthy that ACC Megicks is graduate of the programme. There are other obvious points linking the above commentary to wider story-lines I have described earlier in this chapter on effectiveness, the need for improvement, and taking a ‘what works’ approach to developing the ‘evidence’ to EBP.

There are several key words that arose in my data coding on medicalisation. Therefore this subsection on the medicalisation story-line is further subdivided below, presenting examples based around those key words which are often repeated in the analysed texts.

Treatment

It seems reasonable to contend that on studies reporting policing research one might not expect to see policing activities described as ‘treatments’, and yet this is common parlance in the development of the EBP medicalisation story-line. Bennett, Newman and Sydes (2017) report ‘purist’ research on the deployment of a mobile office to improve legitimacy with remote communities in Queensland, Australia. This may not

seem like the type of study that would use medicalised language and yet it appears extensively. I posit this is to support its status as a ‘proper science’ and ensure inclusion within the body of knowledge discursively disciplined under EBP governance. The below are examples from this text, developing the medicalised story-line of ‘treatment’:

*“For the five **treated** hot spots that were shopping centers, center management were contacted by phone and notified by email prior to a MPCO deployment” (Bennett, Newman and Sydes, 2017, p.421, emphasis added)*

*“Here, we found that the number of crimes recorded in the **treatment group** was (on average) higher than the **control group** (2.66 compared to 1.58), yet this difference was not statistically significant. Similarly, we found that the crime impact score was higher in the **experimental condition** (680.71) compared to the **control group** (504.33) (n.s.).” (Bennett, Newman and Sydes, 2017, p.423, emphasis added)*

*“Additionally, it would be helpful to know if the **treatment** period—how long the MPCO is deployed at a hot spot—as well as time of year (the current study included the Christmas and New Year holiday period) can impact measured outcomes.” (Bennett, Newman and Sydes, 2017, p.425, emphasis added)*

Huey et al, reporting on qualitative research with police officers in Canada about the prospects for developing EBP within that jurisdiction use medical language in their explanations. Once again one might not expect medicalised language to be used in reporting such a study and yet they borrow the language of evidence-based medicine in their reporting, developing the medicalisation story-line I have identified:

*“The policing research literature is full of problems identified by researchers. For example, various reliability issues can confound a study’s results. Among these are problems with ‘implementation fidelity,’ wherein study participants deliberately or inadvertently fail to follow protocols intended to protect against ‘**treatment contamination**’ (Sorg, Wood, Groff, & Ratcliffe, 2014)... Even if all implementations and evaluations were conducted in sound fashion, there is always the potential for problems with respect to ‘**treatment decay**,’ when strategies and programs that were initially deemed effective begin to show diminished results over time (Sherman et al., 1995).” (Huey et al, 2017, p.545, emphasis added)*

Even realist texts, which often criticise the purist medicalised approach, contribute to the treatment / medical story-line in calling for more mixed methodological approaches. Writing from a realist position, and arguably governed by EBP discourse, Greene (2014) provides useful examples of this medical framing in his own critique of purist versions of EBP:

*“Moreover, ethical concerns arise about the **randomization** of police services, a central element in **experimentation** (Sparrow, 2011). Additionally, critics suggest that policing is increasingly seen for its instrumental value as a **“treatment”** such as in making arrests, responding to calls, and reducing crime as opposed to its expressive value, such as in support for community cohesion and civil and human rights (Thacher, 2001).” (Greene, 2014, p.194, emphasis added)*

*“Over the past 15 years or so, a burgeoning industry has formed around these ideas, which now sees “police science” mostly as focused on **treatments and impacts**, sorted out through **experimental methods**.” (Greene, 2014. P.207, emphasis added)*

*“Another issue confronting police research relative to implementation is the nature of the **actual treatment** being provided. Manning (2009) suggests that policing owes its moral and ethical obligations to the society as a whole, rather than to individuals. So, **treatments** provided by the police in micro-spaces owe allegiance to broader social constituencies, but are rarely seen as such. Moreover, the place-based research involving police appears to “black box” the treatment. Placing a number of additional police in a confined area might be likened to **general radiation treatment for cancer**. Unlike **targeted chemotherapies**, now the focus of medical research, radiation, is a **broad spectrum treatment**. Much of what passes for police **“treatments” in experimental studies** is of a similar nature. Is it the case that more police or aggressive police tactics prevent all crime, or selected crime?” (Greene, 2014, p.214, emphasis added)*

‘Treatment’ is liberally used in UK-based texts where purist EBP has significant influence. For example featuring 118 times on 13 pages of Goosey, Sherman and Neyroud’s (2017) 16-page paper reporting an RCT on intimate partner violence. Medicalised language appears to coincide most often with reporting RCT-based research favoured in purist hierarchies. However, I suggest that irrespective of their

nuanced positions, both realist and purist academic texts are subject to governmental discipline on their use of language as they mediate meanings through story-lines of EBP discourse. The above examples illustrate the power of the medicalised story-line in this regard, and the ascendancy the purist version of EBP has enjoyed in influencing others to this point.

Dosage

Again, in my view, one would not expect to find ‘*dosage*’ as common language in studies reporting policing research, and is particularly a feature of purist texts. Its wider use demonstrates the influence of purist ideas on EBP discourse, the development of the medicalised story-line and supports EBPs claimed epistemological heritage of medical science. *Dosage* is often used to describe the *amount* of policing activity we see reported in various studies. This follows medical convention on the volume of drugs in testing pharmacological effectiveness to cure disease. Describing an initiative on domestic violence, Goosey, Sherman and Neyroud use significant medical language, including dosage;

*“For the purpose of the test by this **randomized trial**, it was the **treatment group** who formed the agenda of each meeting, not the **control group**. Agreements were then reached on which agency should supply which services, with what **dosage**, to the victim and offender in each dyad.”* (Goosey, Sherman and Neyroud, 2017, p.174, emphasis added)

In an earlier paper reporting on police patrols, Sherman chooses to use the language of ‘*dosage*’ once again to describe lengths of time and numbers of patrol deployments by police officers.

*“Doubling the **dosage** of marked car patrols in high-crime hot spots at higher-crime times can measurably reduce crime and disorder in those hot spots (Sherman and Weisburd 1995).”* (Sherman, 2013, p.403, emphasis added)

*“Various police strategies have been tested in other hot spots experiments (Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau 2012), but none has apparently replicated either the unit of analysis or the **measured dosage levels** of the initial Minneapolis experiment (Sherman and Weisburd 1995).”* (Sherman, 2013, p.404, emphasis added)

Although my study has not undertaken quantitative content analysis it is noteworthy that when reporting on a randomised experiment into the impact of police patrol time on reported crime and anti-social behaviour, there are no less than 17 uses of the term ‘dosage’ in a paper from Williams and Coupe (2017). Williams is another academic graduate of the Cambridge programme:

*“Actual patrol delivery measured by GPS and activity reports produced a mean of just over 24 patrol-minutes (of one or more officers present) on long days and just under 26 min on short days, so that **dosage** was approximately held constant to test the independent effect of more or fewer visits. The **treatment** as delivered on long days was a mean of 2.5 visits averaging 9.6 min each; on short days, the same officers delivered a mean of 5 visits averaging 5.2 min each.”* (Williams and Coupe, 2017, p.6, emphasis added)

*“Many other **experiments** or **quasi-experiments** (see Braga et al. 2012) have used directed patrols, but only three have reported any precise measures of patrol time **dosage** (Sherman and Weisburd 1995a; Telep et al. 2012; Mitchell 2015).”* (Williams and Coupe, 2017, p.7, emphasis added)

*“One of the most important questions to answer is that of patrol **dosage** and the level of compliance in both **treatment conditions**.”* (Williams and Coupe, 2017, p.12, emphasis added)

Presented in this way the use of medicalised language appears ‘odd’ given the subject of the research reported – and that is certainly my contention. The point here is that it obviously does not appear odd to purist advocates of EBP where it is consistently utilised. The medicalised story-line has become a ‘normalised’ way of communicating about policing within EBP discourse. It seems to support my contention that the

medicalised story-line contains a powerful attraction to those seeking to elevate the status of the EBP project. Additionally, it serves to govern actors research and frame their contributions. Actors apparently have a choice about the language they use to report on their research and yet this choice seems to be demonstrably disciplined by the medicalised story-lines of EBP. This supports Foucault's theoretical framework describing the disciplinary apparatus of discourse in governing what it is possible to think, speak and do.

iii. Randomised Controlled Trials (RCT) and Experiments

Adding substantially to the 'real science' story-line and building upon the 'nature of knowledge' and 'medicalised' story-lines, is the RCT. It is significant and widely-found in EBP texts amongst purist and realist academic contributions, but also permeates into other core group texts. RCT and experimentation is its own story-line within the 'real science' story-line. I considered it could sit as part of the medicalised story-line, or on the nature of knowledge story-line as they are so closely connected with RCTs being favoured in medical science. I consider it separately as RCT is a key feature of EBPs knowledge hierarchies as a gold standard of 'experimentation'. The RCT story-line has mediated away from being just about medicalised RCTs to include a wider span of experimental scientific methods. The story-line is described slightly differently between the two academic camps, with the purists valorising its use, while the realists noting its contribution but seeking inclusion of knowledge produced from other methodological traditions. Importantly, RCT story-line is also identifiable in language

in 'insider' policing texts, demonstrating the spread EBP ideas. Returning to ACC Megicks speech on *'the evidence for smarter policing'*;

*"The course considers cutting-edge research methods and their results in policing, in particular the application of randomised controlled trials. **Randomised control trials (RCTs)** are about managing and nullifying variables. In a policing context there are lots of variables – for example how many officers are involved, the time of day or the number of people involved. Research that nullifies these variables means that you can understand, with **scientific vigour and confidence**, the effect that making a change has. We learnt to understand **the methodology of the approach to building an evidence base**," he says. "This starts with **targeting** – what would have the biggest effect – and then **testing** to make sure we see the effect expected and then finally **tracking** any change. My study has given me much more **confidence in the strength of RCTs**, how they operate, and some of the challenges in using them in a policing context." (emphasis added, PSA 2016a)*

Again the influence of the purist Cambridge school in the development of EBP is clear, with its narrow focus on 'scientific vigour', and the identification of medicalised research – particularly RCTs – being assigned valorised status above other forms of knowing. It is insightful that the link is made between this type of experimental criminological research and that which 'builds an evidence base', by omission suggesting alternative knowledges do not contribute to 'the evidence'. It is also noteworthy the reference back to Sherman's (2013) thesis on the 'triple-T' approach of 'targeting, testing and tracking' which he advocates is a key component of 'valid' EBP research. Although not the focus of my research, a core critique which could be made here of EBP is of the value of RCTs at all in social research. Methodologically this debate is far from settled and yet although ACC Megicks acknowledges problems with RCTs in the policing context, there seems little doubt in the statement that this can be overlooked. RCT remains the standard to aim for in "building the evidence

base”, with confidence the many variables of social research can be managed and nullified.

The claim about removal of variables for RCTs in social research remains contestable, both theoretically and methodologically. This contestability undermines the truth claims that emanate from this type of research. The Cambridge programme sits at the heart of EBP in the UK, and increasingly internationally, with scholars joining from police forces across the world – notably neoliberal states. Testimony above from one of its graduates suggests it remains narrowly focussed on RCTs and other pseudo-scientific methods and this is supported by anecdotal evidence from colleagues completing the programme. This should be a concern for those interested in progressive policing. The danger in following the EBP approach advocated by the purist carries risk that we are educating a generation of global police leaders who are not exposed to alternative philosophical and methodological positions, or critical thinking, outside of the RCT or purist version of ‘police science’ that dominates this landscape.

In the purist tradition, Lum et al (2010) propose an EBP ‘matrix’ to allow researchers and practitioners to ‘judge’ the merit of various research papers for inclusion into policy and operational decisions. This contains numerous references to the valorised randomised experiment.

*“Both **randomized experiments and quasi experiments** have tested Goldstein’s (1979, 1990) proposed strategy of attacking underlying causes, rather than just **symptoms**, of patterns of crime. Most reported studies have been before-after studies with no **control group**, most of which report substantial success.”* (Lum, Koper, Telep, 2010, p.13, emphasis added)

*“In this scenario, the Matrix could be used to elicit discussion and negotiation between the researcher and the police agency in a way that keeps the agency grounded in evidence-based regions but that does not divorce the police researcher from the real needs of the police agency. Solutions might thus include a **quasi-experimental study** testing pulling levers approaches in multiple gang territories, or perhaps a **randomized** repeated measures study of crackdowns on gun carrying in high-risk patrol beats.”* (Lum, Koper and Telep, 2010, p.21-22, emphasis added)

Describing how the former National Policing Improvement Agency (NPIA, forerunner of the College of Policing) should institutionalise EBP, its Chief Executive Peter Neyroud, references Sherman’s ideas on the need to ‘grade’ research based on the methods used in its production.

*“As MacKenzie (2000, p. 457) commented, a review of the evidence for what works in corrections demonstrated that ‘there is an extensive body of research literature.’ Instead, the proper challenge was to **categorize the evidence systematically** and ensure that policy-makers were better informed as to the meaning and weight that can be attached to research as the Campbell Collaboration has sought to do for criminal justice evidence (Petrosino, Boruch, Soydan, Duggan, & Sanchez-Meca, 2001). In particular, policy-makers and practitioners **need a much greater understanding of what methods will produce the best evidence** for different types of problem or policy. For many of the new approaches mentioned above – the use of DNA, the deployment of ANPR, or ‘hot spot policing’ – **a randomized control trial (RCT) is likely to produce the best quality evidence**, because they all involve high volumes of work that can be described and controlled for sufficiently to ensure accuracy (Sherman, 1998).”* (Neyroud, 2009, p.440, emphasis added)

In his paper calling for ‘totally evidence-based policing’, Sherman (2015) himself suggests following medical science in developing a register of EBP experiments to build an institutionalised ‘authorised’ knowledge base. Interestingly, in Chapter 6 I note the SEBP signpost a link the ‘Global Policing Database’ which does just that (SEBP 2019). SEBP as an aside also signposts links to the Cambridge ‘randomizer’ as a tool to support increased numbers of RCT experiments.

*“A central registry for all EBP projects undertaken in a police agency could monitor both present and past projects, with direct links to the detailed reports of the evidence that each projects produces. This would deploy one of the **great tools in science** for avoiding selective reporting of results. Most **medical journals**, for example, now require advance registration for all efforts to **produce new evidence**, without which they will refuse to publish any results from an **RCT**.”* (Sherman, 2015, p.23, emphasis added)

In their introduction to the special edition of the International Criminal Justice Review on EBP, Sherman and Murray add to the medicalised story-line, supporting the purist position;

*“Although **randomized controlled trials** are seen by many as the core of evidence-based policing, we have selected articles that feature other dimensions of testing police practices. The article by Drover and Ariel is a case study in the implementation of a **randomized trial**. The subject of the test they report is police wearing body-worn videos. The focus of the case study is the web of complex relationships up, down, and around the organization that were necessary to make the **experiment** happen.”* (Sherman and Murray, 2015, p.8, emphasis added)

Writing from a more realist position, questioning the valorisation of randomised experiments, and calling for inclusion into the policy space of more mixed methodological studies, Ellefsen (2011) still adds to the RCT and experimental story-line. This demonstrates its importance in shaping EBP discourse through governmental discipline of contributions to EBP. One of the functions of story-lines in discourse is to delimit and structure the terms of debate and we see this clearly below;

*“The evidence-based tradition recommends the most rigorous evaluation methods, favours quantitative methods, and warns against using unstructured qualitative methods. Transparency is a paramount objective in order to allow the reviews to be replicated by other researchers (Welsh 2006:308). Furthermore, the tradition seeks internal validity (that change in an **experimental group** really is different from that in **control groups**) by using **randomized controlled experiment**, while external validity (that findings can properly be generalized) is safeguarded through replications and series of studies (Tilley 2006:222)”* (Ellefsen, 2011, p.112, emphasis added)

*“Moore questions the WW tradition’s dichotomous division between experience/theory and scientific facts. He claims that other methods in addition to **randomized experiments** qualify as valid scientific methodologies (Moore 2006:323). In a **randomized experiment** one can demonstrate a correlation between an independent variable (the preventive initiative) and a dependent variable (crime), while a reliable causal connection presupposes that one is able to perform **control experiments under identical environments**. Neglect of context and mechanisms may therefore undermine the reliability and objectivity of the evaluation (Tilley 2006)” (Ellefsen, 2011, p.117, emphasis added)*

As realist researchers, Bullock and Tilley’s (2009) paper also contains the language of RCT, and treatment / control in pithcing into the EBP discourse. Despite being critical of purist models therefore, Ellefsen, Bullock and Tilley’s reporting all remains within the governance of EBP discourse. The RCT and experimental story-line hence are an important contributors to the ‘real science’ story-line of EBP discourse. It shapes the debate on EBP by providing mediated story-lines to facilitate communication on this messy issue between actors from different perspectives.

3. Development of Evidence-based Policing

The third and final story-line I discuss in this chapter is on story-lines that have emerged from the texts which speak self-reflectively on the development of EBP. The development of EBP as a global project is subject of significant comment in the academic literature. Many of the various texts discuss the story-line about EBP’s development and growth. These story-lines again produce subsets and I present two here. The first bemoans the problems of *implementing* EBP for those who advocate it. While the second is a *critique of EBP* aiming to mediate its development in other directions. There is a distinctness in the approaches to the story-lines, depending on the subject position of the author, which I describe in my analysis.

i. *'Implementation'*

This story-line is inextricably linked to the umbrella story-line and subject positions of *'policing improvement'*. The realist considers epistemologically the importance of context and other factors in the policy transfer processes. However for the purist, context is less of an issue because they deal in scientific facts and proof: therefore, if the science is rigorous and shows it works somewhere then it will obviously work somewhere else because it is true, factual and therefore generalisable. For both academic camps therefore implementation is a challenge to be overcome in progressing EBP. Both reference police leadership, culture and the dichotomous subject positions I identify are strongly reproduced through this story-line: the battler cop and the professional officer. One a 'barrier' to EBPs 'implementation', the other a 'champion'.

Reporting on research conducted with police officers assessing the progress of the EBP in Canada, Brown comments,

"Stanko and Dawson (2015), in assessing relationships with researchers in the U.K. (and 'ways to open dialogue'), find that modifications are required in the 'stubborn' police culture. They note, 'The welcome of new information challenging the "way things are done around here"... requires a change in police culture' (Stanko & Dawson, 2015, p. 2)." (Brown, 2017, p.538)

Brown specifically references an often-used EBP narrative device on 'the dialogue of the deaf'. This paraphrases the relationships between academics trying to 'improve policing', and police officers who are apparently resistant. This supports my conceptualisation of the problematised culture of the *'battler cop'* subject position.

While advising against state institutional arrangements for research – “*a politbureau for police research*” (p.535) - in common with many texts within this discourse coalition, Brown (2017) concludes the need for more dialogue between parties, and a more collaborative approach to research projects. Closer collaboration is valorised as ‘more successful’ in countries with further progressed EBP projects, such as the UK, US and Australia.

I was a little surprised to note the volume of references in EBP texts to research into ‘police culture’. Often this commented on why EBP practices were not more widespread, or reported more detailed studies of problems with EBP implementation, or transfer of ‘evidenced effective practice’ from one jurisdiction to another. The purist literature frequently references the former issue as one of frustration that EBP is not more widely adopted, or not as swiftly as they would hope. While the realist literature is more concerned with problems of implementation. Cultural context is oft-cited as a blockage in this regard, or an explanation of why something with demonstrated efficacy of ‘what worked’ in one place failed in another. To the purist, of course, the context is (almost) irrelevant: if the science demonstrates ‘x’ policy is effective here, then it should be applied elsewhere as a carbon copy to guarantee ‘success’ and replicate outcomes. This is especially true where it has been trialled ‘randomly’ in more than one place and shows replicable results. Without giving consideration to whether EBP is a good idea at all, Sherman (2015) devotes an entire article to discussing how EBP can be ‘totally’ realised, with attendant suggestions for overcoming the implementation problem.

“My own intuition is this: Resistance to EBP is unlikely to be solved by aiming at either of these theoretical causes. The most evidence-based explanation, at least in other fields, seems that opposition to change stems from fear of the unknown. This fear may always be provisional, since once the change becomes familiar, it is no longer unknown. Once the change is understood, the resistance may disappear. It may even be completely reversed and replaced by strong endorsement.” (Sherman, 2015, p13)

Discussing the resistance of policing to attempts to become ‘totally evidenced based’, Sherman reinforces my discourse structurations of the *battler cop* and the *professional officer*. In discussing the implementation problem, Sherman therefore supports story-lines on improvement, and ideas about bringing enlightenment to policing through the application of science. There is recourse to the story-line on implementation that if only cops could be better educated we might be able to remove them from the fearful darkness and into a glorious new light, shone from the application of scientific evidence about their work. This somewhat arrogant theorising about reasons for ‘problematic implementation’ is common in this story-line. Sherman goes further, reinforcing the story-lines on implementation problems, improvement, and discourse structuration of the dark-age *battler cops*, suggesting an almost conspiratorial allegiance to the old (dark) ways of policing which is ‘smothering’ the progress of EBP’s ‘science’;

“If there is a smothering paradigm holding back EBP, despite urgent external demands for change, it is the doctrine that a craft of problem solving cannot benefit from science. This paradigm holds that the best way to make decisions is to learn from experience, and the more the better. The corollary is that statistical analysis of even large numbers of cases will fail to identify the particular details of a given situation, thus misleading rather than improving decisions; police would be better off without looking for such evidence. This prevailing paradigm of “no research need apply” is not only espoused by practitioners; it has substantial backing in academic circles as well. The preference for intuition over analysis is central to a substantial intellectual split in the psychological study of decision making. On one side stands adherents of the Nobel Prize-winning (and evidence based) decision-making psychologist

Daniel Kahneman. On the other side stand adherents of the human factors psychologist Gary Klein.” (Sherman, 2015, p.16-7)

It seems reasonable for me to conclude that this positioning would dismiss my own analysis of EBP as belonging to the dark ages, and resisting the march of scientific progress in the Luddite tradition. I contend though that this misses the point of my analysis. I simply suggest that the march of scientific progress that underpins EBP discourse may be incorrect. For me, EBP is asking the wrong questions. It is trifling at the edges of policing practice rather than asking theoretically-informed questions about policing to provoke genuine debate, promote improvement and generate knowledge about policing. Additionally, it forecloses any debate about austerity and de-politicises any debate on police cuts through problematised (re)constructions of ‘squandered resources’ or ‘inefficiency’, supporting neoliberal state narratives. It is also overly bold in its truth claim assertions about the possibilities its work offers to practitioners. The creation of the *battler cop* position is a simpler way to dismiss these concerns, than to confront the possibility that espousal of the pressing need to introduce EBP at greater pace and scale may simply be wrong.

There is support for the underpinning beliefs of the implementation problem to be found in analysis of the texts from non-academic core groups. The APCC / NPCC ‘Policing Vision 2025’ document alludes to the need for changes;

*“Continuing work to build a **culture** which values difference, openness and transparency, underpinned by the shared values and behaviours set out in the Code of Ethics... **Building an evidence base** on staff wellbeing, procedural justice and maximising discretionary contribution so that **those who work in policing can be supported and valued through change.**” (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.9)*

This section implies an issue with police culture and a requirement for change or improvement. It is interesting to note the reference to needing to do so in an ‘evidence-based’ way. The ‘evidence’ requirements begin to permeate language through governmental processes. ACC Megicks speech on *‘the evidence for smarter policing’* also references the culture and change ‘issue’ that underpins the implementation story-line;

“The evidence-based approach is favoured by the College of Policing and the Home Office and has a growing body of research behind it, although it is still very early days in comparison to other professions. It has a merit in this organisation to build up an evidence base. It can help us to make an impact and a change for the better of the police. Is it not the right thing to do to build up knowledge and share it around colleagues? I think we, as a collective, should help further the knowledge base.” (PFEW, 2016, p.6-7)

Although lacking specific references to the implementation issue, it is clearly implied here in the question about the need to develop and ‘share’ the evidence-based approach across policing. If it were not viewed as problematic, surely a senior officer with a passion for EBP would not be laying out the challenge in this style? With this as an ‘insider view’ therefore, it is perhaps unsurprising to note the volume of references to the implementation story-line within the academic texts.

Lum et al (2011) solution of an evidence-based ‘matrix’ to evaluate – or hierarchise – evidence such that practitioners can more easily distinguish between ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ evidence to help overcome the implementation problem. This contributes to this story-line, offering a solution to bring policing into the light. Albeit, the opportunity for the matrix as a solution seems to be pessimistically presented owing to the many blockages noted;

“Of course, the Matrix is far from being the cure-all to institutionalizing scientific research and evidence into police practice. But, efforts like this may represent the “next step” in translating scientific evidence into practice and institutionalizing evidence based policing. Indeed, there are major and well-known cultural, ideological, political, financial, and practical barriers in policing that regularly block change, science, innovation, new ideas, evidence, and systematic information at every turn (Lum 2009; Sherman 1984, 1998; Weisburd et al. 2003b; Willis et al. 2007).” (Lum et. al., 2011, p.22)

I could have induced the below passage in the subsection on *‘policing improvement’* story-lines or in the chapters which follow on discourse structuration and discourse institutionalisation. My dilemmas on where to include passages from texts support my theoretical and methodological points on the necessary interconnectedness of discursive elements of story-lines, subject positionality, and institutional reform combined into a genealogical presentation of EBP. The text discusses police-academic evidence-based partnerships, which I identify as an important institutional modification, and to the subject positions created and reproduced for *‘battler cops’* and *‘professional officers’*: cops as blockers, officers as pracademic researchers. I include it here as an example of the ‘problematic’ police culture referred to in the implementation story-line.

“the organisational barriers that we discussed above were viewed as impeding not only collaborative research with external academics, but also the ‘inhouse research’ conducted by officers and analysts themselves.” (Goode and Lumsden, 2016. P.9)

This passage typifies the tone of texts in this story-line which do not question the worth of collaboratively produced research (as opposed to critical, and more independent, theoretically informed research conducted from the distance of academia), but expresses frustration at the barriers to the growth of such collaborative arrangements. It echoes the work of Brown (2017) quoted above on the need for

greater and closer evidence-based partnerships between academics and police organisations.

*“Furthermore, U.S. police agencies and their international counterparts are well known for not using evidence-based practices in everyday patrol and investigations. The best example of this is the general failure of police agencies to feature place-based strategies—i.e., hot spots policing, despite the strong evidence of its efficacy and the spatial distribution of crime (NRC 2004; Weisburd 2008; Weisburd et al. 2004).⁴ Police also continue to make widespread use of other strategies that researchers consider ineffective, such as the DARE program (Drug Abuse Resistance Education), reactive arrests, rapid response to 911 calls, and gun buybacks. Many of the causes for this are organizational, related to **the stubborn and slow-changing nature of police culture, tradition, and practices** (Bayley 1994; Mastrofski 1999; O’Neill et al. 2007; Sherman 1984, 1998). Yet as Lum (2009) asserts, the next step in moving toward evidence-based policing is to build on existing evidence, systematic reviews, and research infrastructures to **create translation tools for conveying that evidence to police practitioners.**” (emphasis added, Lum et. al. 2011, p.8)*

This passage again demonstrates the overlap into story-lines on efficiency, wasting resources, but is more specifically about the implementation story-line. Despite criticism here largely aimed at ‘police culture’, there is a desire to continue to promote EBP as the ‘correct model’ moving forward and recommendations on institutional changes to overcome the presented implementation barriers. This passage is typical of the story-line which assumes ‘EBP is a great idea’ and that it needs to be brought to the world to improve it. It is also a story-line which ‘blames’ policing for failing to take up this enlightenment ‘cure’, despite its ‘obvious’ benefits, (re)producing the *battler cop* subject position. This story-line is constantly searching for solutions to get over this ‘problem’ with the police. The story-line cannot conceive of the possibility that EBP may not be as widely adopted as its advocates would like, not because cops don’t understand the scientific evidence but because they do, do not believe its truth claims, and so reject it.

ii. 'Critique'

The 'critique' story-line, as a subset of the story-line on the implementation of EBP, is an interesting one. The 'critique' is found predominantly in the realist texts, and is strong criticism indeed of adherence to scientific models espoused in the purist texts. In fact, the criticism I have found within EBPs realist texts echo criticisms I offer of EBP. However, the critique offered within realist texts, and presented in this subsection, in my view is limited in its thinking as they remain governed by the idea that progression of a modified version EBP is a positive notion. Realist critique, however acute, is used to open the space within the EBP discourse coalition for their own brand of EBP which is a broader church – methodologically speaking – than the purist model. Ellefsen's (2011) promising piece on 'EBP as governmentality' is typical of this story-line. She begins by offering, in my view, a justifiable and important critique of the development of evaluative knowledge as 'crime science' in Scandinavia for use in police management, citing criminological work of Hughes (2007) to support the point;

"Hughes is critical to the WTBD (What is to be done) tradition and particularly to its positioning as 'crime science' in contrast to social scientific criminology. He is sceptical to what he calls '...a global "what works" advocacy network...' in the shape of state-financed research institutions and their offer of '...an administrative criminology for the powerful' (Hughes 2007:199). He objects to the crime science paradigm's unwarranted assumption of the international commonality of the conditions and nature of crime, and he warns against a crime science hegemony that may close off other modes of enquiry." (Ellefsen, 2011 p.113-4)

Ellefsen would share my concerns about discursive closure, and echoes the othered critical criminological research I reference extensively in Chapter 1. However, the paper ends up supporting the need for a modified EBP, this time to include critique. This remains within the story-line guardrails that structure this thinking, adding weight to EBP in doing so:

*“He supports an evaluation tradition which aims to transform the police and their collaborators into better preventers of crime and insecurity, at the same time as it is critical and committed to reveal exclusion and injustice. To achieve this the evaluation tradition ‘needs to be transparent, applied in orientation, **evidence-based**, and committed to empowerment and practical rather than idealistic change, as well as social justice and human rights’ (Hughes 2007:204)” (Ellefsen, 2011 p.113-4, emphasis added)*

There is an acceptance here of the disciplinary power of discursive governance. It seems that despite valid critique, actors are unable to think, speak or do outside of discourse. Below, Ellefsen applies excellent critique of the quasi-scientific modelling of the purist EBP discourses, calling for sociological and theoretical interjections, and yet she ends up in the same position: that such interjections should be made *within* commissioned evidence-based frameworks. Arguably, this is demonstrative of Ellefsen being positioned through EBP governance; positioning her contribution under the rules of EBP governmentality.

“Finally, it helps those who effectuate and administer evaluations to see the value of epistemological and sociological insight (Gundhus 2009:280). The concepts of agency and power are central to the critical-realistic tradition. It may thus better contribute to provide the link between crime and other troublesome public issues such as structural inequalities and social and political exclusions. Using quantitative studies it can demonstrate correlations between power structures and risks of criminalization and victimization, and explore the distribution of this risk. It can also employ qualitative studies to illuminate the connections between structure and agency in crime. Through self-reflexivity it can link power structures to politics and ask who gets to be safe or vulnerable (Hughes 2007:205)... As distinct from WW and WTBD, the critical-realistic evaluation tradition is not objective-means-oriented and

therefore may emphasize more than decision oriented or process-oriented results. Being rooted in a social-scientific tradition, it will be based on theory and able to adapt data, methodologies, analyses, and presentation to the subjects and problems to be addressed. In other words, critical-realistic evaluations tend not to let the commissioner's need of management of objectives and results, or the practitioners' need for simple tools, govern research. Consequently it allows for the production of nuanced results that might break with the expectations of the commissioner" (Ellefsen, 2011, p.120-121)

The analysis shown here in the critique story-line I argue is flawed as it remains 'within' the governance of EBP's discourse. It is preferable to the purist proposals but I suggest 'mixed methodology' as the *least worst option* to take if you must do EBP at all. Given all I have said about the structuring power of discourse and story-lines, allied to the issues of concern I identify for consideration in my research, I cannot conceive of any reasonable conclusion that suggests that EBP should be modified to include considerations from critical realists. These positions seem to argue and debate as Hajer's work conceptualises, to carve out and mediate their own space, for their own type of knowledge, within the EBP discursive structure. Ellefsen and others suggest critical research should be included into the policy mix to improve EBP.

Instead, I argue for a radical deconstruction of EBP discourse through discourse analysis, as EBP (re)produces problematic neoliberal political positions due to the governmental techniques of discourse. The disciplinary processes of discursive closure (re)producing hegemony through story-lines, discursive structuration and institutionalisation, ensures that critical research will become increasingly marginalised and excluded from political policy agendas through progression of EBP discourse, however modified and mediated. EBP's governance techniques need to be revealed and challenged to effect positive changes in policing. Critical scholarship on

policing will likely be squeezed out of policy, and not commissioned by funders. EBP ensures new knowledge about policing is (re)produced through neoliberal institutional modifications observable through EBP texts. The *critique story-line* within the story-line on the development of EBP is an illustrative example of this. It is positioned and structured *within* EBP discourse and so posits modifications in response to its own critique, but does not advocate radical change. Its responses, I argue, are blunted by the discourse through available, normalised and accepted story-lines which operate on actors and institutions through processes of governmentality to (re)produce status quo.

Summary

This chapter presents three important story-lines in EBP discourse, including their subsets. My research illustrates the story-lines of EBP as important political devices, functioning in the three ways described by Hajer (1995). First, they *disguise complexity and provide closure* to problems. According to EBP, policing is not a messy and contested problem that a wider interrogation of criminological literature suggests. Instead, EBP presents the principle concerns of modern policing as connected to its economy, efficiency, and value for money. These in turn, reinforce policing's craft-based heritage, stubborn 'culture' and associated lack of 'professionalism'. These can be addressed by the systematised application and transfer of 'rigorous' scientific methods, following the evidence-based medicine model. Despite nuances in academic literature, EBP discourse neatly pathologises policing according to managerial and neoliberal discourses.

Second, EBP's story-lines act as tropes to allow the construction of issues as a '*coherent problem*'. It is obvious from the examples presented that there is a wide acceptance from a range of actors – academic, police individual and institutional actors, and policy makers – of EBP's story-lines on improvement, science and implementation. There is nuance within the narration of these story-lines but there is also an acceptance of neoliberal and managerial 'issues' as the 'coherent problems' of policing, often without wider contemplation. EBP's shared story-lines narrates these as the accepted pathologies to which policing and researchers must turn their attention. The story-lines gloss over, or politically forecloses, the potential messiness to this coherence caused by deeper considerations of othered critical criminological or sociological literature on the nature of 'crime', the role of policing in society, or the nature of knowledge.

Third, story-lines allow individual and institutional actors to *position themselves and others* against these convenient story-lines. The examples presented in this chapter are taken from texts produced by a range of actors who position themselves within and against EBP's story-lines, which they share. Actors enter EBP's discourse coalition accepting the problematisations, the solutions, the need for EBP to develop and transfer its privileged, 'classified' scientific knowledge into modern policing in accordance with EBP's story-lines, without further consideration of alternatives. EBP's story-lines can be shown to operate together to facilitate communication between discoursing subjects whilst simultaneously governing possible production of new knowledge. Governmentality operates to constrain, enable and discipline

contributions of new policing knowledge at once, ensuring contributions and positions are 'framed' within the dominant discourse. Within the totality of EBP discourse, story-lines help to (re)produce discourse structuration and discourse institutionalisation in the process of delivering simplified hegemonic presentations of messy issues surrounding policing, supporting Hajer's theory.

CHAPTER 5

Subject Positions of Evidence-Based Policing

Foucault was concerned with subjectification of actors: how subject positions become defined within discourse and how this positions subjects in creating social 'order'. Foucault (1964) suggests this involved the construction of categories of actors, such as 'the madman' in his study on the history of insanity. Hajer has taken Foucault's work forward theoretically and I rely on Hajer's conceptual developments to frame this chapter in presenting my own research data. Hajer suggests,

"the task of the political analyst will be to explain how a given actor (whether it is an organisation or a person) secures the production of his discursive position (or manages to alter this) in the context of a controversy" (Hajer, 1995, p.51).

Hajer's work again returns to his central question about permanence and change. Hajer alludes to the possibility of actors moving and adjusting their subject position within discourse. In line with his approach to '*argumentative discourse analysis*' Hajer sees actors as having *agency* in the development of discourse by trying to convince others to view problems according to their own perspective, and equally positioning other actors in specific ways. It is this idea of *argument* – the transformation and (re)production of discourse through debate - that is central to Hajer's ADA theory, and helps explain his approach to change and hegemony. Hajer is therefore concerned with how actors are positioned within and against various discursive elements, as well as positions that are created. This reintroduces a requirement to consider multiple elements of discourse as interconnected in order to develop a meaningful account.

My research on story-lines demonstrates actors bringing their own ideas into EBP discourse, illustrating discourses enabling function. This supports Hajer's ideas about

mediation and change through *argument*. However, I believe the constraining nature of discourse maybe plays a stronger role than Hajer affords it. As such it may not be as possible to create new knowledge or ascribe understandings through argument as easily as Hajer suggests. Returning to Foucault, discourse governs the way we think, speak and act. While I accept discourse is at once constraining and enabling, it seems to me that only a given number of possibilities are conceivable within a given period or geography. Accepting actors may manoeuvre within these possibilities, the degree of change conceived by Hajer is potentially over-emphasised in his work and remains in need of further empirical support in my view.

In his work on *discourse structuration* Hajer describes how the utterance of story-lines, or elements of story-lines which evoke bigger story-lines, allow subjects to retain or enhance their credibility. In this important respect, discourse structuration shares close affinity to subject position. Discourse structuration describes how actors need to rely upon key ideas and categories produced within discourse to explain their own positions, and that their credibility depends on this deference. It is with these theoretical constructs of discourse structuration and subject positionality foregrounded that I next present my analysis of EBP texts, revealing identifiable constituent subjects. The chapter is presented in three sections. I have coded texts which explore: subject positions within policing; subject positions within academia; and political subject positions. Within each section, I present a taxonomy describing the subject positions I have identified, supported with examples from the texts. I also offer commentary on the impact of this on discourse structuration as it is understood

by Hajer, positions within EBP discourse which are created, mediated, and actors position each other against.

1. Subject Positions '*within*' Policing

Battler Cops and Professional Officers

In the previous chapter on *story-lines* I introduced two new subject positions that I identify in the texts that positions those 'within' policing in EBP discourse: the '*battler cop*' and the '*professional officer*'. In the previous chapter I have presented how these positions are (re)produced within EBPs story-line, specifically how the '*cops need enlightening*' and on '*implementation*'. This also links strongly to the 'professionalisation' narrative that runs through EBP. The *battler cop* and *professional officer* positions I conceive operating in juxtaposition; they are mutually reinforcing, much as Foucault (1975) saw madness defined by 'normality'. I propose them as identifiable subject positions, (re)produced through EBP's story-lines and institutional modifications. These positions also operate to discipline and structure discourse in the way Hajer conceives. Those now entering the EBP discursive field are required to position themselves and their contributions to take account of these subject positions. The positions become a governance technique that disciplines what is written about police officers and policing organisations that are subject to research. To this extent both positions have become key features within texts, they are observable within story-lines and institutional modifications, and so serve their

function within discourse structuration, as Hajer suggests. Before illustrating how these positions are dealt with within the texts, I first describe these two positions.

The *battler cop* is conceived after the symbol common in Australian parlance, the *Aussie battler*. The *Aussie battler* has emerged in popular language in Australia as a term to describe in an affectionate way the 'hard working Australian'. In contrast to the discursive device in UK politics where politicians are scrambling to be on the side of 'hard working families', in Australia the *battler* has become a badge of honour amongst working class people to symbolise their struggle, their hard work, their blue-collar glass ceilings, and all the lifestyle, political and social associations that go with it. Sport loving, beer drinking, Ute-driving Aussies' battlers, working hard on low wages in the industrial economy for their families, despite facing structural adversity; *battling on*. A caricature for sure, but a powerful symbol of the 'hard working Australian'. It was while researching in Melbourne I first encountered this term and began to think of it as it applied to the texts I was researching for EBP and the '*battler cop*' was born.

As I wrote in the preceding chapter therefore, the *battler cop* is characterised as the 'mass' of blue collar, poorly educated, working class, street-based, '**battler cops**' who stand in the way of evidence-based 'improvement'. They represent the pathologised 'normal' police in need 'saving' by scientific betters within EBP discourse. Our *battler cop* is almost beloved within EBP texts, echoing the way I saw the *Aussie battler* characterised. The *battler cop* works really, really hard: is in policing for the right reasons; they are of the community; trying to do their best to support fellow citizens

in times of hardship and crisis. They do things most of us wouldn't want to: they put themselves in harm's way; are assaulted, spat at and abused on our behalf; they are poorly paid; have poor working conditions; work night shifts, weekends and public holidays; run towards the danger; and are required to be the paragons of social virtue for all. They are proud, and hang on to, their craft-based, anecdotal, hand-me-down training and traditions, despite the scientific knowledge which is beginning to undermine this according to purist EBP story-lines. The *battler cop* is a quaint anachronism: they are the leech-applying blood letters resisting scientific medical progress.

Rank is unimportant, this is not what defines them. The *battler cop* can be found at every rank and station in policing. Indeed EBP discourse positions most cops as the battler variety: they are 'the masses'. They have, and deserve, the utmost respect of the public and the academic criminologist alike. Despite this warm and fuzzy feeling toward the *battler cop* though they come with a problem for EBP advocates. They are a **blocker**. This is the very definition of the *battler cop*, their essence. They are resistant to EBP. Don't misunderstand this, it is not their fault, for they are generally on the side of the righteous. It's just they simply lack the ability or intellect to become 'enlightened'. They don't understand the science. If only they did, their lives would be easier, and the world would become a better place. Alas, their 'dark' struggle continues. Despite nuance within academic text on the utility of craft -based knowledges, the *battler cop* position is widely found in texts from all four core groups I have sampled.

The *professional officer* stands in juxtaposition to the *battler cop*. The *professional officer* is a minority group. They can be characterised as white-collar, middle class, university educated. The *professional officer* again can be found at any rank or station in policing for again, this is not what defines them. The *professional officer* is the darling of EBP discourse. They **champion** EBP at every turn. They understand the science; they have seen the light; they *know* that science can improve policing and society if it is rigorously applied and what is more, they have ‘the evidence’ to prove this assertion.

A slightly rarer, but growing subset of the professional officer is the EBP *pracademic*. Ideally, graduate of the University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology / Police Executive Programme. The *pracademic* can be found hard at work in policing organisations throughout the world, helping to build the evidence-base about ‘what works’ by applying their robust scientific methods to everyday policing issues, ‘improving’ policing, and demonstrating to the *battlers* that there can be a brighter future. If only the *battlers* could see it and stop getting in the way of ‘progress’. The *pracademic* is oft-found co-authoring research with purist academics of the Cambridge school, reporting research from the masters programme.

It is worth emphasising at this point that these two positional structurations apply both to individual actors and policing organisations. All can be positioned against these characteristics and it is worth reiterating how I draw the distinction. The distinction is made based on their position against EBP discourse and this is revealing of the *discursive structuration* seen at work here. My text analysis illustrates actors and

organisations typically being positioned in respect of their attitude towards EBP as a project. There are examples of senior *professional officers* frustrated at those junior *battler cops* beneath them who frustrate their attempts to deliver EBP in the organisations they lead; and there are relatively junior *professional officers*, frustrated at the *battler cops* senior to them in rank and service who block their attempts for bottom-up changes promoting EBP.

I have provided numerous examples of these subject positions found in the texts presented in EBP story-lines in the proceeding chapter, for example Huey et al (2017) was presented on the police officers who saw little value in EBP, or Brown's work on the 'dialogue of the deaf' (2017). Indeed, the entire notion of the 'dialogue of the deaf' describing in the relationships between enlightened criminologist academic researchers and stubborn *battler cops* resisting progress is widely referenced in the texts, and supports this discourse structuration. I present here further textual content to support my taxonomy. The positions are identifiable in all EBP texts. Sherman complains about the lack of take-up of EBP;

*"Yet there are still **millions** of police around the world who have never heard of EBP, let alone support it. The **thousands** who already do support it must **swim against a tide of indifference or resistance**. No matter how many want to bring evidence into their own work, they are **undermined by many more who disapprove** of that approach. In at least one U.S. police agency, a police officer enrolled in a PhD program has had to conceal it from colleagues, to minimize reprisals. It is no surprise that these early adopters ask whether there is a better way to transform policing toward totally-evidenced decisions. The answer may depend on how we diagnose the causes of resistance to EBP. Some academics assign high, selfless motives to the resistance; other analysts suggest low, selfish motives. The high motives are said to reflect a clear understanding that policing is a **"craft" that lies beyond scientific analysis**... Other high-minded opponents of EBP believe that all police should develop a skilled intuition as the basis of decision making; they fear that evidence will kill off such intuition. The accusation of a low or selfish motive for*

*resistance to evidence-based practice is said to be **pure anti-intellectualism: a fear** that someone else knows more than I do, and will try to “put on airs” or “lord it over me.” This fear may then provoke “straw man” criticisms: Too much education will rob police decision makers of common sense; it might make them “study problems to death, instead of just doing something”; they could “lose touch” with the ordinary people police must serve, getting too far off the ground to be interested in the details of local crimes and criminals.” (Sherman, 2015, p.13)*

This passage reinforces the story-lines of ‘policing improvement’, ‘implementation’ and specifically the story-line that ‘cops need enlightening’. I describe in the following chapter how this also supports institutional modification through recommendations of further education in the methods and knowledge of EBP. For the purposes of this section however, I am concerned with how it also (re)produces the ‘battler cop’. The passage speaks of those poor, frightened, oppressed, uneducated cops who resist the enlightenment that EBP promises. They are positioned as luddites. They are the masses – “the tide / the millions” – against ‘the thousands’ professional EBP officers are juxtaposed as the individual swimmers bringing enlightenment. The elements in the passage I have highlighted demonstrate this strong link to the ‘uneducated’ nature of battler cops and the pressing need to educate them: to bring them into the light of EBP ‘science’. According to the story-line, even ‘they’ might come to embrace EBP once they ‘become familiar’ – are educated – as to the miraculous bounties EBP will surely bring. The purist school’s truth claims are vociferous and influential. There is an almost religious-like inner belief that EBP possesses the ‘truth’, or the tools to acquire it, and no consideration is given to the possibility that EBP is not more widely adopted because police officers might be sceptical of these truth-tellers.

The assumed “anti-intellectual” positioning of battler cops presented in the text above could be considered patronizing and disrespectful. It is possible that highly intelligent,

well-educated police officers have fully considered the claims of EBP and reject them, for a variety of reasons. My own critique for example, comes from my understanding of broader socio-criminological and philosophical literature on the nature of knowledge, power and so forth. I do not consider my critique or rejection of EBP as anti-intellectual or in need of deeper understanding or education in evidence-based methods. No consideration is given to the possibility that despite their truth-claims, the EBP remedies may simply be wrong, lead to perverse outcomes for the police and the public and are resisted on this basis.

Within EBP there are also calls for selection and qualification for police promotions to be based on a strong assessment of candidates understanding of the 'evidence-base' as it applies to policing: *"The aim is to move to an accredited profession, underpinned by a systematic body of knowledge... marrying the best science and knowledge to Peel's model to form a new professional police fit for today and challenges of tomorrow"* (Neyroud, 2014). This quote helps to position the *battler cop* by talking of what they 'lack': professionalism; scientific knowledge. It also support the problematisations of policing that EBP rests upon, however ill-defined and nebulous that problematisation may be.

The work of Dawson and Stanko (2016), who have spent a long time as academics working 'inside' policing organisations (Metropolitan Police Service) and political governance (Mayors Office for Policing And Crime, London), have written about the opportunities EBP provides for academics in respect of the data policing collates from a realist position. In their paper *"The Best-Kept Secret(s) of Evidence Based*

Policing". they foreground their study by supporting the notion of the *battler cop* structuration thus;

*"the challenges of embedding Evidence Based Policing into any police organisation are complex, and numerous academic scholars (overwhelmingly based outside of the organisation) have described these challenges as **resistance to change**. Scholars include descriptions of **cultures inside policing (such as machismo, action-orientated work and internal loyalty)** which too often supports scepticism of social science research."* (emphasis added, Dawson and Stanko, 2016, p.64)

Policing *en masse* here is presented as resistant and 'anti-intellectual'. Thus Dawson and Stanko's research (re)produces the *battler cop* structuration, and so they position themselves against it. They continue presenting this structuration, demonstrating their own 'insight' into the problematic blockages of delivering evidence-based science in policing. They highlight the frustration of working with quaint, hand-me-down, craft-based apprenticeships symbolic of the *battler cop*;

*"An appreciation of the context of policing, the **cultures** within which legal decisions are made, the **bond** of the profession, and its **persistent oral tradition** must go alongside the use of police data too."* (emphasis added, Dawson and Stanko, 2016 p.67)

Also writing from a realist perspective, Goode and Lumsden echo the 'anti-intellectualism' of the *battler cop*, (re)producing it but also being discursively structured by it;

"As Foster and Bailey (2010, p. 197) note, the opposition and reticence academics can encounter is epitomized in a comment by one officer of working with academics as akin to 'letting lunatics into the asylum'. They argue that such a comment 'reflects widespread scepticism and stereotypical attitudes towards academics' (Greenhill 1981, Young 1991)." (Goode and Lumsden, 2016 p.3)

Brown's work on the prospects for EBP in Canada is also illustrative and reinforces discourse structuration and positioning against it: (re)producing the 'stubborn' blocker of the *battler cop* thus;

*"In relation to police, Stanko and Dawson (2015), in assessing relationships with researchers in the U.K. (and 'ways to open dialogue'), find that modifications are required in the '**stubborn' police culture**. They note, 'The welcome of new information challenging the "way things are done around here"... requires a change in police culture' (Stanko & Dawson, 2015, p. 2)." (emphasis added, Brown, 2017 p.538)*

The structuration of *battler cops* continues below from a critical realist paper. In drawing reference to health as a comparator, which is valorised in EBP discourse as a 'science-based profession' accessed through admission via qualification, the *battler cop* can be juxtaposed and discursively structured: 'othered' by dint of intellectual exclusion.

"None of the police interviewed said they used academic literature or consultants to inform their policy decisions, which led the author to question whether research evidence may be less easily taken up in drug-related policing contexts, compared to drug-related health contexts." (Ritter and Lancaster, 2013 p.463)

The discursive structuration is not confined to academic EBP texts, and can also be found in texts taken from operational leadership of policing. In the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners / National Police Chiefs Council joint '*Policing Vision 2025*' document, we can see veiled references to both the 'battler' and 'professional' positions;

*"**Building an evidence base** on staff wellbeing, procedural justice and maximising discretionary contribution so that **those who work in policing can be supported and valued through change**." (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.9)*

It is assumptive of the 'needs improving' story-line and the corollary positions of those workers as needing to be 'supported' and 'valued' in a drive towards a more professional practice, which may be alien to the battler. All based on the best possible evidence, of course. This pertains to a view about workers needing to change, and those workers finding that uncomfortable, perhaps because of a 'lack' or 'deficiency' in understanding in the way their betters might find easier to grasp. There is a genealogical lineage again here to Taylorist views about workers in my view which accords with the *battler cop* position. This is made more explicit elsewhere in the document;

*"By 2025 policing **will be a profession** with a more representative workforce that will align the right skills, powers and experience to meet challenging requirements. We will do this by... Establishing a methodology and framework which helps practitioners across policing contribute towards **building knowledge and standards based on evidence.**"* (Emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.8-9)

Once again, the assumptive view of a need for 'improvement' and 'professionalisation', which speaks more explicitly to the two identified subject positions within policing is clear: the *battler* and the *professional*. It is also noteworthy that the senior operational and political leadership document for the future vision sees a hallmark indicator of such professionalisation as the need for it be 'evidence-based': (re)producing EBP discourse.

With the *battler cop* firmly discursively structured, I next provide typical examples of the *professional officer*; the doyen of EBP, represented in the texts. There is a significant overlap here with another story-line of EBP: the professionalisation of policing. The move towards a profession from a vocation. The move from blue collar

to white collar. The move towards admission by higher qualification from personal qualities. I explain this further as an institutional modification in the following chapter, but for now I present examples of the discourse structuration of the *professional officer*.

Sherman's (2015) influential article on how to create a 'totally EBP organisation' praises those *professional officers* as 'early adopters' of EBP;

"The demand for a clear road map to organizational change is fortunately stronger than ever. A growing number of "early adopters" (Gladwell, 2000) of the EBP paradigm are pressing ever harder to find their way, even without the road map. Several police agencies, in early 2015, are poised on the brink of a wide-ranging effort to use best evidence for changing the way police resources are used." (Sherman, 2015, p.12)

Linked strongly to institutional modifications presented in the following chapter are the growth of 'Societies' of Evidence-based Policing' in advanced neoliberal states. They are also worthy of a note of inclusion in the structuration of the *professional officer*. One would anticipate membership of such an organisation to be a key element of the *professional officer*;

"This demand for rapid change has been fed, in part, by two rapidly growing professional organizations, both founded since 2010: Over 1,500 people have joined the U.K.-based Society of Evidence-Based Policing (see www.sebp.police.uk); another 500 are estimated to have joined the Australia–New Zealand Society of Evidence-Based Policing (ANZSEBP; <http://www.anzsebp.com/>)." (Sherman, 2015, p.12)

It is against this backdrop that Sherman positions the *battler cop* in the lengthier passage quoted above, as the seat of resistance to the intellectualisation of policing through evidence-based transformation. Both subject positions are interdependent and feed off each other in a mutually-reinforcing relationship. There is a sense in

which the *professional officer* is also somehow structured as an 'intellectual pioneer' by reference to this 'early adopter' status.

A key characteristic of the *professional officer*, which helps to distinguish them from the *battler cop* is their role as 'champions' of EBP. The below passage from academia reinforces this structural position as not a matter of rank or seniority, but more about their position vis a vis EBP;

*"Some felt that abandoned strategies were a matter of interest diminishing among senior officers or the result of '**champions**' being transferred or leaving an agency."* (emphasis added, Huey et. al., 2017, p.551)

One of the key elements of the *professional officer* structuration is their education. It is paramount that this education must be robust, 'scientific' and ideally on EBP methods. Even more ideally it seems, this education should have been courtesy of the University of Cambridge;

"Several police agencies have sent as many as four students to Cambridge in one cohort, and one agency is considering far larger numbers than that. Their aim is to create a critical mass of professionals who share the same operational framework for implementing EBP. More evidence is needed on whether there is a threshold of critical mass, where it may be (in terms of numbers), and whether it depends on how the graduates are deployed when they complete the master's degree program" (Sherman, 2015, p.22-3)

These text examples of the positionality of the *professional officer* lead us inevitably to the special subset within this of the '*pracademic*'. These *professional officers* go beyond that discourse structuration. They are a particularly coveted and special group of *professional officers*: zen masters; spiritual guides to EBP; holders of 'sacred' knowledge. Importantly, they have access to data and influence within their own organisations to drive EBP as a project politically. They are recognised, (re)produced,

and oft-referenced within the texts I have examined. Although I will comment further on the development of new publications in the chapter on institutional modification, the editorial notes for the Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing are revealing in helping to position and structure the police pracademic;

“The Journal relies substantially, but by no means exclusively, on the research done by police professionals enrolled in graduate degree courses of the Cambridge Police Executive Program (CPEP)... They serve as the core of a global social network supporting evidence-based policing, while the current and recent students serve as the core producers of a rapidly growing practitioner-led research literature... What makes the Journal highly readable is a departure from general practice: the editors frequently become co-authors, with a police practitioner as first author as often as possible—but with writing and scientific clarity enhanced by editors taking direct responsibility for the quality and reliability of the writing and data analysis.” (Sherman, 2017, p.2-3)

The first reference I have found to the pracademic is contained in Sherman and Murray’s (2015) paper. The notion follows the medical model of medical professors who conduct practice-based research while still engaged in clinical practice. The commentary hence speaks to story-lines of medicalisation as well as improvement and professionalisation of policing, but is also an exemplar of the discursive structuration we can identify in *professional officers*;

*“Police research was once the sole domain of professional social scientists. No longer. Police **professionals** now make major contributions to research, just as practicing **professionals** do in other fields. Medical research is full of practicing clinicians, many of whom split their time between research and practice. Surgeons are first authors of important research articles, with their statisticians in second authorship spots. This volume reflects an aspiration to see the same pattern develop in policing in which research leadership moves from academics to **professionals**.” (emphasis added, Sherman and Murray, 2015, p.7)*

In my view, the advocacy for development of the pracademic position in policing seriously undermines one of the important founding principles of EBP – that ‘evidence’ should be independent and robust. Pracademics ‘marking their own homework’ feels

like a flawed approach in the context of policing, which is markedly different from medicine as a vocation and academic discipline.

There are several references in the texts examined to building academic-police practitioner research partnerships and again I will explore this further in the following chapter but for now, their importance is worth sharing as they help structure the subject positionality of the *professional officer* and *pracademic*;

“Finally, there are research active officers and others that seek to commission research. For any budding evidence based researcher, these are your allies.”
(Dawson and Stanko, 2016, p.67)

Dawson and Stanko directly referencing and commending the professional officer *pracademic* here as the ‘ally’ of the EBP researcher, (re)producing and reinforcing this subject position as defined by its relationship to EBP as a blocker or champion. It is unclear, but seems unlikely, that included in the *professional officer* or *pracademic* structuration would be those conducting research which is outwith EBP, or critical of it. Indeed, Dawson and Stanko reference only ‘evidence based researchers’ and not the criminologists, political scientists or sociologists who might equally see policing and crime as within their domain of inquiry.

Reflecting on my own policing subject position, although senior, progressive and university educated, I do not possess the right ‘type’ of ‘scientific’ education, produce the right ‘type’ of research knowledge, or conform to the EBP discursive view of managerialist ‘progress’. Therefore it seems I would more likely be structured through EBP as a *battler cop*; ignorantly failing to see the benefits of following rigorously medico-scientific evidence-based approaches to ‘improve’ policing. My contribution is

therefore easily 'othered' for failing to meet the requisite hierarchical methodological standards. My discourse analysis is some way away from the RCT and according to EBP scales produces less 'valuable' knowledge. It is also assumptive about the boundaries EBP normatively sets in producing and 'authorising' original research and new knowledge as 'true'.

There are several examples here of the two policing subject positions within EBP discourse. I argue they have come to represent discursive structuration as conceived by Hajer (2002). Discourse structuration is apparent here, positioning actors. This is important as it ensures through governmentality that actors contributions to EBP need to acknowledge and therefore position themselves, others and their contributions 'within' this structuration.

2. Subject Positions Within Academia

I began my coding of texts by developing subject positions for academics as a key constituent part of the EBP discourse coalition. There is the dichotomy I have used extensively between the 'purist' and the (critical) 'realist'. However, there are subtler academic subject positions identifiable within the texts. There is an arrogance and superiority emanating from those doing '*police science*', cemented through the '*real science*' story-line, over those conducting 'other research'. This is further reinforced by the hierarchisation of 'authorised' knowledge, which is a key feature of EBP discourse. The following chapter explores how this is becoming embedded at an

institutional level through *discourse institutionalisation*. The hierarchy of *how* knowledge is produced is seemingly reflected in the way in which those producing such knowledge are positioned by themselves and others.

I had begun to play with initial coding to reflect categorisations such as the ‘enlightening academic scientist’; the ‘balanced academic’; and the ‘superior / purist academic’. These positions are valid and remain identifiable within the texts. However, I discovered an older article in the British Journal of Criminology which proposes a taxonomy for academic criminologists based on Weber’s sociology of religion, which I have subsequently adapted for my work: “*Criminology as Religion? Profane Thoughts about Sacred Values*” (Haines and Sutton, 2000).

Haines and Sutton propose four positions for academic criminologists: the magician; the priest; the guru; and the prophet. Haines and Sutton acknowledge these as ‘ideal types’ rather than ‘set-in-stone’ positions, and suggest that academics move between such types depending on different times and forces acting upon them, such as the need to produce research outputs or deliver funding. In summary, they suggest that the **magicians** are those realists selling the knowledge of ‘what works’ in the marketplace. The **priests** are those committed to doctrine with strong institutional bases: according to Haines and Sutton, exemplified by Marxist approaches to criminology. The **gurus** are those who do not seek to produce new knowledge, but moreover collate what is ‘out there’ and present it ‘independently’ as teachers, guarding that autonomy. The **prophets** are more ‘fire and brimstone’ preachers; revealing great insights and new visions of how the world might be.

Haines and Sutton's article is quite optimistic, arguing that 'most criminologists' are engaged in the discipline from a belief in social justice. They reject concerns about managerialist turns in criminological research on this basis. It is on this point my analysis departs from Haines and Sutton.

"Given its well-established moral tradition – the emphasis that criminology has put on issues of justice and equity rather than pure technical questions of efficiency – it is unlikely that greater exposure to markets will result in these values simply being set aside" (Haines and Sutton, 2000, p.159)

From my own experiences and research I remain fundamentally concerned with the managerialist turn we continue to see in criminological research, particularly in policing typified by EBP, two decades on from the Haines and Sutton article. I concur with Squires (2013) analysis that critical scholarship is being prevented in considering this turn, and the prevention is further strengthened by the neoliberalisation of universities, alongside neoliberalisation of knowledge commissioning in the EBP / 'what works' / 'applied' research paradigm (see also Walters, 2003; Hilyard et al, 2004). In my view Haines and Sutton proposed taxonomy requires revision based on my research. The next section presents examples from the EBP texts I have analysed in support of this revision.

The Magicians

In the magician I find similarities with Haines and Sutton's distinctions. They suggest the magician seeks to work collaboratively; to sell their insights in the marketplace. They lack a baseline institution to revere (such as a church);

"Magicians must act at a pragmatic level, making deals with capricious deities to enable people to cope with everyday problems. They deal with magical forces which, through the correct use of formulae, can be trained to serve human needs... among magicians, lack of institutional base tends to result on total dependence upon selling their skills in the marketplace. For them the key religious question is: 'what works?'" (Haines and Sutton, 2000, p.150-151).

There are times when almost all academics fall into this subject positionality. We need to get REF-creditable outputs produced, secure funding for career advancement, partner in a multi-disciplinary way, and increasingly with agencies outside of the academy, in furtherance of our home institutions market position or in support of individual career advancement ambitions. Elements of EBP purist scholarship are identifiable within this subject position. However it is my contention that the majority of what is observable in the texts I have analysed the magician subject position also fits neatly with the realist scholar.

The following passage from Greene is typical of the realist call for mixed methods in EBP research. In many ways it needs to be understood as reactionary to the more zealous approach of the highly influential purist literature, which seeks to lead police research through the narrower lens of *police science*, aping positivist experimental medico-scientific methodologies.

“Cumulatively, there are many voices seeking to balance experimentation as applied to police interventions and drawing from a much wider array of theories and research methods that make the police contextual, that is, research that places the police in their environmental milieu replete with varying communications, interpretations, and meanings. In some ways, this discussion is not a new scientific conflict; rather, such conflicts arise from fundamental claims to knowledge from those emphasizing quantitative–positivist approaches, and those seeking understanding through phenomenological and qualitative approaches (Bernard, 2013, pp. 7–22). Such distinctions have often divided quantitative and qualitative researchers based in part on their underlying theoretical premises and research methods. Recent attempts to bridge such conflicts in criminology (see Maruna, 2010) reveal the positions of each (quantitative and qualitative) where there are those that rely on statistical significance and all it entails to determine scientific quality, while others seek to “know” about phenomena often through the “eyes of the participants.” Recognizing that neither side in this debate holds exclusive scientific sway, many call for increasing the use, and indeed integration, of “mixed methods” in social research to improve both prediction and meaning (see Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Yin, 2006). These methodological concerns, of course, apply to police research as well.” (Greene, 2014, p.194)

This text demonstrates the *pragmatism* that is a key characteristic of the magician. The magician needs to produce results from the fog of complexity, which are usable and ‘relevant’ to support and improve the human condition. The ‘realists’ are closest to this in my view. They will apply whatever methodology is required to produce results, are therefore flexible and undogmatic. Dogma characterises the ideal types caricatured in the prophet or the priest. Such flexible and ‘magical’ approaches are increasingly required of ‘successful’ academics, practicing within the neoliberal higher education and research marketplace.

“So, our adoption of the “evidenced-based approach” is limited to understanding a narrow, but important, range in police actions, that is, the crime deterrence/displacement effects of police interventions. But, such assessments tell us little about changes in policing brought about by a new generation of police officers, changes in police service delivery, and the implications of the recent decline in municipal resources for policing (Police Executive Research Forum, 2013). Such a focus tells us little about new value conflicts (security vs. liberty) that confront policing, or the competition for policing between the public and private sectors. These types of questions are often clouded by normative ideas about the limits and inequalities of social

control, the role of punishment in deterrence, the importance of the rule of law and support for procedural justice, or the cumulative effects of civic insecurity (political, economic, social, and religious) and their effects on civic dispositions (positive support or negative reaction) toward government actors, including the police. Like many social phenomena, the police are multifaceted, depending on how the question of interest is posed and the method used. Perhaps, the time has come to value the many roads that lead to Rome.” (Greene, 2014, p.201)

This passage again can be viewed as reactionary to the narrowing of the EBP lens required of purist approaches. I include it partly to illustrate the depth of penetration the purist discourse has had on the development of EBP, but also because this broadening out and call for mixed methodologies in EBP is typical of what we see from the realists. Pragmatism I argue, helps construct the magician ideal type within academic subject positions of EBP’s discourse.

I also examined texts that support the magician position in those who are the ‘buyers’ of the magicians wares in the marketplace to understand how academic subject positions are (re)produced by other actors.

*“Using an improved understanding of vulnerability, both in physical and virtual locations, as a means of improving and differentiating service and protection. This may mean **adapting to evidence of what works** locally in targeting vulnerability and areas of high demand and need.” (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.7)*

The notion of ‘adapting’ the evidence of ‘what works’ would be anathema to the dogmatic puritan priesthood, but the acceptance of localised contextuality and ‘magical pragmatism’ on the part of the buyer (in this case the operational and political leadership of policing), finds happy agreement with those magical realist academics selling their ‘evidence’ of ‘what works’. In texts analysed from organisations

representing the lower ranks of policing, I also identified calls for evidence-based approaches;

*“We will engage with the National Police Chiefs Council and the College of Policing to help identify the most effective models for tackling volume crime, based on the **best available evidence**.”* (emphasis added, PFEW, 2017c, p.2)

This further illustrates the structuration of the magical academic, and opens the door further – and the market - to magical explanations of how policing might be improved. To this extent we can see how structuration begins to be both created within discourse, but also recreated and reproduced by the material conditions of that position being constituted in discourse. In short, a magician cannot sell their pragmatic wares in the market place where the market place doesn't exist, or more specifically, without customers. The examples above demonstrate the 'availability' of said market from operational and political police leaders, and also those who represent front line operational police officers.

The (re)production of the magical marketplace is found in other texts from the Police Federation. In a policy paper dealing with plans for how PFEW will conduct its future policy decision making and governance;

“There is a clear trend towards the use of an evidence based approach in policy making, especially with regard to policies on pay, and conditions of service. (This is sometimes also referred to Evidence Based Management). This is an attempt to pull research findings through to practical policy. It is intended to ensure that practitioners are supported in their work by the evidence: it does not mean that all policy has to be set in accordance with evidence, but simply that there is a clear process for its consideration in a systematic way. There are four key components.

- 1. The research evidence base. What is proven to work. (E.g. for talent management programmes such as Fast Track and Direct Entry).*

2. *The specific organisational context. Organisational specific issues may mean that what works elsewhere doesn't work in the organisation in question. (E.g. for the police, will Direct Entry / Fast Track type talent management programmes work, or will the culture and ways of gaining operational experience mitigate against?) Context also includes the legal, social, political, and economic context.*
3. *The views of those affected. Usually judged by surveys / focus groups.*
4. *Management / practitioner (Fed Rep / Council / Board) judgement.*

If an Evidence Informed approach to policy making were to be adopted this would provide a clear auditable trail for the policy formation process. It provides an organisation with a knowledge-based approach to any decision making which would give representatives a level of confidence in the approach they take.” (PFEW, 2015, p.2-3)

This policy paper highlights many of the points in this thesis, but clearly advocates for an ‘evidence-informed’ approach to ‘how to’ do policy making within PFEW structures. The suggestion it contains to include context, views of staff and judgment of key decision makers simultaneously accepts the perceived benefits and *realpolitik* of the evidence-based sub-political environment in which PFEW now finds itself lobbying. Significantly, it dilutes the more purist view of the sanctity of ‘robust scientific’ evidence which I associate with the priestly position and supports a more pragmatic realist, or magical, subject positioning.

The Priests

The priests are caricatured through attachment to dogma, rigid in their approach and anchored to strong institutional frameworks. Haines and Sutton suggested this is most associated with Marxist criminologists. Whilst I acknowledge the point being made, alternatively, I suggest that Marxist authors can more meaningfully be positioned within the prophet category; revealing new insights. When the Haines and Sutton piece was written EBP was yet to fully emerge. In the two decades which have

followed its publication EBP purists can now meaningfully be conceived as comprising the priesthood category. I propose this based on the dogma, rigid approach and increasing institutional arrangements attached to the EBP purist position that justify this distinction in my view.

“Priests, on the other hand, do have an institutional base... Their beliefs are systematized into a rationalized form, and authority is vested in the resultant doctrine and dogma... Disputes must be referred to doctrine for resolution, and dogma flowing from omnipotent authority – which, by definition is not open to magical influence – provides the ultimate source of legitimation... Doctrine allows priests to deal in high levels of generalization, without concern for messy detail. Lack of observable success does not necessarily lead to problems, since the priest can apportion blame elsewhere... Calls for priests to ‘face up’ to lack of practical success therefore will be met with dismissal or derision. Pragmatism is the domain and controlling ethos of the magician – beneath consideration by the priest unless it is to denounce such actions as work of the devil.” (Haines and Sutton, 2000, p.151)

This passage needs a little interpretation to demonstrate what I contend: that the purist school of EBP have become the priests in contemporary criminology. They are characterised by a strong institutional base, principally the University of Cambridge, the second oldest university in the English-speaking world, revered internationally for its research excellence. The priests are further developing their institutional bases through development of the College of Policing, influence of political leadership of policing through the Home Office and Police and Crime Commissioners, and police forces operational leadership whom they actively educate and recruit for ‘conversion’. They are developing their own institutions through an international network of Societies of Evidence Based Policing. Their beliefs are systematised and rationalised into ‘scriptures’ which valorise positivist scientific method. More specifically medico-scientific language and methods. This is their doctrine and routinely found in the texts I have analysed. Dispute can be resolved by reference to the science, the facts: what

does the evidence say? Where this evidence has been produced, by application of rigorous doctrine, then it assumes the status of fact, is sacred, and can be generalised to any situation providing the rigid methodology of its production – to the highest possible medico-scientific standards – has been adhered to. If this fails to work then it is likely to be simply a problem of implementation; an issue with police leadership or battler ‘culture’. An issue outside of the management of the scientific approach which does not affect its pure generalisability. Concerns or disputes emanating from outside of this dogmatic knowledge pool are easily othered and dismissed as work of the devil: the magic of the unenlightened, not real science, proper science, police science, and so easily discounted as laughably misinformed or unfortunate.

As I have acknowledged in the preceding subsection however, the purist can (and does) migrate into the magician group as they too are keen to promote their magical knowledge in the marketplace through EBP structures where market opportunities present. The purist priest though is importantly distinct from the realist magician. The latter is prepared to be flexible and pragmatic; change their methodologies and epistemology to deliver market outcomes, such as applied and transferred knowledge. The priest will stick more rigidly to their dogma and attempt to bend the will of those they are seeking to influence to their own position. It is the dogma that is important and if that means losing a few non-believers along the way in their mission to convert the world to their beliefs, then so be it. The dogma is not for changing.

There are several examples of the disciplinary governance techniques of the priesthood in the texts I have analysed. There are numerous examples of talking ‘up’

priestly methods and research, and supporting other priests within the purist school, and ‘talking down’ other researchers. The texts are littered with examples of scholars within the priesthood referencing each other’s work in positive ways due to their compliance with doctrine, and much ‘othering’ of more magical or prophetic understandings of ‘the evidence’. Those who conform to their doctrines are valorised, whilst those who fail incur their derision.

“However, the veracity of this claim has been challenged by Strang et al. (2014), who traced the origins of this figure to research carried out in 1979 in a small Canadian city. The number 35 was calculated on the basis of just 53 interviews with women who said they had been the victim of a prior incident before the police became involved. The results also excluded data from 15 interviews where the victims did not report any prior incidents preceding police involvement. As such, the study suffers from both low statistical power (with a response rate of just 24% on a sample size of 222 victims) and a lack of external validity (Strang et al. 2014).” (Barnham, Barnes, and Sherman, 2017, p.118-9)

This passage is authored by the Cambridge school, including a ‘pracademic’ and is supportive of the critique made by Heather Strang (Cambridge school) of Canadian research into domestic abuse which fails to comply with the rigid scientific formulae the priestly school holds in highest regard.

“Bland and Ariel (2015) found the majority of ‘dyads’ (76%) made only one report over a 6-year open observation period. A smaller number of victims, just 11%, reported suffering three or more incidents.” (Barnham, Barnes, and Sherman, 2017, p.119)

This passage from the same paper references further critique of findings from research conducted outside of EBP priestly doctrine. The critique referenced is raised by Bland and Ariel, EBP scholars in the priestly tradition.

“Sherman et al. (2014, 2016) propose an alternative method, using an index based on the sentencing starting point for any offender convicted for the first time. Each offence is given a value equivalent to the number of days

*imprisonment imposed on offenders with no prior criminal history, and no mitigating or aggravating circumstances in the crime at hand. This method is called the Cambridge Crime Harm Index (CHI). Using the sentencing starting point has the advantage of avoiding the consideration of other factors when sentencing... Nevertheless, **the Cambridge CHI is the only method capable of being translated into practice quickly and at no cost**... In applying the Cambridge CHI, the reported levels of harm are based on an objective measure” (emphasis added, Barnham, Barnes, and Sherman, 2017, p.121)*

Here is an example of self-referencing commonly found within priestly texts. It valorises, in the section I have emphasised, a new development – the Cambridge Harm Index – as the ‘*only method*’ available for urgent inclusion in policing practice as it is self-evidently compliant with priestly doctrine. It also suggests potential for market position advancement of the priest as magician.

“A crime hot spot is characterized by a cluster of criminal offenses within a small geographical area such as a city block, street segment, building or specific address (Braga 2007; Braga et al. 2014; Braga and Weisburd 2010; Sherman and Weisburd 1995; Weisburd and Telep 2014).” (Bennet, Newman and Sykes, 2017, p.418-9)

This is typical of those within the priestly ideal type. Writing in the Cambridge Journal of EBP, the above authors contain priests and a ‘pracademic’ and references others within the priesthood; (re)producing knowledge within the doctrinal protocols and relying on fellow priests to mutually boost their own legitimacy. I could present a large number of these examples, but this is very typical of what can be found so I limit it to these.

Unsurprisingly, Sherman is a key architect of priestly scriptures, and is widely referenced by others as a source of doctrine. There are two specific areas of his invention which have become part of the story-lines of EBP, but I include here because they are so widely referenced and so help to position the priest as a subject

within discourse. These two elements of doctrine are the ‘Triple T’ approach: targeting, testing and tracking of initiatives, and the Maryland scale of scientific methods. The latter positions evidence and knowledge for its ‘worth’ depending on the methodology of its production. This knowledge hierarchy has become institutionalised through the College of Policing (see Chapter 6), but is widely referenced within the texts and has become part of priestly doctrine. Seeking to develop a ‘matrix’ to guide practitioners in judging ‘evidence’, Lum, Koper and Telep (2011) write on building on Sherman’s hierarchy, thus;

“To map evaluations of police interventions into the Matrix, we used two criteria, one methodological and the other outcome-based. In terms of methodological requirements, we only included studies that were at least moderately scientifically rigorous— specifically, randomized controlled experiments or quasi-experiments using matched comparison groups or multivariate controls. To assess methodological rigor, we were guided by the Scientific Methods Scale (SMS) designed by Sherman et al. for the University of Maryland's “What Works” report (discussed earlier) and updated in Sherman et al. (2002).” (Lum, Koper and Telep, 2011, p.13)

This references not only the work of Sherman as the High Priest of purist EBP, but also the doctrine on which priests rely: quasi-scientific methods of knowledge production. It is implicit in this passage how this works to position academics, their research, supports the story-lines presented in the previous chapter. It simultaneously ‘others’ and excludes knowledge produced by researchers who fail to conform to the doctrine. Their studies are ‘legitimately’ excluded through the disciplinary techniques of EBP.

The ‘triple-T’ approach which Sherman proposes as an approach to embed and improve police science is again widely referenced and revered by the priests and their followers within the texts. It is equally mentioned within texts outside of the priests

and demonstrates how such matters have begun to shape the contributions of others to EBP through processes of discursive structuration, governmentality and 'techniques' of discipline. Without needing to find further examples within the texts, Huey et al (2017), writing on prospects for EBP in Canada write, *"To what extent do Canadian police professionals believe that their agencies are '**Targeting, Testing, and Tracking**' new policing strategies and programs?"*, (emphasis added) as an assessment of how compliant Canadian EBP is with Sherman's doctrinal work on triple-T. Indeed page 1 on the (2017) Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing reinforces the vitality of Sherman's triple-T approach and so the priestly doctrine; *"The Journal publishes important new findings and replications of research for **targeting, testing, and tracking** the use of police resources to make better decisions for better results."* (emphasis added, Sherman, 2017, p.1). The Journal is an example of discourse institutionalisation which I present in greater detail in the following chapter, but it also performs the important exclusory function by reinforcing the boundaries of the dogma as 'included' knowledge at the expense of 'other knowledge' which fails to comply with the priestly standards. This positions purists priests and others within discourse, supporting Hajer's discourse structuration theory.

The Gurus

I concur with Haines and Sutton (2000) and suggest the guru is largely absent as producers of knowledge within my data; *"the guru is, after all, only a teacher who transmits acquired, not revealed, knowledge, and this by virtue of a commission and not on his own authority"* (Weber, 1963, p.52). The gurus though are still identifiable

within the pantheon of academy 'teaching' knowledge produced by others; *"What primarily differentiates such figures (gurus) from the prophets is their lack of that vital emotional preaching which is distinctive of prophecy, regardless of whether this is disseminated by the spoken word, the pamphlet, or any other type of literary composition"* (Weber, 1963, p.53). The gurus are identifiable within knowledge production synthesising the work of others more than contributing original research. There are some example texts found in the data I have analysed which synthesises and summarises other studies. However, the degree to which this is observable in my data is limited and I suggest this is inevitable, given the way in which I selected texts for analysis.

The search terms seeking to retrieve meaningful texts on EBP have tended to bring forward texts reporting original research, authored by the magician or the priest. There are limited examples in my sampling therefore of 'pure synthesis'. Most texts in my sampling fell within one of the other two camps, written from a perspective which supports the priests doctrinal approach, or else offers the critique of this such that knowledges produced from wider methodological approaches should be included in the EBP movement; the magician. I have explored Foucault's work on the teacher, drawn from his later work on *parrhesiasts*, in order to develop this taxonomy further (see Foucault, 2011 for full discussion). From a reading of Foucault, the guru – or teacher / professor as he describes it - can be conceived as a non-research active, transmitter of other peoples acquired knowledge to juniors; it is a pupil / master relationship. While it is important to recognise this as a powerful subject position - as a 'benign truth teller' and a 'neutral' transmitter of 'facts' to students - it is not a position

involved in original research and the production of new knowledge. This position may operate to 'confirm' and validate knowledges as 'fact', and reproduce governance techniques in story-lines, subject positions and institutional reforms to wider audiences. The guru does not generate new knowledge. They are technically 'free' to convey any knowledge – not just priestly knowledge. However, discursive technologies of institutions and so on may discipline the knowledge they are 'free' to convey as only 'authorised truths'. Foucault's work aligns here, but I accept the limitation of this subject position's utility for analysis in my own work.

If we conceive of the Cambridge school 'priests' in their role as gurus when educating the laity via their taught programmes on EBP, the importance of this subject position is brought to life. Although 'free' to transmit all research, the technological disciplines of knowledge hierarchies, 'authorised' professional practices that influence course content and so on limits this freedom for the guru. Resultant presentation of 'priestly' quasi-scientific research as 'facts' to students without critical assessment of wider research is deeply troubling to those who believe in the important power of critical thought and education to change the world and improve the human condition. The power here comes from subject positions who have the right to 'authorise discourse', such as EBP academics who then transmit knowledge to others 'authorising' it as 'true', sustaining EBP as a 'truth regime'.

The Prophets

Haines and Sutton (2000) suggest,

“Inevitably, some become impatient with what they perceive as recycled wisdom and stale dogma. Through force of personality and charisma, such individuals lay claim to new revelation and unique insights. They become prophets” (Haines and Sutton, 2000, p.153).

The prophet I see reserved for those operating from structural or post-structural positions; revealing insights into phenomena, giving glimpses of what might be possible ‘from the edge’. I guess equally though it could apply to anyone proffering ‘new knowledge’. I am comfortable situating my own research in this final category. As Haines and Sutton point out however,

“Many of us, moreover, experience no difficulty in shifting between categories of priest and guru, prophet and (just occasionally) magician as strategic priorities, tactics and financial circumstances demand” (Haines and Sutton, 2000, p.154)

The revelatory aspects one might associate with the prophet is again absent from much of my textual sampling on EBP. As with the guru typology, this is perhaps no surprise given how I searched for texts. There is a gap in the EBP literature *per se* on research conducted ‘from the edge’, or offering a fresh perspective on what is at play in the progression of EBP as a political project. This is the precise gap my own research contributes to fill. Burnham et al (2004) point out that it is more difficult to analyse excluded discourses. The lack of identified ‘prophecy’ from my text sampling of EBP is potentially explainable in this way.

The discourses excluded from EBP therefore, such as research on social harm, or critical criminology on penal abolitionism, decarceration and decriminalisation, has not been brought forward by my textual sampling of EBP because it is excluded and speaks to a different discourse (see as examples Tombs, 2016; 2018; Hillyard, 2004;

Pemberton, 2015). This work feels like potentially the most revelatory – or prophetic – in contemporary criminological research, and can be shown through my sampling to be an excluded discourse by EBP, especially from policing policy. Although I am familiar with this literature and it is easily discoverable from a wider interrogation of literature on crime and policing, its absence in the discursive development of EBP was one of the inspirations for my own research. It is unsurprising that I cannot provide examples of its prophetic narrative from the texts I have analysed on EBP.

In summary therefore, on discourse structuration of the academy, I am content the ideal types proposed by Haines and Sutton remain valid, with the modifications I propose. As in all things discursive, the importance of this structuration lies in its disciplinary nature. The (re)production of subject positions within the academy can be understood as a governance technique of discourse, helping to shape how contributions are positioned and structured. This structuration ensures some things are included (see the examples above on magicians and priests), and supports the ‘legitimised’ exclusion of other perspectives (prophets). The absence of textual examples that would typify the guru or the prophet, is as important as the typologies I was able to provide examples of from within the analysed texts. ‘Other’ knowledge is simply not welcome within EBP discourse as it fails to ‘fit’ the EBP world view and distorts its coherence.

3. Subject Positions of Politicians

The independent, non-ideological, politician

A key feature of the ‘what works’ agenda in other policy spheres is the extent to which politicians can now present as rational, scientific beings, devoid of political favour or ideology. Evidence-based approaches allow politicians to present as ‘neutral’ when making policy; they can simply ‘follow the evidence’. What is more, policy based on scientific fact is almost ‘guaranteed’ to produce social improvement. This subject position does two important pieces of political work. First it depoliticises decision making. Second, it performs a function of absolution for actors. Within my text sampling I have found support for this view. Ellefsen’s piece comments on the Scandinavian experience of this phenomena,

“Producing new knowledge is one of the mentioned purposes in the Swedish and Norwegian governmental strategy documents on crime prevention evaluations. The idea of knowledge-based police work has been established as a superior principle in most Western countries and can be interpreted as a mark of a proliferation of a scientific rationality. The knowledge-based principle can be interpreted as a request for a professionalized police, in which respect it coincides with a broader social trend where politics, bureaucracy, and professions have been scientified.” (Ellefsen, 2011, p.121).

Sherman (2017) specifically references, *“Elected officials responsible for overseeing police agencies, and their staff”* (p.3), as a target audience in his editorial guidance of the new Cambridge Journal of Evidence-based Policing. The idea of producing knowledge in service of political leadership of policing, aimed at this utilitarian purpose, is important in explaining the development of EBP discourse. It significantly supports the subject position of the rational, non-ideological politician. Commenting on the development of EBP from a realist standpoint, Greene notes the coincidence of political objectives – value for money – with that which EBP research supports,

“This movement has gained momentum over the past several years, and its message has resonated with government agencies seeking “value for money” and funders seeking to know “what works.”” (Greene, 2014, p.193-4)

Writing on the ‘McDonaldisation’ of police-academic partnerships, Goode and Lumsden provide examples of discourse institutionalisation in describing a culture of ‘industrialised’ performativity, and support for the economic efficiency story-line I describe above. Importantly the following passage supports the discourse structuration of the non-ideological politician, focussing on the ‘evidence of what works’ to depoliticise resource allocations rather than more overtly politically-motivated rationales for decisions on policing resources during ‘austerity’;

“The ‘What Works Centre for Crime Reduction’ specifically focuses on: reviewing ‘research on practices and interventions to reduce crime’; labelling ‘the evidence on interventions in terms of quality, cost, impact, mechanism (why it works), context (where it works) and implementation issues’; and providing ‘Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs) and other crime reduction stakeholders with the knowledge, tools and guidance to help them target their resources more effectively’ (College of Policing 2015b).” (Goode and Lumsden, 2016, p.2).

The configuration of legislation in the UK prevents policing being ‘political’ in the overt and traditional sense of the term. The depoliticising quality of EBP is helpful therefore to actors needing to perform ‘political roles’ while being restricted from doing so in any ‘real’ sense. It is illegal for police officers to be members of trades unions, or withhold their labour through striking for example. Police officers in the UK are not ‘employees’, but are legally ‘crown servants’. Their interests are therefore ‘represented’ through various organisational bodies that lobby and make recommendations on their behalf, but lack any ultimate power. I have explored texts from these representative bodies in my EBP four core groups. It is noteworthy

reflecting on the policy paper of the Police Federation which represents officers up to the rank of Chief Inspector, that I find the non-ideological political position.

*“If an Evidence Informed approach to policy making were to be adopted this would provide a clear auditable trail for the policy formation process. It provides an organisation with **a knowledge-based approach to any decision making which would give representatives a level of confidence in the approach they take.**”* (emphasis added, PFEW, 2015, p.3)

We see in this passage an explanation of the *non-ideological politician* position. Where decisions and policy positions can be claimed be based on the ‘best available evidence’ then presentationally at least, they cease to become *political*. Given the precarious nature of the Police Federation’s political position, I identified further examples in the analysed texts referencing the ‘evidence’ which depoliticizes some of their lobbying;

*“There is an opportunity for police leaders to provide a credible, **evidence based argument** about why these additional resources are needed and where they would go.”* (PFEW, 2017a)

This example is taken from a commentary by the Chair of PFEW, on the chancellors autumn 2017 budget. The lobbying for additional resources is thus portrayed not as a political act, but based on independent, scientifically verified, evidence-based ‘facts’. This reinforces the notion of the discursive structuration I identify within EBP discourse of the *non-ideological politician*.

Actors making such decisions or pronouncements are increasingly portraying a reliance on ‘expert knowledge’, ‘science’, ‘the evidence’ which both emboldens political policy decision making by its depoliticising power, but also absolves them of responsibility for making political decisions, or being ‘blamed’ for doing so. This

absolution works according to this narrative; *'it wasn't my decision / my fault, I was simply following the robust expert scientific evidence'*. The discourse of EBP, and the discursive structuration identified in my research strongly supports this subject position. In texts analysed from more traditionally-defined 'policing politicians', elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), there is a notable identification of the *non-ideological politician* subject position, invoking the absolutionist qualities it possesses.

*"If you are BAME in London you are 2.5 times more likely to be stopped and searched than white people, rising to ten times more likely for vehicle stops. **Evidence suggests** that the quality of the interaction matters as much if not more than the volume of stops: if people perceive that they are less likely to receive a full explanation and less likely to report being treated with respect, than they are less likely to be satisfied."* (emphasis added, MOPAC, 2017, p.16)

This is taken from the Mayor of London's policing plan and covers the highly controversial – and deeply political – subject of the over-representation of young black men in figures on the execution of police stop and search powers. By shifting the conversation quickly to the 'evidence' on the quality of interactions between officers and those subject of this intrusive power it avoids the politicisation of the issue. This supports EBP discourse more generally, its simplifying story-lines, obfuscation of mess and complexity. 'Following the evidence' precludes the need for the politician to take up a position on this difficult and controversial issue, and potentially absolves the politician of any blameworthiness later for consequences which flow from policy. It was based on the 'best evidence', therefore not a political choice. The PCC plan for Greater Manchester contains a further example;

*"The plan has been produced after extensive consultation and has been informed by listening to people and partners from across Greater Manchester. It is informed by wider information gathering, **is evidence-based** and sets out what we want to deliver, how we are going to deliver, and how we - and*

importantly you - are going to know we have delivered.” (emphasis added, GMPCC, 2017, p.74)

This is included because it typifies the *non-ideological politician* subject position and proliferation of the EBP discourse. There is no explanation of what ‘evidence’ this is based upon, but this supports Hajer’s story-line concept well. Utterance of the ‘evidence-based’ words invokes all of the normalised ‘what works’ discourse and so lends power, legitimacy and credibility to the statement. In the same sentence above, the PCC is both inviting public scrutiny on their delivery of policing in Manchester while at the same time, noting its ‘evidence-based’ credentials which offer the ‘wriggle room’ for manoeuvre later on should things become difficult when that scrutiny is applied; *‘the plan is based on evidence, not my political decisions or priorities’*.

The *non-ideological politician* can also be identified in Norfolk’s PCC plan. In a section describing the PCC’s ambition to reduce the number of young people entering the criminal justice system – a political policy decision - I found an evidence-based and therefore apolitical comment about allocation of money for local programmes of work;

*“Support **evidence-based funding** for initiatives targeting young people at risk of reoffending (NC)”* (emphasis added, OPCCN, 2016, p.33)

This absolves the politician of responsibility, while simultaneously making them appear balanced and expert, rather than ideological. In a another section on tackling anti-social behaviour – a highly politicised debate - the Norfolk PCC commitment to evidence-based (and so, non-political) decisions is reinforced;

*“Develop initiatives where appropriate in conjunction with the **Evidence-Based Policing** and OPCCN Early Intervention Fund (NC)”* (emphasis added, OPCCN, 2016, p.32)

There are deep concerns about the application of anti-social behaviour policy in the UK, its attempt to police and control social behaviours and interactions, its potential to target marginalised groups at the behest of those with economic, political and social capital, and the obvious negative outcomes this may create for both individual actors and social cohesion (see Squires, 2008; Betts, 2011). Despite this, being able to use EBP to veneer political decision making is a convenient way of political leaders avoiding such controversial issues, or being held to account for those political decisions by the electorate. There are numerous examples in the texts I analysed for the *non-ideological politician* subject position. It is potentially noteworthy that where references are found in the PCC plans to 'the evidence-base' or EBP, they appear to be in statements absolving responsibility to 'the evidence' for the entire approach (as in the examples above), or else on topics which are likely to be political contentious either currently, or in the future (such as stop and search, allocation of increasingly scarce public money, or 'anti-social behaviour' policies, in the examples given above). If this insight held good with further research, there is potential to make more sense of the *non-ideological politician* as a political device linked to evidence-based approaches in other policy fields.

Summary

In addition to describing the power of 'argument' between discoursing actors to modify discourse and influence change, Hajer's work on discourse structuration acknowledges the discipline which is brought to bear on actors through discourse;

“even if they do try to challenge the dominant story-line, people are expected to position their contribution in terms of known categories” (Hajer, 1995, p.57).

This position is closer to Foucault’s earlier work on governance of actors and accords more closely to my own beliefs. The work presented in the previous chapter on story-lines and this one on subject positions start to identify governance techniques of EBP contained in the positioning of actors and taken together, the reflexivity between the two elements. For example, I found some ‘critical’ scholarship from academic ‘realists’ showing support for ‘argument’ within the texts. However all that I discovered sought modifications to EBP to incorporate their own positions, indicating limitations on the degree of agency and change – constrained by normalised discursive positions and story-lines. Examples presented from non-academic actors are oddly narrated through the established story-lines of EBP. These examples both empirically illustrate Hajer’s theoretical conception in the quote above – on the need for actors to situate their contributions within ‘known categories’. While supporting Hajer’s idea of actor agency in amending subject positions through ADA, my research also demonstrates the disciplinary properties of discourse in dominating actors through governance techniques such as EBP’s story-lines. My work suggests discourse reproduces itself through these disciplinary processes which operate to frame contributions and ‘other’ critique. In my view, this constraining effect potentially outweighs the facilitative effect that Hajer emphasises in his ‘communicative miracle’ of discourse. I conclude from my data that the wider degree of agency which Hajer ascribes in ADA is potentially overstated. Hajer might counter that I provide illustrative examples of modified story-lines through argument, and potentially this is accurate. My research shows for example a ‘softening’ over time of the categories of ‘included research’ away from the more puritanical methodological insinuations of some EBP advocates.

Importantly however, I submit there is no *significant change* in the *overall effects* of EBP discourse through any such argument mediation. The extent to which any modification is 'real' and produces substantial change remains highly questionable and in need of further research. From my perspective observable changes in EBP remain 'within' the dominant discourse. It can be advanced therefore that presentational 'changes' are simple artifice that operate to improve acceptability and broaden coalitions towards hegemony. The artifice argument adds acceptability through normalisation and sees Hajer's 'argument' where it is identified operating as a 'fig leaf' allowing discourse to sustain and reproduce itself. 'Argument' adds a veneer of possibility of change, presenting issues as 'open' when, in fact, the governing techniques of discourse ensure issues are foreclosed and genuine change may not be possible without more seismic epistemic shifts.

This understanding is closer to Foucault's early work which accords prominence to episteme in dominating actors through discourse. It is precisely this epistemic dominance, and the resultant lack of explanation of change that Hajer is attempting to correct and so my considerations here are tragically circular. How epistemic shifts are possible, given the disciplinary qualities of discourse needs further consideration. I concur with Hajer that this aspect of Foucault's theories are underdeveloped. At its heart EBP, however superficially modified through *argument*, remains disciplined by the broader discourses of neoliberalism and enlightenment science. While helping to extend the debate, unfortunately my work does not arrive at a conclusion on the degree of possible change derived through argumentative agency versus epistemic

rupturing. I am not fundamentally differing from Hajer, but it is the *degree* of possibility, or agency, which I think is unresolved in his ADA approach. I aim to explore this question more deeply in future research projects.

CHAPTER 6

Institutional Modification as Discourse Institutionalisation

Writing on the politics of environmental discourse, Maarten Hajer considers the,

“strengths of social constructionism and discourse analysis is not limited to the demystification of what previously appeared as rational. Social constructionism should not only be concerned with the opening of ‘black boxes’ but should also help to see how ‘reflexive’ institutional arrangements may be developed, and shall assess to what extent one can expect such institutional arrangements to overcome the fundamental contradictions that the ecological dilemma conceals.” (Hajer, 1995 p.7).

There is a shared understanding therefore between Hajer (1993; 1995) and Foucault (1963; 1964; 1975) on the importance of institutional arrangements within discourse. Foucault suggests we should be concerned with small inconspicuous practices which operate in a disciplinary way. By analysing such practice's, this chapter focusses on revealing those institutional practices that have developed to take account of and so reinforce EBP discourse. I show how systemic institutional arrangements work in the governance of actors through 'black boxing' under EBP (see Latour, 1999). Others describe the 'black box' phenomenon variously as the 'taken-for-granted' (Fairclough, 1995), or that which comes to appear 'normalised' and 'rational'; beyond any further contemplation.

Story-lines play an important role in providing motifs that come to represent a broader consensual understanding that disguise complexity 'black boxes'. Story-lines can be contemplated as providing a shorthand for complexity, providing actors the ability to *invoke* a broader set of understandings within discourse through utterance of key elements of narratives. Viewed in this way story-lines themselves can be considered exemplar 'black boxing'. Good examples are the way in which 'improvement' of

policing is an accepted rational story-line of EBP. It is considered as a 'good', an essential requirement of modern policing and therefore requires no further thought. The 'improvement' story-line functions as a black box in this way.

The taxonomic structure of this thesis which segments the analysis into convenient 'chunks' of work for ease of presentation - story-lines, subject positions, and institutional modification - I have acknowledged is, to an extent, flawed. This is because of the significant interconnectedness between taxonomic elements within discourse. Discursive elements must be considered not individually, but in their combination in producing truth effects and structuration of the world through their combined disciplinary effect governing actors and institutions. As well as describing the interconnectivity of institutional arrangements and story-lines therefore, I also need to consider the previous chapter on subject positionality and their discourse structuration effects. Hajer discusses this interconnectedness of analytical elements further; "*institutions are only powerful in so far as they are constituted as authorities vis a vis other actors through discourse*" Hajer, 1995, p.51). Hajer follows Foucault's historicisation, being interested in how institutions modify over time to become 'reflexive' to accommodate complexity. Complexities become concealed in processes of institutional reform that favour simplistic motifs which are (re)constituted as story-lines and subject positions. Hajer describes 'discourse institutionalisation' as the process of institutional modification occurring to take account of discourse which, in turn, begins to reinforce discourse through policy conduct. This political process is inextricably linked to *power*, with discourse institutionalisation being an output of interconnected power relations. Institutional reform has the output of both closing

down debate by fixing meanings, or else facilitating change. Returning to Foucault, examination of smaller details of institutional practice help the researcher reveal how we have arrived at the present state of affairs, demystifying rationality.

Hajer suggests discourse institutionalisation is observable when discourses become 'translated into institutional arrangements', and policy begins to be conducted within institutions according to theoretical concepts which exist within discourse. In common with Foucault, Hajer suggests we need to examine institutional practices that contribute to discursive formations. It is vital to remember that institutional analysis must be seen in the context of operating within the full effects of story-lines, subject positionality and discourse structuration. Hajer recognises the argumentative struggle for hegemony can only be properly understood in the context of institutional arrangements that exist.

This chapter presents my findings on identified institutional modifications within EBP discourse within this context. I argue these reforms can be interpreted as discourse institutionalisation: the conduct of policy according to the dominant discourse. It is noteworthy in the context of this thesis that overwhelmingly, the institutional modifications observable within the analysed texts are geared towards neo-liberal politico-economic outcomes. In many of the texts analysed, there are calls for institutional modification to promote or accommodate the development of EBP. It is unsurprising therefore that I have found so many examples of discourse institutionalisation that accommodate EBP. I present the data in four sections, reflecting identifiable institutional modifications interpreted from the analysed texts

covering academia; operational policing; political governance of policing; and special interest groups.

1. Academic Institutional Modification

This section illustrates with examples drawn from the analysed texts observable changes in academia that add to the institutional architecture sustaining EBP. As I summarised in Chapter 1, there is an extensive literature critical of universities normatively pursuing neo-liberal market goals (Hilyard et al 2004, Squires 2013). That literature is notable for highlighting the relevance of REF submissions (formerly RAE), student surveys, ‘contracted’ research, precarity of junior academic employment and generation of income, all of which have become synonymous with ways of demonstrating ‘success’ for the modern university in the market-led environment. Many of the examples of institutional modifications for universities and individual academics engaged in EBP presented here lend support to this observable trend noted elsewhere. I have already highlighted the dominance of neoliberal goals and values within EBPs story-lines: framing the ‘improvement of policing’ in economic-managerialist terms, for example. There is an observable burgeoning neo-liberal alliance developing around EBP.

New university courses

The generation of increased financial income through fee-paying students is important in the marketised higher education sector in the UK and globally. EBP, alongside the 'professionalisation' of policing, has seen the introduction of a requirement for entrants to policing by degree from 2017. This arrangement has been overseen by the College of Policing, so provides an example of institutional modification within policing to account for discourse. There has been a corresponding rapid expansion of universities stepping forward to offer these courses, for the appropriate tuition fee of course, to meet this artificially created 'free market demand' generated through EBP discourse. There are several examples in the texts of institutions modifying to accommodate such changes, including those institutions who have modified to become 'centres of excellence' on EBP; positioning themselves to exploit this market opportunity by offering advanced courses, masters programmes and PhDs. Such examples are obviously also highly relevant to institutional modification in policing, but are included here due to their economic relevance and more significant institutional reform of universities.

Before the requirement became institutionalised, Sherman when discussing the 'EBP implementation problem' story-line, offers educating and 'improving culture' of policing as a potential solution.

"A broader and deeper understanding of science throughout a police agency can begin with the scientific requirement for hypothesis testing. That challenge stands in sharp contrast to the legal advocacy culture of selective case building: evidence-based conclusions rather than conclusion based evidence. The idea of neutrality may be hard to absorb, even among people who support EBP. One local police leader of a randomized trial, for example, suppressed and rewrote a Cambridge report he had commissioned on the trial that showed mixed results—by excluding the negative evidence and only "highlighting the good contributions" of the program he tested with Cambridge assistance.

*Nothing could be more important than for the police culture to learn this lesson: in science, we must let chips fall where they may. The crucible for this value is reacting to research findings that contradict national policy or even law. Even if evidence is not altered or suppressed, the smothering paradigm of “national policy” may cause the evidence to be ignored. The best vaccine for this problem is to **educate the culture of a police agency to understand and appreciate science.**” (emphasis added Sherman, 2015, p.20)*

Clearly, there is much to gain for EBP academics and their institutions in the provision of courses, training and qualifications, such as the Police Executive Programme at the University of Cambridge. University status, incomes and reputation might all be enhanced by offering such programmes. Equally this modification has helped in accelerating the normalisation of EBP research as a legitimate ‘scientific’ discipline into institutional practice. A growth in students and their fees through the gates of a neoliberalised universities is an additional benefit flowing to universities implementing police research and education. The passage also (re)produces EBP subject positions on *battler cops* and *professional officers*. It also (re)produces EBP story-lines on medicalisation, ‘real’ scientific neutrality, and the development of EBP. I include it here due to the discourse institutionalisation it recommends and demonstrates. The call for greater education on EBP culture and its disciplines is a significant reputational and economic boon to academic institutions embracing EBP. This lack of independence and conflict of interest I believe means claims of neutrality of EBP, and the presentation of pursuance of the EBP agenda as a ‘public good’ can be seriously questioned by those who benefit economically and reputationally from this pursuit. How institutional modifications are governed – who will partake in academic-police partnerships and in what circumstances, which courses are offered, what is in the content of syllabus and who teaches them, which conferences are supported and

what types of knowledge is being transmitted, and what is published and where, are all questions that arise.

A 2015 paper about creating 'totally EBP' agencies discusses 'police education';

"Sending a selected "power few" (Sherman, 2007) leaders or analysts to complete a master's degree-level program each year, including a research thesis, at a leading university, who can then help to train others in the agency as well as to "train the trainers," and conduct their own research projects as examples... Retaining "embedded" PhD-level criminologists to review protocols and project reports, as well as to support education and training in EBP." (Sherman, 2015, p.21)

It is obvious that such 'leading universities' offering 'relevant' EBP research guidance, supervision and higher degrees, include Cambridge as Sherman's employer. The institutional amendment of entry into policing by degree-level qualification, including modules on EBP, which has been agreed through policing political and operational governance has led to proliferation of these 'vocational' degrees in 'policing profession', 'policing practice', 'criminal investigation' and so on, particularly in post-1992 universities. This has not come through strongly in my textual analysis, possibly because it is too recent to be reported, but there are several further references in other sampled texts to the longer-standing Cambridge programme. Commenting on the rise of EBP, the Superintendents Association annual conference organised a special input from one of its graduates;

*"With the increasing movement towards evidence-based policing and the growth of study and research about what works, the Association has put the topic on the agenda for its annual conference in September. Leading this discussion will be **Assistant Chief Constable Simon Megicks**, Hertfordshire Constabulary, who this summer has completed his Master of Studies in Applied Criminology and Police Management from Cambridge University. The course considers cutting-edge research methods and their results in policing,*

in particular the application of randomised controlled trials.” (emphasis original, PSA, 2016a)

In addition to providing an example of the development of university courses aligned to the EBP movement, the above passage also demonstrate the nature of the teaching in these programmes, specifically mentioning the import of RCTs. The article continues in a similar vein, highlighting things which are presented as important in progressing approaches to EBP, such as Sherman’s (2013) ‘triple-T’ approach to criminological experimentation in building an evidence base, showing the influence of ‘purist’ ideas on the development of EBP on policing actors;

***“We learnt to understand the methodology of the approach to building an evidence base,”** he says. **“This starts with *targeting* – what would have the biggest effect – and then *testing* to make sure we see the effect expected and then finally *tracking* any change.”** (emphasis added, PSA, 2016a)*

There is a generated financial incentive therefore for institutions pursuing EBP teaching through the provision of taught courses, and higher research degrees. It emerges from the texts, that it is a particular type of knowledge that is being taught and transmitted to students; and it is knowledge at the more ‘priestly’ end of the academic scale, doctrinal about evidence-based science, rather than more interpretive, critical, theoretical, or sociological forms of knowledge about crime and policing. This narrowing of the field of knowledge transfer through EBP discourse in police education is as troubling as the narrowing of the field of police research towards the techno-managerial. Such concerns are more acute when alternative knowledge is absented from the syllabus of such courses, and that which is included is presented as ‘fact’ and the ‘best’ or ‘only’ way of producing valuable and robust knowledge; the ‘truth’ about policing.

It appears that a likely output of the incorporation of EBP discourse into such institutional modification is increasing governance of actors and story-lines, ensuring (re)production of EBP. This is because these institutional arrangements within discourse contain the power to 'authorise' the discourse as 'true', especially through the advent of qualification to 'produce' knowledge (through research), or 'speak' the truth. These modifications help to support EBP as a 'truth regime' through the power-knowledge nexus. This is because of the power of dominant discourses to 'authorise' knowledge as 'true'. In turn, that knowledge can be used to sustain a dominant discourse as a 'truth regime' in a given period.

This troublesome insight is compounded when reflecting on the '*guru*' subject position of academics. Insights from Foucault (2011) on the '*teacher / professor*' from his later work on parrhesia positions the teacher as occupying a powerful subject position as the 'benign truth teller', neutrally transmitting articulated 'facts' to students, conceived in a pupil-master relationship. There is a strong likelihood the knowledge that is included and championed in university courses that are emerging under EBP discourse may begin to create the 'truth' about policing, its problems and knowledges, through processes of discursive reproduction such as those described here. EBP creates new knowledge, based on principles it determines for inclusion 'within' its discourse, stratified, codified and hierarchised, and then transmitted that knowledge as 'truth' via the powerful subject position of the '*guru*', as benign conveyor of fact. The circularity of discursive reproduction is complete.

The creation of new teaching provision in higher education to accommodate EBP discourse is therefore an example of the institutional modification of academia, and the discourse institutionalisation that is presently occurring produced through EBP discourse.

New publications

Another key area on which academics and their institutions are assessed for success is in the publication of original research. Traditionally, this has entailed submitting papers for publication in relevant journals, or producing books. However, this has failed to bring together evidence-based (prac)ademic research evidence in sufficient depth and pace for those who promote it. In the field of publication, the launch of the Cambridge Journal of Evidence-based Policing I suggest is an example of institutional changes in academia to account for EBP discourse, representing an uptick in EBPs institutionalisation. Sherman as principle editor notes the purpose and scope of the journal;

“The Cambridge Journal of Evidence-Based Policing publishes peer reviewed, scientifically rigorous original research, in clear and plain English, written by and for practitioners of evidence-based policing. Our primary aim is to promote evidence-based practices in policing.” (Sherman, 2017, p.1)

This passage speaks to the story-lines of assumed ‘policing improvement’ and the ‘rigorousness’ of science and evidence-based approaches. Importantly however, it also has been launched as a vehicle to promote the work of the ‘Cambridge school’ (prac)ademics. The Journal is a vehicle for pracademic Cambridge graduates to

produce papers from their masters' experiments co-authored with supervisors. The Journal helps to (re)produce the subject positions identified in the previous chapter. It is a good example of discourse institutionalisation, whereby academia has been reformed to (re)produce discursive alignment with EBP. In turn, this modification supports EBPs development and progression through new institutional practices. This passage is also interesting in that unlike many academic journals it is aimed at 'practitioners' of EBP, rather than a straightforwardly academic audience. It assumes EBP as its own unique discipline and notably blurs the distinction between the academic and the police officer into the 'pracademic'; both referencing and (re)producing this institutional change. The passage is also unambiguous in its 'primary aim': promoting EBP as a project. EBP is therefore enshrined here as a routine and normalised concept, taken for granted and clearly not subject to contest.

Although not part of my original research, Wright's (2000) content analysis of leading criminology journals notes the increasing reporting of 'state' research from 'administrative criminologies' and suggests a need for editors to promote publication of more critical scholarship. 'New' Journals of EBP can arguably be seen as extending this 'problem' to new levels. I suggest this is another clear example of institutional modification produced by EBP discourse, contributing to EBPs future reproduction as its explicit intention. The power of the texts that will be produced from this institutionalisation once again support the continued reproduction of EBP as a truth regime, drawing on the power of peer-reviewed scientific journals to 'authorise' truth through power- knowledge.

New EBP 'knowledge' partnerships

Police / academic partnerships are burgeoning within EBP discourse. Production of original research is another key measure of university success, and EBP is instrumental in supporting this through provision of 'access' to data. They can be conceptualised as an institutional modification in both academia and policing. Such arrangements appear to be being embraced with equal vigour within both academic and policing circles. I include them here (under the academic modification section) because the EBP academic researcher – the producer of 'useful' knowledge understood as 'evidence' – is the common denominator in both types of institutional arrangements.

"Bradley and Nixon (2009, p. 424) employed MacDonald's (1986) characterization as a framework in advancing their case for ending the 'dialogue of the deaf' – through contemporary research initiatives involving more 'intimate and continuous' collaborative partnerships between police and academics. Their submission has prompted a number of contributions, which build on the theme of increasing cooperation in policing research (e.g., see Cordner & White, 2010; Fleming, 2010, 2012; Fyfe & Wilson, 2012; Johnston & Shearing, 2009; Rojek, Martin, & Alpert, 2015; Steinheider, Wuestenwald, Boyatzis, & Kroutter, 2012; Wuestewald & Steinheider, 2010) and improved collaboration between police practitioners and academics is now a frequent topic of discussion in both communities (particularly in the context of the movement toward evidence-based practices in policing) and across the scholarly literature." (Brown, 2017, p.530)

This passage highlights and describes the development and breadth of police-academic partnerships as a 'frequent discussion' on ending the oft-quoted 'dialogue of the deaf', which refers to more traditionally distant police-academic relationships who maybe view one another's roles with some degree of scepticism. Brown references just some of the many commentators who make the case for 'better' or

‘closer’ collaborative institutional arrangements between police and academics through EBP. The idea of collaborative research arrangements also reinforces other elements presented in this thesis: discourse structuration of subjects, the police professional or the pracademic for example; or the story-lines on ‘policing improvement’.

“The literature on police–academic partnerships refer to inherent obstacles in bringing the ‘two worlds’ of research and practice together, and reflects an increased recognition on both sides of the benefits to be had from the co-production of research – reflecting a shift from conducting research on police, to conducting research with police.” (Goode and Lumsden, 2016, p.1)

This is typical of what is observable in the texts but also reinforces my own observations when considering discourse institutionalisation. I described in Chapter 1 the ‘neoliberal coalition’ emerging between academics and the police through EBP, and research partnerships are an example of this arrangement becoming institutionalised through modification. In the texts it is common to find examples calling for longer term police-academic ‘partnerships’. To operate successfully these partnerships need to negotiate and agree similarities on strategic goals; to ‘improve’ policing using scientific knowledge for example. Such partnerships are steeped in utility, reciprocity, mutuality, collaboration: data and access exchanged for ‘knowledge’. It is my contention that what is lost in these negotiated partnerships is the ability to *critique* – for one side to ask the difficult questions of the other. EBP rests on its ability to produce ‘robust’ and ‘objective’ scientific knowledge about policing to ‘improve’ it. This is potentially exacerbated in the deployment of pracademic experiments: police personnel conducting their own research on their own work, or work of their colleagues, in collaboration with ‘friendly’ academics. Such arrangements seem to determine research priorities and develop the questions to be

researched. It seems to me that the growth of institutional arrangements which bind researchers to the researched further endangers production of critical research as 'preferred suppliers' are negotiated better access and data.

The development of such arrangements across institutions already produces

g

o

v

e

r

n

The APCC / NPCC 'Policing Vision 2025' document, references to how academia is now assessed by those leading the service as a potential 'partner' for policing policy improvement, following EBP discourses.

c

e *"Improving data sharing and integration to establish joint technological solutions and enabling the transfer of learning between agencies and forces so we can work more effectively together to **embed evidence based practice, especially those determined by partners such as academia and the** College of Policing."* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.7)

Self-evidently this calls for greater use of academic, policing and political partnerships in developing evidence-based approaches to policy, (re)producing EBP discourse. It is difficult to conceive of classical socio-criminological studies on policing and crime which truly moved forward debate about the role of policing (such as those by Jock Young and Stan Cohen), with their sharply drawn critiques of policing practices, policies and broader theoretical insights would ever be considered as 'partners' by the political and operational leadership of policing. It is not said in this passage, but it

c

e

seems clear that in considering academic partnerships, the concept more likely pertains to those 'friendly' academics who 'evaluate' 'what works', rather than those who might ask difficult questions about agency or structural inequality presenting as difficulties or criticism for policing? The development of 'partnership' institutional arrangements seems likely to govern the future of police research therefore towards more agreeable 'evidence-based' managerialist concerns than those seeking access to explore more 'critical' questions.

Police-academic partnerships are burgeoning under EBP discursive conditions. They are likely to result in an increasing squeeze on critical and theoretically informed research into policing in favour of research which contributes to the 'evidence-based' approach to policing. In my view the discourse institutionalisation observable in these arrangements are reason enough for EBP to be resisted, given the important role for academia in scrutiny of policing. It is equally important for policing to avoid such arrangements in my view. Policing seems more likely to be improved by external academic scrutiny from theoretically informed critique to which policing must respond, than through developing, validating and commissioning 'echo-chamber' evaluative research that validates its own normative assumptions and practices through power-knowledge.

Yet such arrangements proliferate and institutional modifications are observable which encourage them (notably on research funding, described below). In the text sampling conducted for this research, institutional modifications developing partnerships were common. The work of Jonathan Houdmont (University of Nottingham) Mary Elliott-Davies (Police Federation of England and Wales) is an

example. They coproduced the '*2016 Police Officer Welfare, Demand, and Capacity Survey*' (PFEW, 2017) and published a paper on the inferential results. The study is an attempt to 'scientificate' a position that the police are overworked and under-resourced, and is a good example of policy-based evidence-making: the commissioning of 'independent' academic research, co-produced in partnership arrangements, which is done to support a policy position by a lobbyist organisation (PFEW). It is both an example of the police-academic knowledge partnerships which are produced by EBP discourse, but also of discourse institutionalisation. It suggests an understanding that to lobby effectively for a political policy position, organisations such as PFEW need to come to the negotiating table armed with 'the evidence'. Policy is therefore demonstrably beginning to be made and conducted institutionally according to the dominant EBP discourse in the way conceived by Hajer as discourse institutionalisation.

Research funding

In 2015 the College of Policing, Home Office and Higher Education Funding Council launched a £10 million 'Police Knowledge Fund' (PKF); a competition for research institutions to apply to the College to partner with policing organisations to conduct 'evidence-based' research. This control of funding is an excellent example of the 'micro-practices' of institutions that provide governing techniques through discourse.

Through setting rules on funding requiring collaborative bids, police-academic partnerships were engineered, promoting and reinforcing EBP's core ideas. The programme was overseen by the What Works Centre for Crime Reduction (WWCCR,

2015), a new institutional arrangement under the auspices of the College of Policing, itself a new arrangement dating from 2012. 14 police-academic partnerships were funded and a quick review of the partnerships that received funding finds a strong 'evidence-based' bias. 7 of the 14 projects contain references to 'evidence' in the titles. 6 of the projects were also to scope or establish 'centres' of police-academic evidence-based partnership. Successful bids included Sherman's work to "*promote tipping points of evidence-based policing, including development of an EBP international centre of excellence for post graduate police education and research*". I have presented comments above from a graduate of this programme about the type of education and research which is promoted (PSA, 2016a). Such arrangements no doubt build on the patronage policing affords to Cambridge's Police Executive Programme, of which Sherman and his partner are directors. Sherman also sits as an 'independent' member on the College's Board (CoP, 2019). Although this is available openly on the College website, oddly the weblink I reference contains 'DO NOT PUBLISH'. It is unclear why as it only links the Sherman's biography as a Board member. Irrespective, the control of funding in this way by the College further embeds EBP discourse into institutional arrangements. In respect of the Cambridge Institute, it is further tied to the state research and funding to which it owes its origins, albeit now through a market construction of competition for funding rather than more straightforward former Home Office patronage (see Walters, 2003 for a discussion).

Another PKF-funded project "*Policing Hate Crime: Modernizing the Craft, An Evidence-based Approach*", is indicative of the story-lines of EBP in terms of 'craft versus science' debates (Weir, WWCCR, 2015). The language used also

(re)produces the subject positions constructed for academics and police officers within EBP discourse, reinforcing the requirement to 'play' to these positions to develop successful funding proposals. I highlight Sherman's project due to his central position in the development of EBP discourse across a range of institutions and ideas, and Weir's due to its resonance with other elements. Both typify the 'type' of project that won support and funding under the PKF scheme.

No 'critical' projects feature, probably because of the way the applications were framed as requiring partnership with policing agencies and adding to the 'evidence-base'; 'governing' the outcome of the 'competition' through micro-practices. As an aside, I explored funding my own PhD research through PKF, but did not make application due to the criteria. Other critical scholars may have reached similar conclusions, demonstrating the squeezing out of independent critical scholarship from policing research through institutional governance modified through discourse. The institutionalisation of funding for research through this type of arrangement demonstrates both the institutional modifications produced by EBP discourse and EBPs reproduction through 'governing technologies', such as research support, data access and funding.

Another institutional change on funding worthy of note is the College of Policing's 'bursary scheme', to encourage staff into higher education. This seems a laudable idea, and 150 staff have benefited to the tune of £2000 a year since 2016; a c.£300,000 strategic investment from the College. Reading the texts about this

through a discursive lens however, what is conceived by this initiative or what its impact could be becomes clearer,

*“Rachel Tuffin, Director at the College of Policing, said: ‘We are delighted to announce the opening of our fourth bursary scheme which offers financial support for officers and staff who want **an opportunity to develop and contribute to evidence-based policing**’.”* (emphasis added, CoP, 2019a)

Interrogating the College webpages do not reveal details of bursary awards and I have not done a detailed analysis of the scheme, but I discovered signposted ‘research surgeries’ run by the College to discuss research ideas and collaborations; a peer support network; and the ‘Police and Crime Reduction Research Map’, which contains a detailed map of 242 ‘evidence-based’ research projects being conducted between police agencies and academics in the UK, often through centres funded under the PKF. Given the College’s mission to ‘professionalise policing’ and develop EBP it seems clear the type of activity and work that is envisaged by these new institutional modifications: EBP research. 26 of these projects are tagged as randomised control trials. That ‘RCT’ is singled out as a filter that can be applied to the research map, This signals the College’s normative biases on research ‘evidence’ (WWCCR, 2019). From my apriori knowledge about Cambridge’s Police Executive Programme and the work of the College, it seems to me that research and courses promoting EBP are likely to be supported under its bursary scheme, to the exclusion of other forms of knowing and learning.

A further example of institutional modification in the funding of students to undertake study and research promoting EBP was revealed in the texts. This is specifically referenced in the below example, trailing an input ACC Megicks provided to the

Superintendents Association Conference in 2016 on his experiences of the Cambridge Masters programme, with financial support for doing so;

“ACC Megicks was sponsored by the Association through the award of the Sir Anthony Bottoms Bursary to undertake the Masters while he was a Chief Superintendent and Chair of the Cambridgeshire Branch.” (PSA, 2016a)

This is an important example of the narrowing of scholarship and research towards progression of EBP. Sir Anthony Bottoms is a former Director of the Cambridge Institute. It is a further instance of discourse institutionalisation whereby policy (in this case award of supported scholarship and research funds) is conducted according to the prevailing dominant EBP discourse. I offer no comment on the possibility of attracting funding for courses or research which do not promote EBP, although it seems unlikely ‘state funding’ would be directed at critique? (see Walters, 2003, on techniques of neutralization). Exploring the criteria on those funding arrangements, and projects that win support might be revealing as a future research project.

The allocation of funding at the individual level through the bursary scheme, or the institutional level through PKF are both examples of discourse institutionalisation of EBP through the College of Policing, with its attendant disciplinary impacts on story-lines and subjects through governance techniques.

New Research Centres and Conferences

The funding changes facilitating the development of “policing research centres” around the UK through the PKF scheme are highlighted above. Their growth can be posited as ‘new institutional changes’ through EBP discourse. They are a by-product

of police-academic partnerships and the allocation of research funding through bodies such as the College of Policing. These centres roughly coincide with the emergence of EBP since the mid-2000s. I have completed an internet search for police research centres and most UK academic institutions lay claim to some form of flourishing policing centre or institute. The proliferation in “policing centres” are increasingly well placed to ‘partner’ with police agencies to meet the strategic goals of EBP: provide the education, qualifications and knowledge EBP ‘requires’ of policing. They allow institutions to take advantage of the improved market conditions in terms of research funding availability that EBP has produced. This proliferation provides an excellent example of institutional modification produced by EBP discourse. They reflect the market conditions (re)produced by EBP discourse, and the responses by those actors (individual and institutional) who are required to ‘perform’ in neoliberalised higher education and governmental spaces. While I could have included this section in either of the two above, I felt it worth highlighting specifically as an example of institutional modification tracing its lineage to EBP. The centres are also important not only as a product of EBP but as a way of sustaining the discourse through power-knowledge. The centres are modified institutions that (re)produce the knowledge that reciprocally sustain discursive positions in the way Foucault conceived.

Another key way for individual academics, departments, centres and institutes to showcase their success and share research is to host conferences. Alongside the institutional modifications noted above, since about 2010 there has been a growth in ‘EBP conferences’. This change can again be positioned as a tangible governing technology linked to the development of EBP discourse. A number of EBP centres

run their own conferences focused on showcasing their EBP research, and the texts contain references to these. To demonstrate, I cite the 2019 SEBP conference as an example (SEBP, 2019a). It was hosted by UCL jointly with SEBP and held at the Royal Society, invoking again the status of established scientific bodies with which to align EBP's work. A look at who presented papers and appeared on panels is revealing. The country's most senior police officers (including the Commissioner of the Met) were on a panel about the future role of EBP in policing. There were a number of sessions charting the progress and trajectory of EBP. A scattering of (prac)ademics presented papers on their research into a variety of 'what works' managerial-operational issues, which seems to be the main thrust of EBP research. Alex Murray (President of SEBP and Commander in the Met) and Sherman both gave addresses. There was also a session on the 'model hospital' and lessons for policing productivity, (re)producing neoliberal-managerial story-lines as well as symbolically aligning EBP's genealogy with medical science (SEBP, 2019a).

I have reviewed – and presented papers - at other conferences that have emerged within EBP discourse and they are similar affairs; bringing together EBP academics, police officers, policy officials, politicians and staff, and those with an interest in policing governance such as the College⁶. The SEBP 2019 Annual Conference is therefore used as an example, of that which typifies what is discoverable through discourse analysis. I suggest that the development of EBP research centres and

⁶ The annual Centre for Crime, Justice and Policing (CCJP) summer conference at the University of Birmingham is a further example where I appeared on a specially convened 'critical' panel in a side event to showcase the university's academic diversity in 2018. Of note CCJP is another post-2010 example of a research centre chasing the market opportunities presented through EBP discourse. CCJP has recently been successful in a PKF-funded evaluative research project bid.

conferences are further examples of institutional modification that (re)produce EBP discourse through their disciplinary effects of governance on actors, story-lines and institutions.

2. Institutional modification in Policing

College of Policing

Although it is heavily referenced in the above subsection due to its role in distribution of funding to academia and setting criteria and rules which govern EBP practices, the College is worthy of its own subsection. The very existence of the College is an example not only of a modified institution under EBP discourse, but also of the creation of a new entity that functions to (re)produce EBP discourse through governance. As I have presented above it has a very specific role in some of the governing technologies of discourse which have a disciplinary effect (access to funding, data, research support, knowledge hierarchies, education and so on). Particularly in its role to 'permit' actors to speak the 'truth': it 'authorises' truths about policing. For EBP, the College sits in the centre of the power-knowledge nexus institutionally speaking.

The College of Policing was created to 'professionalise policing' through an act of parliament in 2011, and instituted in 2012. It aspires to mirror the status of the medical 'royal colleges' in providing leadership on protocols, authorised professional practices, and national consistency in operational delivery based on 'what works'.

Crucially for the purposes of my research, the College is determined to achieve this based on the best available 'evidence'. Therefore, the College's establishment is both caused by and mutually supportive of the growth of EBP. The College of Policing is intrinsically linked to many of the story-lines identified in my research on policing improvement, the need to 'enlighten' policing, as well as some of the subject positions identified, such as the professional officer and battler cop. The below passage echoes the story-line of 'policing improvement', but also describes the developing role of the College of Policing in championing the application of EBP.

"Many police forces are beginning to facilitate requests for information brigaded under the College of Policing's continuous push for generating better knowledge to benefit policing." (Dawson and Stanko, 2016, p.67)

Without commenting specifically on what is wrong with the current knowledge, or what might constitute 'better knowledge', it seems clear that this is written within (or governed by?) EBPs discursive frameworks. It suggests an approach that grades and codifies knowledge into some type of scale of utility. The role of the College in delivering such an approach can be seen as an example of discourse institutionalisation; the conduct of policy according to EBP discourse. The perceived benefits of the College, their role in codifying knowledge and promoting EBP ideals is exemplified in an 2013 article by the then-president of the Superintendents Association who suggested;

"Whilst there should always be room for individual and bespoke solutions to local policing problems, it's a poor indictment that the spreading of good practice has, until now, been so piecemeal. Part of the College's responsibility will be to identify "what works" and then share that knowledge to all forces so they can implement it. These won't be just 'someone's good ideas' – they will be scientifically researched and evaluated methods as the service moves towards a more 'evidence based policing' approach. We should be sharing these ideas with pride and not clinging to some perceived advantage. Policing

should not be a competition – if we've got evidence that something works we should all be doing it, with local adaptation if necessary.” (PSA, 2013a)

Alongside (re)producing the story-lines of EBP – ‘what works’, ‘professionalisation’, ‘improvement’ based on ‘science’ – the passage additionally reflects the institutional modification of the College in (re)producing the discursive circumstances in which it has been constituted. The College’s role, it appears, is: to improve the quality, pace and spread EBP as *the* approach to policing, without considering whether this approach is beneficial; what alternative approaches to ‘the problem’ might be available; who defined ‘the problems’ of lack of professionalism, application of craft based knowledge, or inefficiency in the first place; or what the unintended consequences might be of following such a model. This reinforces my point that the College is an example of discourse institutionalisation within EBP discourse. For anyone who might be concerned by this insight, the article offers reassurance about the role of the College;

“The term ‘college’ does tend to conjure up images of academia and professors in stuffy libraries but this is misleading. The College of Policing is not simply about research and study. Professional bodies have existed in other organisations for years and we should not fear them. They have existed within the medical profession for more than a century. They allow experts from across a particular field to come together and agree on procedure and guidelines. The College of Policing will provide this opportunity for policing.” (PSA, 2013a)

It appears from this there is nothing to worry about from the creation of the College as such structures have supported ‘higher status’ professions for many years; particularly, medicine. As well as reinforcing the insight about the College as an example of discourse institutionalisation, there are obvious references to my thematic coding presented in the preceding two chapters on story-lines and subject positionality: the assumption of ‘improvement’; the need to ‘enlighten’ and

‘professionalise’ the ‘battler’; and the way this might be done, through the application of ‘robust’ and ‘scientifically produced knowledge’. A triumph of techno-science over craft-based approaches. A triumph of industrially efficient managerialist process over artisanal diversity. The Taylorist belief in ‘one best way’ to achieve economic efficiency, delivered to the stupid worker by their intellectual betters. All now underpinned by an institutional modification of the College to patrol and reinforce those boundaries through new governance technologies such as ‘authorised professional practice’.

Moving forward three years to 2016, the Superintendents Association created space at their annual conference for a recent graduate of the Cambridge Masters programme on EBP to present its virtues. The text introducing the piece is enlightening;

“The evidence-based approach is favoured by the College of Policing and the Home Office and has a growing body of research behind it, although it is still very early days in comparison to other professions.” (PSA, 2016a)

This quote illustrates the further institutional modification which now notes support for, and endorsement of, the College’s evidence-based approach from the Home Office, as HM Government’s principle agency responsible for UK policing policy. The passage also highlights that policing remains ‘lagging behind’ other ‘professions’ and so implies the need for delivery of EBP at greater pace and scale to ‘improve’ or ‘professionalise’ it. This rests on normative assumptions and operates as a story-line simple metaphor to disguise the complexity of these issues. There is no indication in my textual analysis of ‘the problem’ EBP is being advocated to solve. It is inadequately articulated or debated. The terms of the problematisation of professionalisation or

improvement is ill-defined. The passage does not specifically mention which 'professions' policing is lagging behind, although later in the article the medical profession is referenced once more as an exemplar approach to follow.

This passage is also noteworthy by its assertion of the growing body of research which supports an evidence-based approach. The statement ignores all of the social policy, sociology and criminology research that questions the application of evidence-based approaches to social policy issues. This is a brilliant example of circular reproduction of discourse identifiable in processes of discourse institutionalisation. The institutions have modified to take account of the discursive changes EBP necessitates and the same bodies are distributing funding and commissioning research – producing knowledge - based on the same discursive tropes. So research is commissioned based on problematisations and priorities viewed through the lens of EBP, its rules on method, and hierarchies of knowledge. It is unsurprising therefore that there is indeed a growing body of research which underpins the view that EBP is indeed 'the way forward' for policing. This circularity is exemplar power-knowledge in the way Foucault understood it and serves to validate EBPs position through governing technologies of discourse operating on actors and institutions.

The next example in this section is taken from the PCC Plan for West Midlands;

"I want West Midlands Police to continue to adopt best practices from elsewhere and engage with the College of Policing and academia."
(WMPCC, 2016, p.28)

This provides an illustration of the penetration of EBP discourse into the political leadership of policing. It references the modification inherent in the creation of the role

of the College as an example of discourse institutionalisation. It specifically references the join up between academics and policing institutions through EBP, in the pursuit of identification of ‘best practice’, and the role of the College in supporting such ventures. Again, it fails to question the evidence-based approach, pay any attention to the controversy that a wider view provides on evidence-based approaches. It accepts EBP as rational, normalised and unproblematic.

Analysed texts show the College of Policing’s ‘What Works Centre for Crime Reduction’ (WWCCR) has developed its own ‘evidence-selection’ hierarchies. I suggest this is a further illustration of discourse institutionalisation. From its content it appears to be influenced by academic influences of realist and purist EBP ‘experts’. The first table shows the WWCCR “Effect Rating” for scoring studies or interventions.









Effect rating	What it means
	Overall, evidence suggests an increase in crime
	Overall, evidence suggests an increase in crime (but some studies suggest a decrease)
	Overall, no evidence to suggest an impact on crime (but some studies suggest an increase)
	No evidence to suggest an impact on crime
	Overall, evidence suggests no impact on crime (but some studies suggest either an increase or a decrease)
	Overall, evidence suggests no impact on crime (but some studies suggest a decrease)
	Overall, evidence suggests a decrease in crime (but some studies suggest an increase)
	Overall, evidence suggests a decrease in crime

Table 3: WWCCR 2016, Effect Rating Scale (WWCCR, 2016a)






The table demonstrates the impact and outcomes the Centre are looking for from interventions. There is much to say about this in terms of methodological critique and reliance on 'counting crimes', but I include it here to highlight that the contested nature or ontological status of 'crime' is unconsidered or glossed over through EBP governance. Policy outcomes that are possible from citizen-policing interactions or initiatives but have a broader positive impact on health, human flourishing, social harm, economic, social or political inequalities are not considered by the College's scale of 'effective' policy initiatives, according to this taxonomy. This is despite the considerable literature which calls for stronger ontological debates about 'crime', 'policing' and 'justice' (see Pemberton, 2015, as an example). Pemberton (2015) demonstrates the nature of 'crime' remains a contestable concept. Using social harm theory, Pemberton argues 'naturalised' phenomena such as premature death, arguably caused by specific activities linked to capitalist production could and should be a broader concern for government, the police and other bodies than the behaviours currently designated as 'crime'. More 'traditional' thinking on 'crime' is the predominant focus of the College and WWCCR impact hierarchy, which is likely to reproduce status quo policy positions.

The outcome of 'less crime is good' is a predetermined *political* policy choice. The work of Pemberton and others suggest this is potentially an immature construct through which to assess quality of policing interventions. Even in more mainstream thinking on policing policy, *increased* reporting of some crimes is conceived as important. Increased reporting of hate crime, child sexual abuse, female genital mutilation, domestic abuse, slavery and human trafficking are seen as indicators of






trust that vulnerable or marginalised groups may have in policing. Great efforts have been made to *increase* instances of reporting to understand the ‘true picture’ of these ‘hidden crimes’. There is also considerable scepticism about the *actual* level of crime versus what is reported to the Police, and is therefore measured and counted in official crime statistics as against something like the British Crime Survey (BCS). Often statistical counts of crime vary significantly between official reporting and BCS reporting. This makes assessment on the quality of policing interventions based on ‘counting crime’ a highly questionable exercise with multifarious factors – including performance ‘gaming’ – likely to impact on any ‘effectiveness’ assessment.

The WWCCR second evaluation hierarchy is potentially more useful for this thesis as it demonstrates the influence of purist and realist academic ideas becoming institutionalised as policy reality. The College’s ‘EMMIE’ quality scale relates directly to the *quality* of research ‘evidence’ into policy interventions. It produces a ranking, scoring research ‘evidence’ for its utility to EBP.






Effect

	Text to reflect specific review
	Although the review was systematic, many forms of bias that could influence the study conclusions remain
	Although the review was systematic, some forms of bias that could influence the study conclusions remain
	The review was sufficiently systematic that many forms of bias that could influence the study conclusions can be ruled out
	The review was sufficiently systematic that most forms of bias that could influence the study conclusions can be ruled out






Mechanism

	No reference to theory - simple black box
	General statement of assumed theory
	Detailed description of theory - drawn from prior work
	Full description of the theory of change and testable predictions generated from it
	Full description of the theory of change and robust analysis of whether this is operating as expected




Moderator

	No reference to relevant contextual conditions that may be necessary
	Ad hoc description of possible relevant contextual conditions
	Tests of the effects of contextual conditions defined post hoc using variables that are at hand
	Theoretically grounded description of relevant contextual conditions
	Collection and analysis of relevant data relating to theoretically grounded moderators and contexts

Implementation

	No account of implementation or implementation challenges
	Ad hoc comments on implementation or implementation challenges
	Concerted efforts to document implementation or implementation challenges
	Evidence-based account of levels of implementation or implementation challenges
	Complete evidence-based account of implementation or implementation challenges and specification of what would be necessary for replication elsewhere

Economics

	No intervention related costs and / or no synthesis of costs
	Only direct or explicit costs (and/or benefits) estimated
	Direct or explicit and indirect and implicit costs (and/or benefits) estimated



	Marginal or total or opportunity costs (and/or benefits) estimated
	Marginal or total or opportunity costs (and/or benefits) by bearer (or recipient) estimated

Table 4: WWCCR Research Quality EMMIE Scale (WWCCR, 2016)

The ‘systematic’ approach – akin to natural science methodologies – is the preferred and ‘best evidence’ endorsed by the College of Policing. This further supports the representation of the College as an example of the discourse institutionalisation of EBP. There are also substantial references here to neoliberal themes of ‘*economy, efficiency and value for money*’ which I further explained in Chapter 4 as underpinning rationalities of EBP. The College inclusion of assessment of ‘theoretical’ grounding appears to be very biased towards positivist / medicalised scientific method of ‘what works’ looking at ‘theory of change’ from a given ‘intervention’, as against political or social theory. It feels an immature and one-sided basis on which to assess the nature of quality of ‘evidence’ on which to base policy.

There is a strong bias here towards the rationalities of logical positivism. The College of Policing has established the “What Works Centre for Crime Reduction” with the strap line “*Better Evidence for Better Policing*”. Although I included it here as an example of discourse institutionalisation, this hierarchy also appears to lean heavily on the language and story-lines of EBP in promoting ‘systematic reviews’ aimed at: “*more informed decisions; better value for money; reassurance and accountability; collaboration and partnership; prevention, not reaction*” (WWCCR, 2016). Their intention here is clear and unequivocal: it is to deepen, and spread the ‘evidence-base’ of policing research among practitioners and academics. Moreover, WWCCR is also seen to provide a quality assurance role, develop research strategies and

distribute funding in line with those strategic objectives. To this end, the College and the WWCCR can be portrayed as a kind of 'gatekeeper' of what's included and excluded in the 'evidence-base' through the deployment of governing apparatus to maintain the 'standards' of EBP research 'evidence'. These standards are maintained through governance techniques such as research project 'surgeries' with 'experts', and using 'evidence base-camps' to determine and influence research priorities. With no hint of irony, the College of Policing appear to have created a body to 'police' the standards of research evidence included in the EBP project.

The corollary effect of valorising this type of knowledge as higher status has a strong othering effect on the craft based traditions of policing. This is a theme addressed by Willis and Mastrofski (2016) through their reported interviews of US patrols officers. Written in the EBP realist tradition they argue that policing's craft-based knowledges are undervalued within EBP and should be brought into EBP consideration through scientification of craft knowledges through experiment and trial to understand how it might work as a science.

Policing in the UK for decades has relied on all entrants joining as probationary constables and conducting two years of front line street duties. During this period we are schooled in points of law alongside practical street skills on communication skills, conflict resolution, first aid, self-defence and personal safety training. While time is spent in the classroom, a far larger proportion of training is conducted in practical scenarios; very importantly, often on the street under the charge of more experienced 'tutor constables'. In my own three decades of policing experience it is here, on the

street, that the *arts and crafts* of policing are learnt. My first day in policing saw me making a tray full of tea at 0530hrs for an 0545hrs parade. By 0700hrs I was stood with a dead body of young woman who had tragically taken her own life in a hotel room. This was the first time I'd seen a dead person and I relied significantly on more senior colleagues not only for process, policy and procedure but for emotional support and dealing with my feelings about this. In subsequent weeks I confronted and came through extremely violent situations on a weekly basis, dealt with drunkenness, madness and trauma in equal parts. I learnt how to get the best information from people who were highly traumatised and distressed, how to respond best as a team to an incident that had just happened to secure the best evidence, the best chance of apprehending a suspect, how to interview suspects and get the best outcome possible for victims. I learnt how to deal with dangerous environments, stop cars safely on the highway that might be full of suspects and evidence when I was alone in the dead of night. I learnt how to patrol effectively based on intelligence briefings and 'knowing the patch', where suspects might disappear towards after committing offences, and where they dispose of property and so forth. And how all of this could be effected by the day, time of day, weather conditions and various other factors. I could go on. This approach produces highly skilled and knowledgeable effective police officers who by and large do a fantastic job for the public. Policing is a dirty job. Policing is an art, not a science. And it is a vocation, not a profession. Policing's craft is learnt over many, many years, in very challenging circumstances. The argument of EBP that this system of hand me down knowledge 'needs improving', 'professionalising' or codifying into worthy and unworthy knowledge for purposes of 'efficiency' through hierarchies is just not made out in the literature. The subjugation

of our craft to experimentation is something that should be challenged. The nuance of this is entirely lost in the EBP progression through its story-lines. The institutionalisation of EBP through governance techniques such as the EMIE scale based on simplified story-lines overlooks the complexity I present here. It assumes a lot and risks othering valuable craft knowledges.

The implications here for EBP are stark. If the outcome desired of WWCCR's taxonomies is progression of managerialist and neoliberal politico-economic goals, with limited or no consideration of broader aspects of policing, then deployment of particular 'experts' to inform what is included within its 'useful knowledge' may be a useful exercise. As noted by Beck (1992), *"It is not uncommon for political programmes to be decided in advance simply by the choice of what expert representatives are included"* (p.173). However, if the desire is improvement of the lives of citizens, then the institutionalisation of the EBP approach needs to be subject of greater contestation. The role of the College, and the modifications it has introduced is particularly important given its role in 'authorising' the 'truth' about policing. The College conducting policy according to EBP discourse can be seen as an example of discourse institutionalisation, according to Hajer's definition.

Evidence-based research driving policy

I was curious about the extent to which I could identify examples in the texts of EBP research actually improving or driving policy, in the way that is conceived by the EBPs

advocates. There are examples in the texts of this phenomena, but there is an equal degree of complaint about the lack of growth, barriers and blockages to the progress of EBP from its advocates; particularly given its foundational assumption as an 'obvious' way to 'improve' policing. I have provided some examples of this in the 'EBP implementation' story-line.

The APCC / NPCC 'Policing Vision 2025' document specifically references a future intent to conduct policy according to evidence-based standards, discourse and approaches:

*"Establishing a methodology and framework which helps practitioners across policing contribute towards **building knowledge and standards based on evidence**."* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.9).

This seems to allude to the type of institutionalisation I have presented above as observable in the WWCCR 'scales' as potential 'frameworks' for promoting the 'right type' of 'evidence'. This passage indicates not only to the progression of EBP per se, but also to the role practitioners might play in this progress. This contributes to the subject positioning of the 'pracademic' as an emergent position for the aspiring *professional officer*; as an active 'contributor' to producing EBP knowledge, as well as an implementer of the practice that emerges from applying EBP's insights.

*"The use of **evidence based practice** and the Code of Ethics will be embedded and inform day to day policing practice."* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.5)

This text sets out *how* policing is conceived as being delivered in the future: based on evidence. It speaks of 'embedding' EBP into everyday practices of policing, reflecting the discourse institutionalisation as policy and practice becomes conducted according

to dominant EBP discourse. The text continues to extol the virtues and benefits of EBP;

*“secure a **solid evidence base of ‘what works’**, addressing sources of demand, and developing and encouraging uptake of existing and emerging technologies.”* (emphasis added, APCC / NPCC, 2015, p.10)

It is clear that what is proposed here is the promotion and incorporation of EBP in driving future policy and practice concerning identification of opportunity, need and encouraging use of new technologies. Again, an example of evidence driving policy but also of discourse institutionalisation, with both APCC and NPCC conducting their policy and using language according to EBP story-lines, subject positions and institutional changes.

Returning to the budget comments from the Chair of the PFEW, there is a further example of the ‘evidence’ driving policy;

“There is an opportunity for police leaders to provide a credible, evidence based argument about why these additional resources are needed and where they would go.” (PFEW, 2017d)

In this case, it is a suggestion about following the ‘evidence’ to determine allocation of resources. This is a further instance of institutional modification, with PFEW lobbying within the discursive frameworks of EBP for a fairer slice of the resourcing cake. It is therefore, more support for the view of interpreting what is observable here as discourse institutionalisation, (re)produced by the governance techniques of story-lines and subject positions.

I also found examples of 'EBP driving policy', and so discourse institutionalisation, in the analysed texts of political leaders pertaining to policing. In a section taken from the Norfolk Police and Crime Plan on delivering a 'modern and innovative service';

*"Through the **evidence-based policing** and OPCCN early intervention funds, support bids which exploit technical solutions to reduce crime and support victims (NC)" (emphasis added, OPCCN, 2016, p.37)*

Here is a direct reference not only to EBP, but importantly to how this knowledge will relate to the implementation of policy regarding victim support, crime reduction linked to deployment of technology, and allocation of resources. It provides another illustration of discourse institutionalisation (re) produced through discursive techniques of language and subject position governing actors.

3. Institutional modifications in political governance of policing

Evidence-based 'requirements'

Linked to neoliberalism and the depoliticisation of UK politics noted in Chapter 1, there is an increasing trend of political decision makers 'requiring' to see the 'evidence' of success of any proposed changes, before committing resources to their implementation. My lived experience suggests this approach retards and restricts the development of innovative policy, and particularly changes which do not conform to EBP story-lines grounded in managerialism and neoliberalism. In this political climate, it is difficult to conceive of agreement reached to invest resources without 'following the evidence' of 'what works' being provided to decision makers. Equally relevant, is the increasing requirement for 'robust evaluation' of policy initiatives and projects. This has spawned an entire 'policy industry' within academia and private sector think tanks, of professional evaluators using evidence-based approaches (Tchilingirian,

2018). It is widely noted that evaluative research is heavily governed by evidence-based discourses (Walters, 2003; Dayem et al, 2014). EBP rationalities require policy makers and decision makers to have proof or ‘evidence’ that their decisions are ‘improving policing’, and this ‘improvement’ usually seeks evaluation criteria which demonstrate more ‘efficient and effective’ use of ‘resources’, or otherwise demonstrable ‘value for money’.

There are several references to the rhetoric of setting ‘evidence-based requirements’ for change in EBP texts, many of which I have already included. The ‘evidence-based’ requirement is illustrated in the below passage taken from the Mayor of London’s police and crime plan provides a typical example;

“Measuring the things that matter. We will oversee the performance of the MPS by using a new, evidence-based performance framework. In the past, MPS performance has been assessed through basic, city-wide targets (to reduce burglary by 20 per cent, for example). While this is a simple way to set out and measure progress towards an ambition, this approach has significant drawbacks.” (MOPAC, 2017, p.131)

This articulates the requirement now imposed by those who hold policing to account politically, to ensure that account-holding is ‘evidence-based’. It provides an illustration of both the ‘evidence-based requirement’ I identify as a theme in the story-lines of EBP, but also discourse institutionalisation of political institutions of policing (PCCs and Mayors) beginning to conduct policy according to burgeoning EBP discourse. The passage alludes to the ‘old ways’ of measuring success juxtaposed to the ‘new and improved’ ‘evidence-based’ way of now judging success, narrating the story-lines of EBP as somehow ‘better’ and guaranteeing ‘improvement’.

This next point requires further research and is more of a personal reflection of three decades in public service. It is my contention that to be an effective operator within the EBP discursive political landscape, and initiate positive change, you must increasingly do so *within* the terms of EBP discourse. I have already presented examples in this chapter from organisations representing interests within policing, pitching their lobby requests in ‘evidence-based’ parlance; whether that is the PFEW on welfare, morale, or resources, or the Superintendents Association calls for future decisions on funding to be ‘evidence-based’. These are examples of disciplinary techniques of discourse operating on subjects through governmentality, and illustrates the power of discourse to shape our world. For example, if you wish to improve lives of individuals through changing policy in a way which may be considered ‘radical’ (such as decriminalisation of vulnerable groups), this can only really be achieved if you can demonstrate through experiment, pilot and evaluation, that the policy might be more ‘cost-effective’ in economic terms. The social value or moral imperative for policy change will rarely be enough to persuade policy-makers to invest. Another possible way of affecting change might be to find ‘evidence’ from more enlightened jurisdictions who have tried a similar approach and transposing policy ‘evidence’, albeit only if the ‘economic efficiency’ of such an effort can be ‘evidenced’ (e.g. legalising drug use from the Swiss experience, or decriminalising prostitution from the Dutch model). Such ‘evidence’ might then be used to present and broker change. Change is increasingly permissible only *within* the constructed and normalised rationalities of EBP discourse.

4. Societies’ of Evidence-Based Policing (SEBP)

Such societies' are a relatively recent invention, but they are widely referenced in the texts. They are informal collaborations of academics, police officers, pracademics, and others interested in promoting EBP. They are governed by committee, have a membership, organise conferences (see above on new academic conferences), share research 'evidence', publish newsletters and undertake activities to progress EBP's core ideas. SEBP's progression has been important in increasing awareness of EBP, and represents an important institutional modification as another 'new' institution which can be viewed as a (re) production of EBP discourse. Although SEBP sit outside of formal institutions and I describe them as 'sub-political', I include SEBP within this chapter as they are acquiring institutional status in my view. They behave institutionally, taking on the structures and rationalities of more formal institutions. SEBP occupy an important sub-political space in the operation of 'new politics' of EBP, and so are worthy of the scrutiny critical scholarship brings on this basis.

I have predominantly utilised the SEBP webpages in my textual analysis in this section, although SEBP are referenced in other texts. Most notably by academics promoting the work of SEBP. SEBP webpages state their intention is to;

"The Society of Evidence Based Policing is made up of police officers, police staff, and research professionals who want to improve policing from within by using the best research evidence." (SEBP, 2019b)

This mission statement contains several of normative assumptions, which hide the complexities and tensions about EBP revealed in this thesis by use of EBP story-lines. First, it uses the 'policing improvement' story-line as an assumed problematised issue, without further consideration of the complexities this presents. It accepts and

therefore supports the normative assumption that policing 'requires improving'. By simply using this statement it operates politically as a metaphor, invoking a whole other set of story-lines and narratives based on neoliberal managerialism, ensuring it finds 'official' support.

Second, SEBP is a transparent 'coming together' in coalition between policing 'insider' (officers and staff), and 'outsider' subject positions (research professionals and policy makers). SEBP represents an open call to build a coalition around EBP from bedfellows that may be better separated. This is patently my view, preferring to conduct research 'from the edge'. However the scientific standards which EBP relies upon for its internal coherence - of robustness, objectiveness and independence - seem potentially compromised by statements calling research professionals into an institution like SEBP operating "*within policing*". The impact of doing so potentially generates a policing research agenda unduly influenced by the objects of the research. This is unlikely to produce or consider critical research which might progress or 'improve' policing 'from the edge'. For the academic the windfalls from supporting SEBP are clear: access to data from 'friendly' networked 'professional officers', potentially enhancing market position of their university employers.

The use of the term '*research professionals*', rather than academic, is also interesting in the above text. It indicates the close relationships SEBP hold with 'other' research institutions such as the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), the Behavioural Insights Team (BIT) otherwise known as the 'Nudge Unit' under PM David Cameron's Cabinet Office. At the time of writing BIT is described as a 'social purpose company'

owned by the Cabinet Office, its employees and NESTA. NESTA describes itself as an 'innovation foundation' funded by endowment. These groups, producing 'independent research' are very closely aligned or embedded with powerful political institutional actors in the British establishment. This is necessary for their survival through attracting funding, patronage and access to research data to 'evaluate'. It correspondingly creates doubt about their 'independence' in my view. There is a fundamental problem when research knowledge outputs about those who are being researched are linked to those footing the bill (see Dayem et al, 2014).

Third, the use of the word "*within*" in the text seems very important too. It alludes not only to the ability of SEBP to *influence* access to data, but also to influence *policy*. This highlights the powerful subject position of SEBP, and those involved within it. SEBP is suggestive of an institutional arrangement which, according to Beck's (1992) definition, can be described as '*sub-political*'. SEBP hints at its political power as 'within' institutional frameworks, affiliated with policing agencies, the College, staff associations and other bodies. The created perception of *policy impact* is another powerful draw for the research academic.

Finally, the use of the phrase "*best research evidence*" underscores much about the project. The phrase invokes all of the story-lines about 'real science', knowledge hierarchies, the 'nature of evidence' and 'medicalisation'. The statement at once also excludes other 'types' of knowledge. SEBP favours a 'facts-based' approach to its 'evidence'. Although a broad EBP church, SEBP is influenced significantly by purist ideas that elevate positivist scientific knowledge over other forms of knowing. This

has a powerful disciplinary effect through governing rationalities. SEBP can be posited as doing political work in aligning the discourses of the powerful – managerialism, enlightenment science, and neoliberalism – with ‘improvement’ based on ‘evidence’. This alignment ensures SEBP attracts attention and support from powerful institutional and individual actors, such as those appearing at its conference described above.

SEBP texts reveal the influence of many of the individual actors who have been at the forefront of promoting EBP. Exploring the SEBP webpages, its Chair Alexander Murray is a Police Commander and graduate of the Police Executive Programme at Cambridge. Murray received an OBE in 2017 for promoting EBP, and remains research active publishing with Sherman amongst others (Sherman and Murray, 2015). It is difficult to determine an exact year of establishment of SEBP, but it seems to emerge in about 2010 from a combination of Cambridge Police Executive Programme graduates and academics. Of note, Sherman was elected Honorary President of SEBP in 2010. The SEBP Vice Chair is a police officer holding a visiting scholarship at Cambridge. SEBP has grown to include other academics, such as Dr Emma Williams who is Director of the Canterbury Centre of Police Research⁷. Williams appears to be an evaluative ‘evidence-based’ researcher and can be considered a policing EBP ‘insider’ in so far as her biography states she is a former

⁷ *Canterbury Centre of Police Research is a further example of a ‘new’ policing research centre, established in 2016. It aims to conduct research of strategic importance to policing; increase research funding flows; increase post graduate police research; and translate research findings for practitioners. Its core themes are: police professionalism; criminal investigation; cyber crime; and vulnerability and risk. See <https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/science-engineering-and-social-sciences/law-policing-and-social-sciences/canterbury-centre-for-police-research/about-us.aspx>*

researcher with the Metropolitan Police and Ministry of Justice. Williams is currently operating as the SEBP south east organiser (SEBP, 2019).

The SEBP website contains links to sister SEBP organisations in the US, Canada, Australian and New Zealand. SEBPs webpages also signpost EBP resources. These resources indicate where SEBP is positioned – at the heart of EBP discourse. There are links to free online journals such as the Aus and NZ SEBP Journal, and the Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing (established in 2016 and 2017 respectively). There are links to several knowledge hierarchies – all of which favour positivist experimental method – such as the WWCCR / College of Policing quality scales presented above, and George Mason University’s Centre for Evidence-Based Crime Policy “Evidence Based Policing Matrix”, which is co-directed by Cynthia Lum and David Weisbird. SEBP also signposts the Global Policing Database which is described as *“a web-based and searchable database designed to capture all published and unpublished experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations of policing interventions conducted since 1950”*. It contains links to articles useful for the EBP researcher, *“How to be an evidence based practitioner”*, and a link to the Cambridge *“Randomizer”* tool to support the spread and development of RCTs (SEBP, 2019c).

SEBP (2019c) also contains a link to the Campbell Collaboration. This Collaboration assesses research ‘evidence’ by its utility for answering pre-determined policy questions and problems. The stated aim of the group is;

“produce systematic reviews on the effects of interventions to inform criminal justice policies, with the ultimate aim of reducing crime and increasing justice

in society. The CCJG prepares systematic reviews on the effects of interventions aimed at prevention, treatment or control of crime and delinquency” (Campbell Collaboration, 2016).

I include this here to illustrate another example of policy elite / academic crossovers and the sub-political elements of what SEBP and aligned groups bring to the EBP project. Peter Neyroud CBE QPM is the Co-Chair of the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group Steering Committee, but also former Chief Constable and ‘Resident Scholar’ at the Jerry Lee Centre for Experimental Criminology, Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge. A Centre and Institute which Sherman leads and delivers the Police Executive Programme. While serving as a Chief Constable Neyroud oversaw the migration from the National Policing Improvement Agency towards the establishment of the College of Policing. As an important aside, although not the focus of this Chapter, the aim of the Campbell Collaboration’s ‘systematic application of evidence’ is to ‘delinquency’ and ‘reducing crime and increasing justice’. There is seemingly no consideration of literature covering ontological debates on ‘delinquency’, crimes of the state, crimes of the powerful, or ontological concerns about the status of ‘crime’, ‘justice’ and ‘deviant behaviour’ in contemporary western neo-liberal states. The text also illustrates legitimating techniques, borrowing from evidence-based medicine the language of ‘prevention, *treatment* and control’. Another key theme – medicalisation - I identify in EBP’s story-lines.

This summary of SEBP-signposted resources therefore indicates how it links to other powerful individual and institutional actors, through a network of power relations reproducing EBP discourse. They show the influence of key purist scholars and the spread and influence of their ideas into police officers and policy makers through the

development of EBP. I suggest no conspiracy or culpability here on the part of any individual actors named, but what is revealing is they have been able to promote their conservative ideas and gain wider influence because of their alignment to statist tropes and strategic objectives. EBP builds on the history of statist criminologies, embedded in positivism and causation, and in the UK linked historically between the Home Office and University of Cambridge from WWII (Walters, 2003). SEBPs links to the establishment suggest EBP is arguably therefore not about improvement by scientific fact, but instead is blindly complicit in the reproduction of neoliberal managerialist discourses through governance techniques demonstrated as discourse institutionalisation. Thus I suggest SEBP is an important site in the reproduction of EBP discourse

Summary

The passage from Hajer at the start of this chapter contains a suggestion which contains a point of divergence from my research. Hajer advocates the discourse analyst should consider how 'reflexive arrangements' for institutions that might be usefully developed? Hajer's (1995) text on environmental discourse incorporates a concluding chapter containing recommendations for "reflexive discursive laws" to enforce debate. Hajer recommends we should explore institutional arrangements that might be developed to ensure complexity can be dealt with and acknowledged in policy development. Hajer argues we need to move beyond merely presenting discourse as it appears to reveal contingencies and instead, present alternatives to

policy processes that overcome some of the problems our analysis illuminates. I do not believe this is a desirable role for the discourse analyst, preferring to conduct research 'from the edge' as Foucault suggested; offering insights. I also wonder whether it is possible at all when considering the potential for researchers to 'escape' discursive entrapments in making such recommendations.

Hajer's suggestion I consider how I might 'fix' the problems with EBP that my research identifies shares commonalities with the critique of 'realist' researchers I have offered throughout this thesis. Realists routinely highlight problems with EBP only to then suggest modifications to improve EBP's weaknesses, often to include their own perspective. Where successful, I believe this leads to 'less worse' versions of EBP. I do not believe that this is a sensible outcome for which to aim or a helpful contribution. I therefore hold a similar view about Hajer's suggestion for discourse analysts development of reflexive arrangements. Trying to 'fix' a problematic set of institutional arrangements (re)produced through discourse seems a futile exercise. What is likely to emerge from such an exercise is a negotiated modification that extends the problems identified, further empowered as 'newly reflexive'. The desire of realist researchers (and potentially Hajer) in seeking to accommodate critique by suggesting 'useful' amendments is potentially explicable by the governing technologies surrounding the 'utility of knowledge'; the market-led requirements of university research to be 'valuable' or 'useful'. The neoliberal discourse governs contributions of scholars within its traditions and values.

I do concede there could be potential benefits in making the problems my research identifies less acute. Nevertheless I remain convinced the principle role of discourse analysts is to present issues through the revelatory potential of our methods and allow this research to *speak for itself*. In my view it is not the discourse analysts role to attempt to 'put right' or 'to fix', in the *applied* or *utilitarian* tradition, the problems we highlight. Whilst I know within our neoliberal episteme it may hinder progress of my policing and academic career, I leave this futile task to others as they mediate and negotiate the development of EBP. Rather than engage in this renegotiation, and so in my view become part of the problem, I would prefer to retain my ability to produce analysis independently *from the edge*, without an intent to make it 'useful' for policy makers. This thesis is concerned with the narrowing of perspectives that seem to inevitably flow from the commodification of knowledge in this way, producing 'understanding' only for its utility as market potential (Hilyard et al, 2004). There should be an equal space reserved in the academy for knowledge that is produced to be critical, speaks truth to power, pushes at the intellectual boundaries of what is possible outside of current systems and thinking. It is this 'deviant knowledge' that the utilitarian commodification of knowledge production is shrinking through EBP, and so I urge resistance to this (Walters, 2003).

This chapter demonstrates institutional modifications are solidified as an important third element to my approach. They serve to 'authorise' certain actors to use EBPs knowledge and story-lines, and act in an excluding way for others. I anticipate these same process may be used to exclude my own research from considerations on EBP. I recognise I am in a very fortunate position at this stage of my life and career to have

the freedom to write and research without being quite as disciplined by market considerations on issues such as 'impact' as other colleagues. My research has not been produced using methodological standards considered 'robust' or 'scientific' enough by the Society of Evidence-based Policing, or those within it, and lacks the institutional patronage of the College of Policing. I lack the 'authorisation' to speak the 'truth' about policing. Therefore it can easily be excluded from presentation at conferences or publication in EBP journals and so on by these governance techniques. Failure to follow such institutional practices makes exclusion of other perspectives a routinised discursive practice.

It may also be desirable to find a way of 'othering' my research for those 'within' EBP discourse, given it raises issues of 'messiness' and uncomfortable insights on shared genealogy with neoliberal projects that cannot be easily modified or absorbed 'into' EBP discourse. This is not a deliberate act on the part of individual actors or institutions, it is simply an effect of discourse. The critical point of this however, is that far from being an independent, benign and objective project of 'improvement' based on 'scientific facts', the effects of discourse institutionalisation ensure EBP has political consequences. EBP can therefore be re-positioned as doing political work in furtherance of neoliberal outcomes. The EBP project presentationally appears as one thing, but is potentially demonstrable as something entirely different.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

This project did not set out to ‘test’ whether EBP is accurate in its methodological work, adds value to the legitimacy of policing, policing’s operational ‘effectiveness’, or Sherman’s claim about EBP’s ability to promote human flourishing as the invention of the printing press did. EBP came to me as an issue of ‘current concern’ in my dual subject positions in both policing and academia. I was uncomfortable with the language, story-lines, subject positions and institutional modifications that are becoming normalised around me in policing, academia, and related spaces through EBP discourse. My research set out to explore *why* EBP has come to be seen as an authority on the ‘truth’ about policing in contemporary discourse, what power relations contributed to this, and what the impact might be. I set out to offer a perspective so make no claim that my research offers any ‘truths’ about EBP; I humbly offer insights. However, I do reject the hierarchical structuring of ‘knowledge value’ that EBP discourse promotes. I believe my research is as valid as any other in what it allows to be said about EBP, judged on its own terms.

I set out seven points of concern in my research rationale in Chapter 1. This Chapter first revisits those points and adds comment on what my empirical work illuminates about EBP. I then set out what this research contributes theoretically and methodologically, and what remains to be done in the field.

First, the ‘truth claims’ upon which EBP is founded were an area for inquiry; both in terms of claims about its own work and the political impact this has when linked to

policy through power-knowledge. It is far stronger narratively and politically to support policy with scientific 'facts' and 'evidence' than mere opinion, given the status of science in contemporary discourses. Such foundational beliefs are contestable and yet my work demonstrates they are writ large into EBP discourse. I have presented EBP story-lines of 'real science', 'knowledge hierarchies', 'medicalisation', 'RCT and experimentation', and 'what works', all of which rely on foundational positivist-science truth claims. My analysis shows these story-lines influencing subject positions that structure actors and their contributions. Policing into 'battlers' and 'professionals', based on their position relative to EBP. 'Magical' academics who trade in the market place on such claims; 'priests' have created EBP doctrine and ritual practices; and the use of these powerful story-lines by non-ideological politicians who simply 'follow the evidence'. My analysis also highlights several examples of governing technologies being modified 'into' institutional practices, reinforcing EBP's discursive 'truths', and operationalising the 'authorisation' of them as 'true' through institutional power. These modifications are exemplified by the development of police-academic knowledge partnerships, the growth of 'policing' research centres, the internalisation of EBP discourse into policing, the creation of the College of Policing, and the creation of 'new' institutions such as SEBP internationally. All of this indicates the self-sustaining power of EBP, reproducing itself through discourse.

EBPs progression rests on the foundational belief in the truth claims of producing and applying 'the evidence', and the power this has in 'authorising' truth. EBP has become a 'natural' evolution of scientific progress, in congruence with other 'progressive' developments science has given us. My analysis suggests EBP can be re-presented

as a political project. A project that (re)produces wider neoliberal-managerialist discourses through governmental technologies disciplining actors. The foundation of EBP's normative positioning as a progressive techno-scientific discipline based on 'fact' or 'evidence' – higher classified knowledge - adds to EBP's discursive power as a reproductive political force.

Second, this research was concerned about the lack of critical thought or challenge for policing arising from the continued growth of EBP. Following Hajer's theory, my analysis identifies *discourse structuration* through EBP; actors adopt subject positions within EBP discourse. Additionally, examples of *discourse institutionalisation* are identified – institutions continually modifying to conduct policy according to EBP discourse. Decisions and policy are increasingly required to be 'evidence-based'. Operationally, textual examples of the 'implementation' story-line highlight complaints from those who promote EBP that the craft-based heritage remains strong, but the same texts sound optimistic tones as EBP science 'catches up' and might impact further into operational decision making. Hajer's work suggests that where *discursive structuration* alongside *discursive institutionalisation* exist, this indicates *discursive hegemony*. I argue that EBP disciplines actors and institutions seeking to enter the police research field through its governance technologies such as access to funding, data, and the development of knowledge hierarchies. Such technologies create an 'othering' of critique. To this extent, EBP can be seen as hegemonic, and further securing its hegemony through discursive power.

This research was only realised through independent funding, knowing where to look

for 'open source' data, and remains easily 'othered' by the powerful disciplinary forces of EBP technologies as it enters the discursive field on publication. This discipline squeezes out the ability of the critic to influence, or be included in, policy. The rise of EBP hegemonically, is likely to continue to act as an echo chamber for conservative political normalisation of the marketised discourses EBP (re)produces.

Third, the aligning objectives of disparate groups of actors and institutions who are drawn together to promote EBP remains a concern. My analysis shows the academy, politics and policing gathering around EBP discourse. Using Hajer (1995), they can be described as being drawn into an EBP *discourse coalition*, which adds to EBPs discursive (re)production. The EBP story-lines around which they gather offer insights as to *why* this might be. The identified story-lines accept the problematisation that policing has a need for 'improvement' or 'professionalisation'. Despite the lack of precision in these problematisations, EBP has emerged as 'the answer' to more 'efficiency', 'effectiveness', and 'value for money'. These are distinctly neo-liberal objectives, and align strongly with industrial-managerialist tropes lent from capitalist-organisational discourses, such as Taylorism – 'one best way', provable by scientific betters. To borrow from Fairclough (2003), this neo-liberal accord one can easily ascribe as a 'background assumption' – or ideology - of EBP discourse.

I believe this helps to explain *why* EBP has brought together this powerful discourse coalition. There is success, economically and politically, in progressing EBP in our current age for all parties because in its soul it aligns with bigger and more powerful politico-economic conservative discourses. My analysis allows EBP to be

repositioned not as the neutral scientific programme it presents itself as, but as a project which has attendant disciplinary technologies that reproduces neoliberal outcomes, performing political work. For those interested in the potential for policing to contribute to social progress in a more radical way, EBPs governing technologies that reproduce neoliberal efficiencies need highlighting and challenging. This is the point of Foucauldian research. However, governing technologies ensure that from an 'insider position' such resistance is extremely difficult. A key finding from my analysis is the importance of critique 'from the edge' of policing being given a louder voice.

Fourth, this research was concerned with the increasing classification of knowledge under EBP discourse. This need to 'systematise' borrows heavily from positivist medico-scientific discourses (Foucault, 1963; 1964). Classification is strongly reflected in EBPs academic texts, but also found in institutional modifications observable such as the College of Policing, and in statements from non-academic actors. Examples presented from the texts demonstrate the valorisation of pseudo-science over other forms of knowing. Such 'technologies' determine what is 'useful' or 'reliable' for policy decisions. This contributes to ensuring some 'types' of knowledge (the pseudo-scientific) are included into the policy space over 'others' (the critical, theoretically informed, or artisanal). Importantly the incorporation of ideas on classifications into discourse institutionalisation supports the development of further governance technologies, such as access to data and funding through distribution of Police Knowledge Fund research funding or bursaries that rely on this 'ordering' in decision making. Knowledge which fails to accord to such categorisation is increasingly not being commissioned and financed. Where critical knowledge is still

'independently' produced, it lacks the institutional patronage to 'make itself true' and can easily be excluded from any 'real world' impact on policy through EBP governance. This marginalising impact should concern those interested in non-managerialist policing problems, or those who might champion alternative definitions or policies on 'crime', 'policing' and 'justice' that support social progress for the marginalised. The 'authorised knowledge' produced from the 'ordering' of EBP discourse is demonstrably neo-liberal.

Fifth and linked to categorisation of knowledge, this research explored about the *commodification* of knowledge. My work indicates this commodification is (re)produced through EBP discourse. The combined governing technologies revealed in the texts on 'efficiency', 'fact', 'professionalism', 'what works', the market-inspired disciplines of new centres, courses, publications, and institutional modifications that reproduce these echo neo-liberal politico-economic values. 'Knowledge' is 'useful' in EBPs discursive arrangements in so far as it is *economically* useful in the marketplace: reducing costs to policing, or income generation for universities. The impact on the ability to produce 'other' theoretical or critical knowledge which is valuable on its own terms is clear. There is likely to be less critical or radical research in a future that judges critical research as less relevant in meeting the politico-economic utility 'tests' that EBP discourse demands, or indeed challenges those market assumptions. To this extent this thesis builds on the work of others who have highlighted this issue (Hilyard et al, 2004; Walters, 2003; Squires, 2013).

Sixth, I was concerned with why and how policing came to be problematised as

unprofessional and inefficient and so 'needing' EBP to 'save it'. My research fails to answer this specifically, and no further precision or clarity on these problematisations was identifiable within the EBP texts. My work has indicated why we might have arrived in this position with limited challenge to this assumption. EBPs framing of tackling 'problems' of efficiency, economy, public value for money, is a quite conservative 'ask' of policing. It finds accord with political requirements of modern-day neoliberal politics. EBP comfortably assimilates into pre-existing dominant political positions. To use Foucault's insights on governmentality – governance of the self – EBP aligns with the requirements of the state. The more challenging 'asks' of policing raised by classic criminological studies that are excluded through EBP (for examples see Cohen 1980 on policing youth groups, Young 1971 on drug taking), are *hard* to resolve. Those challenges require fundamentally different thinking and radical shifts in political positions to meaningfully address the issues they raise. EBP helps to gloss over current concerns over discrimination against marginalised population groups, the extension of state surveillance, policing of protest and so on, by focussing attention, the political agenda and research resources elsewhere. Managerialist concerns have demonstrably triumphed in the problematisation of policing over more 'critical' concerns through EBP. As EBP becomes hegemonic, with its attendant governing technologies, it is likely to continue to reproduce conservative over radical policing problematisations and therefore reinforce policy priorities around the former for the foreseeable future.

Seventh, I wanted to examine consequences that might flow from the continued development of EBP. I have presented examples underlining how EBP is increasingly

normalised and 'taken-for-granted' in statements from police leaders, policy documents, academic papers, subject positioning and through institutional reforms. My research indicates EBPs story-lines, subject positions and institutional changes will likely reinforce conservative, managerial and neoliberal discourses. Furthermore the nature of governing technologies my research highlights and the recursive power within discourse ensures EBP is likely to endure for some time as the dominant discourse for and about policing; certainly in the UK context of advance neoliberalism. Despite criminologists calling for more 'public criminology' – public debate on the nature of crime, policing and so on (see Loader and Sparks, 2010) - EBP discourse has so far proven adept at modifying (in the way Hajer suggests through ADA) to promote its own hegemony. My research signals the likely consequences to flow from this adaption might be failure to address problematisations of policing that fall outside of managerial concerns and require more fundamental, structural or radical political changes. Ongoing reproduction of neoliberal politico-economic positions appear to be the likely consequences of sustained EBP hegemony.

Nothing in my work suggests the production of knowledge is problematic, nor is seeking to improve policy or policing. It is bringing these two activities together through normalised advanced systematisation, categorisation, and institutionalisation following industrial-managerial norms that produces the troubling discursive politics of EBP which my analysis highlights. This (re)produces through discourse structures, technologies and normalised pathologies that discipline what it is presently possible to *'think, say and do'* about policing. This, in turn, reproduces the foundations upon which they sit. My analysis suggests EBP shares genealogical heritage - a DNA -

with neoliberalism, and this is deeply problematic in my view. Discourse is facilitative but also excluding and EBP discourse demonstrably problematises managerial issues in policing over and above much more serious concerns about modern policing that are raised by perspectives derived from theoretical research (Hilyard and Tombs, 2007; Pemberton, 2015). EBP helps avoid the contemplation of issues of political difficulty. EBP can therefore be considered as a subjective, conservative, values-based project that de-politicizes, and not the objective, benign force for social improvement based on values-free science that it presents itself to be. This is problematic because of which political preferences are 'authorised', normalised and legitimated through this discursive process.

"the practical orientation of policy analysis makes it always vulnerable to become the intellectual handmaiden of government agencies" (Hajer, 2003, p.190)

Discursive conditions that produce the ability to 'authorise' knowledge as 'evidence' or 'truth', translated into policy, is a political device that required interrogation. Science is not neutral. Scientific knowledge is changing constantly undermining its own truth claims, and this is a view supported by some of the great social and political theorists of the modern age: Foucault, Latour, Popper. Scientific knowledge is increasingly driven by big capital market interests of dairy, agriculture, pharmaceutical, carbon-heavy mining and manufacturing industries. The presentation of scientific knowledge as objective 'evidence' (of truth) through discursive ordering therefore takes on a political dimension as it becomes routinised into state institutions through processes of discourse institutionalisation (Hajer, 1995, p.61). EBP, with its links to state and sub-political funding and institutions, should be reconsidered reflecting upon the analysis presented here.

I submit this thesis makes five distinct and important contributions: methodologically, theoretically, and empirically. Empirically my work extends three debates. My analysis takes forward what might be said about EBP as a socio-political phenomenon, the literature on the use of evidence in other social policy fields, but also extends the debate on the current state of criminology as a discipline, its positioning in respect of the knowledge criminology produces and its relationships with the state.

I contribute methodologically to 'how' one might conduct discourse analysis from a Foucauldian perspective: clearly articulating a replicable approach to this type of research. This directly addresses the challenge that has presented difficulty to scholars wishing to conduct post-structural discourse analytical research since Foucault: 'how to' conduct discursive research from a position that is consistent with Foucault's work? My approach has considered the benefits, disadvantages and commonalities of methods developed by other discourse analysts who have followed Foucault (see Hall, 1997; Fairclough, 1995; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Howarth, Glynos and Griggs, 2016; Hajer, 1993, 1995, 2002, 2003). I have used my own reading of Foucault to develop an approach that examines 'texts' through three distinct lenses to reveal elements of discourse. This allows illumination of discursive contingencies through: story-lines; subject positions; and institutional modification. This is a replicable method that facilitates discourse analytical research, appropriately historicised, based on detailed coding of appropriately selected texts from the archive in a way that is consistent with my reading of Foucault's original work. This allows researchers to conduct genealogical analysis following archaeological method, in a

way that is appropriately historicised. This is an important contribution to an under-developed field, furthering this discipline methodologically. I do not suggest that this is the correct or only method of conducting this type of research, others should be encouraged to interpret their own approach. However, my work allows other scholars to replicate or adapt the method to explore other problematised issues of concern. In my view, this needs sharing more widely to encourage progress of this type of research because of its revelatory potential about normalised modern politico-social phenomena.

Theoretically I contribute to extending Foucault's work, developing a richer understanding of discourse, power, and the importance of institutional changes in 'authorising' truth regimes, using the new empirical lens of EBP. Notably, my research extends Maarten Hajer's work on discourse coalitions, story-lines, discourse structuration, and discourse institutionalisation (1993; 1995). My empirical analysis supports theoretical work on ADA indicating the importance of epistemic determination in delimiting possibilities, and also the contingent nature of problematised issues in the modern world. My thesis also contributes to the ongoing theoretical developments of concepts of discourse, power, change, and agency that dominate post-structural theory more broadly (see Rosenau, 1992 for a discussion). I have also identified some key theoretical issues that are in need of further research. Principal among these are the degree of individual and institutional agency in facilitating change through discourse, versus the degree of 'epistemic' determination that discourse exercises on actors.

Hajer (1993) recognises the challenge of explaining how change occurs which is left by Foucault's work, and proposes Argumentative Discourse Analysis (ADA) as a route through the dilemma. Hajer argues through ADA that discourses modify over time to sustain themselves by adaption through argument. While my analysis supports Hajer's conception on ADA presenting discourse as an evolving and adaptable entity influenced by actors in its quest for hegemony, it equally suggests the positioning of those contributing to the 'argument' is potentially limited by the spatial and temporal context of wider dominant discourses influencing governance techniques. In line with Foucault (1970), I consider actors *are* constrained by what it possible to 'say, think and do' at any given time. Foucault suggested his projects "*will not seek to identify the universal structures of all knowledge {connaissance} or all possible moral action, but will seek to treat instances of discourse that articulate what we think, say, and do as so many historical events*" (Foucault, 2000, p.315). In this respect discourse analytical work following Foucault that looks at these articulations in great detail, as I have done in this thesis, can be understood as transformative. They reopen that which appears foreclosed to "*the possibility of no longer being, doing, or thinking what we are, do, or think*" (Foucault, 2000, p.316). While I have not reached a satisfactory conclusion on the question of agency in producing socio-political change in the context of epistemic constraints, my research on EBP at least extends this debate and recommends further research is undertaken on this specific point.

In taking a post-structural discourse analytical approach to research, the thesis also makes a significant empirical contribution to understanding EBP in a fresh

perspective. I have addressed the seven points of concern about EBP above. My research re-presents EBP not as the neutral, science-based, objective producer of knowledge as a force for good it claims to be. Instead I suggest EBP can be repositioned as doing political work. EBP shares a DNA, genealogically-speaking with other political projects of late modernity, such as managerialism, that function to sustain neoliberalism. To this extent I do not advocate for modifications to EBP, but instead suggest EBP should be subject of greater contestation.

My research contributes to how the emergence of EBP can be understood and interpreted. I do not claim the privileged status of 'evidence' for my own work. My analysis is interpretive by design, but I believe it offers a valuable insight into the historic emergence of EBP that should be considered by scholars, academics, policy makers, politicians, and police officers interested in the future of policing, and the development of EBP in particular. The processes of 'othering' identified in my analysis through governance techniques (e.g. knowledge hierarchies, access to data and funding), might mean my empirical contribution to the development of EBP could easily be marginalised. I have deliberately tried to conduct this research 'from the edge' to use Foucault's words, and used only data that is available publicly and did not rely on my insider policing status to gain privileged access. Irrespective of the potential marginalisation of my research I argue it should be judged on its own terms using Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Phillips and Jørgensen's (2002) 'tests' for discourse analytical research. As such, it makes a valid and important contribution to understanding EBP.

To this extent my work contributes to the EBP literature itself (see Sherman, 2013; Neyroud, 2009; Greene, 2014; Thomas, 2014; or Bullock and Tilley, 2009, as examples). The potential 'othering' of my contribution by those 'within' the EBP 'bubble' is rendered more likely by the insights my research presents about the nature of EBP. EBPs' coherence relies upon the foreclosing of critical interventions that are typified by this thesis. The insights my work generates into EBP, repositioning it as a discursively constituted political project, means EBP should be abandoned given the impact it has on sustaining neoliberal managerialist discourses; discourses that arguably hinder the progress of effective policing by excluding more radical ideas of how policing might be 'improved'. Insights such as this are neither politically expedient to those invested in EBP, or easily accommodated by simple modifications to EBP's story-lines or practices through my 'argument'.

Additionally, this thesis contributes empirically beyond EBP and policing. The revelations my research unmask into EBP are potentially relevant for other researchers examining the evidence-based movement in other policy domains. There is a wider body of research on the evidence-based movement, as it pertains to other policy fields such as health. I believe that the approach and insights generated in my thesis also extends this literature (see Fotaki, 2009, and Learmouth and Harding, 2006, on healthcare; Solesbury, 2001, and Stevens, 2010, on general civil service responses; Williams and Glasby, 2010, on social care; Hope, 2004, Brown, 2010, Smith 2010, and Marston and Watts, 2003, on criminal justice).

Thirdly, my research contributes and extends the debate within criminology on the state of the discipline, 'public criminology' and the links between academic criminological knowledge, politics and policy. Drake and Walters (2015), and McAra (2017) both cite Christie's work in the early 1970's as prompting debate amongst criminologists on the relationship of criminological knowledge and their positioning to the state. Both papers build on Hillyard et. al. (2004) paper that cites Foucault's commentary on criminology as a discipline of 'ceaseless chatter' and 'garrulous discourse' to question the marketised trajectory of criminological research (Hillyard et. al. 2004, p.369). This remains an unsettled debate, presently centred around where criminology should sit, and how aligned it should be to political policy making. EBP sits within this debate. Sherman, Tilley and others make strong arguments for the application of criminological research to state policy from an 'evidence' based perspective, building on longstanding state links to the criminological discipline catalogued by Walters (2003). Loader and Sparks (2010) and others (Chancer and McLoughlin, 2007) advocate 'public criminology', suggesting academics should be more public figures, influencing the political debates on crime. While others still would more actively resist the influence of state control and influence on academic freedoms, advocating further distancing of sites of production of criminological knowledge because of the dissonance caused from proximity (Jackson, 2020). My research also supports the hypothesis outlined on the marketisation of the discipline (Hillyard et al, 2004). My work demonstrates an intensification and extension of the processes they identify over at least two decades in the UK, driven by neoliberal discourses that have simultaneously produced EBP and ensured its reproduction through the modifications to actors, language and institutions that produce

governance effects. This thesis suggests EBP can be viewed as a new zenith in the neoliberalisation of criminological knowledge about policing. In this respect my work can also be positioned as extending the debate on the nature of the criminological discipline.

Whether my work has reactivated the possibility of actors thinking, speaking and acting differently about EBP as Foucault envisioned this type of analysis might is for others to judge. However, I do believe I have achieved my aim in offering a different perspective on EBP by applying a discourse analytical lens.

REFERENCES

PRIMARY SOURCES

Academic

Ashby, M.P.J. (2016) Is Metal Theft Committed by Organized Crime Groups, and Why Does it Matter? *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 16(2): 141 –157

Barnham, L., Barnes, G.C., & Sherman, L.W. (2017) Targeting Escalation of Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence from 52,000 Offenders. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 116–142

Bennett, S., Newman, M. & Sydes, M. (2017) Mobile police community office: a vehicle for reducing crime, crime harm and enhancing police legitimacy? *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 13: 417–428

Bowden, S. and Barnes, G.C. (2015) Targeting Nondomestic Violence Inside Houses of Multi-Occupancy. *International Criminal Justice Review* 25(1): 54-63

Braga, A.A. & Weisburd, D. (2006) *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bridger, E., Parkinson, J., Strang, H. & Sherman, L.W. (2017) Intimate Partner Homicide in England and Wales 2011–2013: Pathways to Prediction from Multi-agency Domestic Homicide Reviews. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 93–104

Brown, G.R. (2017) A dialogue of collaboration: cooperation in Canadian policing research today. *Police Practice and Research* 18(6): 528-543, DOI: 10.1080/15614263.2017.1363962

Bullock, K. & Tilley, N. (2009) Evidence-Based Policing and Crime Reduction. *Policing* 3(4): 381–387

Button, I.M.D., Angel, C. & Sherman, L.W. (2017) Predicting Domestic Homicide and Serious Violence in Leicestershire with Intelligence Records of Suicidal Ideation or Self-Harm Warnings: a Retrospective Analysis. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 105–115

Dawson, P. & Stanko, E.A. (2016) The Best-Kept Secret(s) of Evidence Based Policing. *Legal Information Management* 16: 64–71

Ellefsen, B. (2011) Evaluating Crime Prevention—Scientific Rationality or Governmentality? *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention* 12(2): 103-127

Gill, C., Wooditch, A. & Weisburd, D. (2017) Testing the “Law of Crime Concentration at Place” in a Suburban Setting: Implications for Research and Practice. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 33(5): 19–45

Goode, J. & Lumsden, K. (2016) The McDonaldisation of Police–Academic Partnerships: Organisational and Cultural Barriers Encountered in Moving from Research on Police to Research with Police. *Policing and Society* DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2016.1147039

Goosey, J., Neyroud, P. & Sherman, L. (2017) Integrated case management of repeated intimate partner violence: a randomized, controlled trial. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 174–189

Greene, J.R. (2014) New Directions in Policing: Balancing Prediction and Meaning in Police Research. *Justice Quarterly* 31(2): 193-228, DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2013.840389

Heaton, R. & Tong, S. (2016) Evidence-Based Policing: From Effectiveness to Cost-Effectiveness. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 10(1): 60–70

Huey, L., Blaskovits, B., Bennell, C., Kalyal, H.J. & Walker, T. (2017) To what extent do Canadian police professionals believe that their agencies are ‘Targeting, Testing, and Tracking’ new policing strategies and programs? *Police Practice and Research* 18(6): 544-555, DOI: 10.1080/15614263.2017.1363968

Huey, L. & Ricciardelli, R. (2016) From Seeds to Orchards: Using Evidence-Based Policing to Address Canada’s Policing Research Needs. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 58(1): 119-131

Kerr, J., Whyte, C. & Strang, H. (2017) Targeting Escalation and Harm in Intimate Partner Violence: Evidence from Northern Territory Police, Australia. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 143–159

Lum, C., Koper C.S. & Telep, C.W. (2011) The Evidence-Based Policing Matrix. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 7: 3–26

Murray, A., Mueller-Johnson, K. and Sherman, L.W. (2015) Evidence-Based Policing of U.K. Muslim Communities: Linking Confidence in the Police With Area Vulnerability to Violent Extremism. *International Criminal Justice Review* 25(1): 64-79

Neyroud, P. (2009) Squaring the circles: research, evidence, policy-making, and police improvement in England and Wales. *Police Practice and Research* 10(5-6): 437-449

Ritter, A., & Lancaster, K. (2013) Illicit drugs, policing and the evidence-based policy paradigm. *Evidence & Policy* 9(4): 457-72

Sherman, L.W. (2015) A Tipping Point for “Totally Evidenced Policing”: Ten Ideas for Building an Evidence-Based Police Agency. *International Criminal Justice Review* 25(1): 11-29

Sherman, L.W. (2017) Editorial Policies. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 1–4

Sherman, L.W. & Murray, A. (2015) Evidence-Based Policing: From Academics to Professionals. *International Criminal Justice Review* 25(1): 7-10

Sherman, L., O'Connor, D. & Strang, H. (2017) Introduction—Key Facts About Domestic Abuse: Lessons from Eight Studies. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 59–63

Sherman, L. W. (2013) The Rise of Evidence-Based Policing: Targeting, Testing, and Tracking. *Crime and Justice* 42(1): 377-451

Slothower, M., Sherman, L.W. & Neyroud, P. (2015) Tracking Quality of Police Actions in a Victim Contact Program: A Case Study of Training, Tracking, and Feedback (TTF) in Evidence-Based Policing. *International Criminal Justice Review* 25(1): 98-116

Strang, H., Ariel, B., Sherman, L.W., Chilton, S., Rowlinson, T., Jarman, R., Cornelius, N., Weinborn C. & Braddock, R. (2017) Reducing the Harm of Intimate Partner Violence: Randomized Controlled Trial of the Hampshire Constabulary CARA Experiment. *Cambridge of Journal Evidence Based Policing* 1: 160–173

Telep, C.W. & Lum, C. (2014) The Receptivity of Officers to Empirical Research and Evidence-Based Policing: An Examination of Survey Data From Three Agencies. *Police Quarterly* 17(4): 359–385

Telep, C.W. & Somers, L.J. (2017) Examining police officer definitions of evidence-based policing: are we speaking the same language? *Policing and Society* DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2017.1373775

Thomas, G. (2014) Research on Policing: Insights from the Literature. *Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles* 87: 5–16

Thornton, S. (2017) Police Attempts to Predict Domestic Murder and Serious Assaults: Is Early Warning Possible Yet? *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 64–80

Veigas, H. & Lum, C. (2013) Assessing The Evidence Base of a Police Service Patrol Portfolio. *Policing* 7(3): 248–262

Whitworth, A. (2012) Sustaining Evidence-based Policing in an Era of Cuts: Estimating Fear of Crime at Small Area Level in England. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 14(1): 48–68

Williams, S. & Coupe, T. (2017) Frequency vs. Length of Hot Spots Patrols: A Randomised Controlled Trial. *Cambridge Journal of Evidence Based Policing* 1: 5–21

Willis, J.J. & Mastrofski, S.D. (2016) Improving Policing By Integrating Craft And Science: What Can Patrol Officers Teach Us About Good Police Work? *Policing and Society* DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2015.1135921

Worrall, J.L. (2014). *The Politics of Policing*. The Oxford Handbook of Police and Policing, Edited by Michael D. Reisig and Robert J. Kane

Political

APCC / NPCC (2015) *Vision for Policing 2025*.
<https://www.npcc.police.uk/documents/Policing%20Vision.pdf>

GlosPCC (2017) *Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021*

GMPPCC (2017) *Standing Together Our Plan for Police, Community Safety, Criminal Justice Services and Citizens in Greater Manchester*

MOPAC (2017) *A Safer City for All Londoners: Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021*

NorfolkPCC (OPCCN, 2016) *Police and Crime Plan 2016-2020*

NorthumbriaPCC (2017) *Police and Crime Plan 2017-2021*

WMPCC (2016) *Your Police Your Priorities: The West Midlands Police and Crime Plan 2016-2020*

Operational

APCC / NPCC (2015) *Vision for Policing 2025*.
<https://www.npcc.police.uk/documents/Policing%20Vision.pdf>

Canterbury Centre for Policing Research (CCPR, 2017) *Police Federation's Annual Pay and Morale Survey*

College of Policing (CoP, 2019)
https://www.college.police.uk/About/Governance/Board/Pages/archive_DO_NOT_PUBLISH/sherman.aspx Accessed 22.4.19

College of Policing (CoP, 2019a) <https://www.college.police.uk/News/College-news/Pages/Launch-of-the-college-bursary-scheme-for-2019.aspx> Accessed 22.4.19

PFEW (2015) *Policy capture process report: Joan Donnelly, Karen Pinfold, Elaine Parker (PFEW 'Research Dept')*
http://www.polfed.org/documents/Policy_capture_and_formation_process.pdf
Accessed 3.3.19

PFEW (2016) *Magazine article reporting PSA Conference speech by graduate of Cambridge Police Executive Programme*
http://www.polfed.org/documents/Police_Magazine_October-November_final_-_with_links.pdf Accessed 3.3.19

PFEW (2017) *Police Officer Welfare, Demand, and Capacity Survey Inferential Results (December 2017) Jonathan Houdmont (University of Nottingham) Mary Elliott-Davies (Police Federation of England and Wales)*
[http://www.polfed.org/documents/PFEW%20Inferential%20Results%20Report-27-12-17-V1.0%20\(002\).pdf](http://www.polfed.org/documents/PFEW%20Inferential%20Results%20Report-27-12-17-V1.0%20(002).pdf) Accessed 3.3.19

PFEW (2017a) *POLFED Annual Public Value Report*
http://www.polfed.org/flip/Public_Value_Report/files/basic-html/page9.html
Accessed 3.3.19

PFEW (2017b) *POLFED Annual Public Value Report*
http://www.polfed.org/flip/Public_Value_Report/files/basic-html/page10.html
Accessed 3.3.19

PFEW (2017c) *Policy statement on dealing with volume crime using 'best available evidence'*. http://www.polfed.org/documents/PFEW_Policy_-_Volume_Crime_-_March_2017_v2.pdf
Accessed 3.2.19

PFEW (2017d) *Chair of PFEW suggests using evidence-based approach to determine police resources* <http://www.polfed.org/newsroom/5132.aspx>
Accessed 2.2.19

PFEW (2018) *Vice Chair of SEBP Roger Pegram on knife crime at PFEW conference breakout session*

PSA (2013) *Comment on launch of College of Policing*
<http://www.policesupers.com/2013/02/05/launch-of-college-of-policing/> Accessed 3.2.19

PSA (2013a) *More on the role of the College of Policing*
<http://www.policesupers.com/2013/02/07/a-college-for-all/> Accessed 3.2.19

PSA (2013b) *Blog setting out priorities of incoming President of PSA*
<http://www.policesupers.com/2013/03/18/new-psaew-president-sets-out-key-priorities/>

PSA (2014) *Blog from President of PSA on role of the college and promotion of EBP*
<http://www.policesupers.com/2014/09/10/presidents-speech-structures-blame-culture-welfare/> Accessed 3.2.19

PSA (2016) *Statement in response to NPCC 2025 vision doc – calling for greater use of academic and evidence-based approaches*
<http://www.policesupers.com/2016/11/16/policing-needs-to-look-much-further-ahead-supers-president/> Accessed 3.2.19

PSA (2016a) *Conference speech by graduate of Cambridge Police Executive Programme* <http://www.policesupers.com/2016/08/09/the-evidence-for-smarter-policing/> Accessed 3.2.19

WWCCR (2015) <https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Partnerships/Knowledge-Fund/Pages/Police-Knowledge-Fund.aspx> Accessed 22.4.19

WWCCR (2016) <http://whatworks.college.police.uk/About/Pages/default.aspx> Accessed 7.8.16

WWCCR (2016a) <http://whatworks.college.police.uk/toolkit/Pages/Effect-scale.aspx> Accessed 7.8.16

WWCCR (2016b) <http://whatworks.college.police.uk/toolkit/Pages/Quality-Scale.aspx> Accessed 7.8.16

WWCCR (2019) <https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Research-Map/Pages/Research-Map.aspx> Accessed 22.4.19

Special Interest Groups

Campbell Collaboration (2016) <http://www.campbellcollaboration.org> accessed 3.8.16

SEBP (2019) <https://www.sebp.police.uk/contact> Accessed 22.4.19

SEBP (2019a) <https://www.sebp.police.uk/2019-conference> Accessed 22.4.19

SEBP (2019b) <https://www.sebp.police.uk> Accessed 27.4.19

SEBP (2019c) <https://www.sebp.police.uk/resources> Accessed 27.4.19

REFERENCES

SECONDARY SOURCES

Alvesson, M. and Willmott, H. (1996) *Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction*. Sage, London

Ariel, B., Vila, J., & Sherman, L. (2012) Random Assignment Without Tears: How to Stop Worrying and Love the Cambridge Randomizer. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 1-16

BBC (2009), <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8334948.stm> accessed 8.4.19

BBC (2018) <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-46053069> accessed 8.9.19

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society*. Sage, London

Betts, P.R. (2011) *"Licensing The Intolerant": Anti-Social Behaviour Policy in Modern Britain?* (MPA dissertation, unpublished)

Betts, P.R. (2020) Criminology as Religion: Profane Thoughts about Sacred Values, 20 years on. (submitted for publication)

Bevir, M & Rhodes, R.A.W. (1998) Narratives of Thatcherism. *West European Politics* 21 (1); 97-119

Bilton, T. et. al. (1987) *Introductory Sociology*. Macmillan, London

Brown, A.P. (2010) Qualitative method and compromise in applied social research *Qualitative Research* 10(2): 229-248

Burnham, P. (2001) New Labour and the politics of depoliticisation. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 3(2); 127-149

Burnham, Lutz, Grant, & Layton-Henry (2004) *Research Methods in Politics*. Palgrave MacMillan, London

Burr, V. (1995) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Campbell, D. (1969) Reforms as Experiments. *American Psychologist* 24: 409-29

Chalmers, I. (2005) If evidence-informed policy works in practice, does it matter if it doesn't work in theory? *Evidence and Policy*. 1(2) 227-42

Chan, J (1994) Crime Prevention and the Lure of Relevance: A Response to Adam Sutton. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 27(1) 25-29

Cohen, S. (1980) *Folk evils and Moral Panics: The creation of the Mods and Rockers* (New ed.) Martin Robertson, Oxford

Cohen, S. (1981) *Footprints on the Sand: A Further Report on Criminology and the Sociology of Deviance in Britain*, in M. Fitzgerald, G. McLennan and J. Pawson, eds, *Crime and Society. Readings in History and Theory*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London

Collier, R. (2013) Privatising the Public University: The Case of Law. *Journal Of Law And Society* 40(3): 450-467

Chancer, L. and McLaughlin, E. (2007) Public criminologies, Diverse perspectives on academia and policy. *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 155-173

Dayem, T.A.; Barbullushi, H.; Barnes, G.; Cubitt, C; Hayward, J.; Jin, R; Kay, J.; Lee, A.; Page, E.C.; Patel, N. (2014) Evaluation Under Contract: Government Pressure And The Production Of Policy Research. *Public Administration* 92(1): 224-239

De Vos, P. (2003) Discourse theory and the study of ideological (trans)-formations: analysing social democratic revisionism. *Pragmatics* 13(1): 163-180

Diaconu, M.A. (2014) Truth and Knowledge in Postmodernism. *Procedia – Social and Behavioural Sciences* 137: 165-169

Drake, D.H. & Walters, R. (2015) Crossing the line': Criminological expertise, policy advice and the 'quarrelling society'. *Critical Social Policy* 35(3): 414–433

Dymock, A. (2017) Prurience, punishment and the image: Reading 'law-and-order pornography'. *Theoretical Criminology*, 21(2) 209–224

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. Longman, London

Fairclough, N. (1992) Text and Context: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis Within Discourse Analysis. *Discourse and Society* 3(2): 193-217

Fairclough, N. (1993) Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse and Society* 4(2): 193-217

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. Longman, London

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge, London.

Flacks, S. (2020) Law, necropolitics and the stop and search of young people. *Theoretical Criminology*, 24(2) 387-405

- Flinders, M. & Buller, J. (2006) Depoliticisation: Principles, Tactics and Tools. *British Politics* 1; 293-318
- Fotaki, M. (2009) Are All Consumers The Same? Choice in Health, Social Care and Education in England and Elsewhere. *Public Money & Management* 29(2): 87-94
- Foucault, M. (1963) *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*. Routledge, Kent.
- Foucault, M. (1964) *Madness & Civilisation: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*. Routledge, Oxon.
- Foucault, M. (1969) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Routledge, Oxon.
- Foucault, M. (1970) *The Order of Things*. Vintage, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1975) *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Penguin, London
- Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Vintage, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1985) *The Use of Pleasures, Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality*. Vintage, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1986) *The Care of the Self, Volume 3 of The History of Sexuality*. Vintage, New York.
- Foucault, M. (1991) *Governmentality, in The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. ed. Burchell, G., Gordon, C. & Miller, P. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.
- Foucault, M. (1997) *The Politics of Truth*. ed. By Sylvère Lotringer. Semiotext, USA
- Foucault, M. (2000) *The Essential Works of Michel Foucault*, ed. Paul Rainbow. Vol. 3 *Power*, ed. James Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley et. al. New Press, New York.
- Foucault, M. (2011) *The Courage of The Truth (The Government of Self and Others II): Lectures at the Colege de France 1983-1984*. ed. Frederic Gros. Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Gilbert, J. (2004) Signifying Nothing: 'Culture', 'Discourse' and the Sociality of Affect. *Culture Machine* 6
- Giluk, T.L. & Rynes-Weller, S. (2012) *Research Findings Practitioners Resist: Lessons for Management Academics from Evidence-based Medicine*, 130-64 in

Rousseau, D.M. ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Evidence-based Management*. OUP, New York

Guilfoyle, S. (2013) *Intelligent Policing: How Systems Thinking Methods Eclipse Conventional Management Practice*. Triarchy, Devon.

Haines, F. & Sutton, A. (2000) Criminology as Religion? Profane Thoughts about Sacred Values. *The British Journal of Criminology* 40(1): 146-162

Hajer, M. (1993) *Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalisation of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Great Britain*. In Fischer, F. & Forester, J. *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham, London

Hajer, M. (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse*. OUP, Oxford

Hajer, M. (2002) Discourse analysis and the study of policy making. *European Political Science* 2(1): 61-65

Hajer, M. (2003) Policy Without Polity? Policy Analysis and the Institutional Void. *Policy Studies* 36(2): 175-195

Hall, S. (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Sage, London

Hall, S. (2007) Will Life After Blair Be Different? *British Politics* 2; 118-122

Hall, S. & Winlow, S. (2012) ed. *New Directions in Criminological Theory*. Routledge, London.

Hammersley, M. (2005) Is the evidence-based practice movement doing more good than harm? Reflections on Iain Chalmers' case for research-based policy making and practice. *Evidence and Policy*. 1(1), 85-100

Haralambos, M. (1985) *Sociology Themes and Perspectives*. Bell & Hyman, London

Harding, S. (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*. Cornell UP, USA

Harding, S. (1992) After the Neutrality Ideal: Science, Politics, and 'Strong Objectivity'. *Social Research* 59(3): 567-587

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford

Hillyard, P. (2004) *Beyond Criminology: Taking Harm Seriously*. Pluto, London

Hillyard, P, and Tombs, S. (2007) From 'crime' to social harm? *Crime Law and Social Change* 48(1-2): 9-25

Hillyard, P., Sim, J., Tombs, S. and Whyte, D. (2004) Leaving a 'stain upon the silence' Contemporary Criminology and the Politics of Dissent. *British Journal of Criminology* 44: 389-390

HMIC – Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (2010) *Valuing the Police: Policing in an Age of Austerity* London, HMIC. ISBN: 978-1-84987-241-6

Hood, C. (1990) De-Sir Humphreyfying the Westminster Model of Bureaucracy: A New Style of Governance? *Governance*. 3, 205-214

Hood, C. (1991) A public management for all seasons? *Public Administration* 69(1); 3-19

Hood, C. (1994) *Explaining Economic Policy Reversals*. Open University Press, Buckingham.

Hope, T. (2004) Pretend it Works: Evidence & Governance in the Evaluation of the Reducing Burglary Initiative. *Criminal Justice* 4: 287-308

Howarth, D., Glynos, J. and Griggs, S. (2016) Discourse, Explanation and Critique. *Critical Policy Studies* 10(1): 99-104

Howarth, D., Norval, A.J. and Stavrakakis, Y. (2000) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*. Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Hughes, G. (1998) *Understanding Crime Prevention: Social Control ,Risk and Late Modernity*. Open University Press, Buckingham.

Hughes, G. (2000) *Understanding The Politics of Criminological Research*, in V. Jupp, P. Davies, and P. Francis (eds) *Doing Criminological Research*. Sage, London.

Hughes, G. (2007). *The Politics of Crime and Community*. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Hyder, D. (2003) Foucault, Cavailles, and Husserl on the Historical Epistemology of the Sciences. *Perspectives on Science* 11(1): 107-

Jacobs, K. (2006) Discourse analysis & its utility in urban policy research. *Urban Policy & Research* 24(1): 39-52

Jackson, W. (2020) Researching the policed: critical ethnography and the study of protest policing. *Policing & Society* 30(2): 169-185

Jessop, B. (2007) New Labour or The Normalisation of Neo-Liberalism? *British Politics* 2: 282-88

- Kendal, G. & Wickham, G. (1999) *Using Foucault's Methods*. Sage, London
- Kennedy, D. (1979) Michel Foucault: The Archaeology & Sociology of Knowledge. *Theory & Society* 8(2): 269-290
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony & Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso, London
- Laster, K (1994) The Lure of Relevance. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 27(1) 3-4
- Latour, B. (1999) *Pandora's hope: essays on the reality of science studies*. Harvard UP, Cambridge
- Learmouth, M. & Harding, N. (2006) Evidence-based Management: The Very Idea. *Public Administration* 84(2): 245-266
- Lemke, T. (2001) 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the college de France on neo-liberal Governmentality. *Economy and society* 30(2): 190-207
- Loader, I. & Sparks, R. (2010) *Public Criminology?* Routledge
- Marston, G. & Watts, R. (2003) Tampering with the Evidence: A Critical Appraisal of Evidence-based Policy-making. *The Drawing Board: An Australian Review of Public Affairs* 3(3): 143-163
- McAra, L. (2017) Can Criminologists Change the World? Critical Reflections on the Politics, Performance and Effects of Criminal Justice. *British Journal of Criminology* 57: 767-788
- McDonald, L.C. (1968) *Western Political Theory: From Its Origins To The Present*. Harcourt, Brace & World, New York
- Miller, P. and Rose, N. (1990) Governing Economic Life. *Economy and Society*, 19, 1-31
- Millward, D. (2016) <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/07/10/black-lives-matter-protests-continue-in-cities-across-the-us/> accessed 3.8.16
- Morrell, K. (2006) Policy as Narrative: New Labour's Reform of The NHS. *Public Administration* 84(2): 367-285
- Murphy, B (2020) Regulating Undercover Policing: Subjects, Rights and Governmentality. *Critical Criminology*. 28, 65-84
- Neyroud, P. (2014) Is Policing a Science-based Profession? *The Globe and Mail, Canada*. @GlobeDebate accessed 22.2.2016

Nutley, S., Boaz, A., Davies, H. & Fraser, A. (2019) New development: What works now? Continuity and change in the use of evidence to improve public policy and service delivery. *Public Money & Management*, 39(4) 310-316

Nutley, S. M., Davies, H. T. O., & Tilley, N. (Eds.) (2000). Getting research into practice. *Public Money & Management*, 20(4)

Nutley, S., Davies, H. & Walter, I. (2002) Evidence Based Policy and Practice: Cross Sector Lessons From the UK. *ESRC UK Centre for Evidence Based Policy & Practice: Working Paper 9*

Nutley, S., Powell, A. & Davies, H. (2012) What Counts As Good Evidence? *Research Unit for Research Utilisation, School of Management, University of St. Andrews*. www.ruru.ac.uk

O'Malley, P. (ed.) (1998) *Crime and the Risk Society*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

O'Malley, P. (2000) Criminologies of Catastrophe? Understanding Criminal Justice on the Edge of the New Millennium. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 33(2) 153-67

Osborne D. and Gaebler (1992) *Reinventing Government : How The Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming The Public Sector*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co, Wokingham/

Parkinson, J. (2004) Why Deliberate? The Encounter Between Deliberation and New Public Managers. *Public Administration* 82(2): 377-395

Parsons, W. (1995) *Public Policy: An Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Policy Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Pawson, R; Greenhalgh, T; Harvey, G; Walshe, K. (2005) Realist Review – A New Method of Systematic Review Designed for Complex Policy Interventions. *Journal of Health Services, Research and Policy* 10(1): 21-34

Peck, J. (2006) Liberating the City: Between New York and New Orleans. *Urban Geography* 27: 681-673

Pemberton, S. (2007) Social harm future(s): exploring the potential of the social harm approach. *Crime Law and Social Change* 48: 27-41

Pemberton, S. (2015) *Harmful Societies: Understanding Social Harm*. Policy Press

Phillips, L. & Jørgensen, M.W. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. Sage, London

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology*. Sage, London

Raco, M. & Imrie, R. (2000) Governmentality and Rights and Responsibilities in Urban Policy. *Environment & Planning A* 32: 2187-2204

Raphael, D.D. (1990) *Problems of Political Philosophy*. Macmillan Press, London

Rhodes, R. (1994) The Hollowing Out of the State: The Changing Nature of the Public Service in Britain. *Political Quarterly Review*, 65, 137-41

Rhodes, R. (1997) *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Rock, P. (2014) The public faces of public criminology. *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 14(4): 412-433

Rorty, R. (1989) *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

Rose, N. (1996) *Governing Advanced Liberal Democracies*. In Barry, A. (ed) *Foucault and Political Reason*. University College London Press, London.

Rose, N. (2000) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Rosenau, P.M. (1992) *Post-Modernism and the Social Sciences: Insights, Inroads and Intrusions*. Princeton UP, New Jersey

Sabatier, P.A. (1987) Knowledge, Policy-oriented Learning, and Policy Change. *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 8(4): 26-37

Sabine, G.H. (1963) *A History of Political Theory*. Harrap, London

Sanderson, I. (2002) Evaluation, Policy Learning and Evidence-based Policy Making. *Public Administration* 80(1): 1-22

Sherman, L. W. (2013) The Rise of Evidence-Based Policing: Targeting, Testing, and Tracking. *Crime and Justice* 42(1): 377-451

Slater, T. (2011) From 'Criminality' to Marginality: Rioting Against a Broken State. *Human Geography* 4(3)

Slater, T. (2012) Impacted Geographers: A Response to Pain, Kesby and Askins. *Royal Geographical Society Area* 44(1): 117-119

Slater, T. (2014) The Myth of 'Broken Britain': Welfare Reform and the Production of Ignorance. *Antipode* 46: 948-969. Doi: 10.1111/anti. 12002

- Slothower, M. & Neyroud, P (2013) Operation Turning Point: Progress Report. *Jerry Lee Centre of Experimental Criminology, Institute of Criminology, Cambridge*
- Smith, K. (2010) Research, policy and funding - academic treadmills and the squeeze on intellectual spaces. *British Journal of Sociology* 61(1): 176-195
- Solesbury, W. (2001) Evidence-based Policy: Whence it Came and Where its Going. *ESRC Centre for Evidence Based Policy & Practice, London*
- Squires, P. (2008) The Politics of Anti-Social Behaviour. *British Politics* 3: 300-323
- Squires, P. (2013) Research Prevention and the Zombie University. *Criminal Justice Matters* 91(1): 4-5
- Stevens, A. (2010) Telling Policy Stories: An Ethnographic Study of the Use of Evidence in Policy-making in the UK. *Journal of Social Policy* 40(2): 237-255
- Syed, S.B; Hyder, A.A; Bloom, G; Sundaram, S; Bhuyia, A; Zhenzong, Z; Kanjilal, B; Oladepo, O; Pariyo, G; Peters, D.H. (2008) Exploring Evidence-policy Linkages in Health Research Plans: A Case Study from Six Countries. *Health Research Policy & Systems* 6(4): 1-10
- Taylor, F.W. (1911) *The Principles of Scientific Management*. (reprinted 1998) Dover Publications, New York.
- Tchilingirian, J.S. (2018) Producing Knowledge, Producing Credibility: British Think-Tank Researchers and the Construction of Policy Reports. *International Journal Of Politics Culture And Society* 31(2): 161-178
- Thomas, G. (2014) Research on Policing: Insights from the Literature. *Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles* 87: 5-16
- Thusi, I. India (2020) On Beauty And Policing. *Northwestern University Law Review*. 114(5), 1335-1402
- Torring, J. (1999) *New Theories of Discourse*. Blackwell, Oxford
- Tombs, S. (2016) What to do with the Harmful Corporation? *Justice, Power and Resistance* 1: 193-216
- Tombs, S. (2018) The UK's Corporate Killing Law: Un/fit for purpose? *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 18(4): 488-507
- Townshend, J. (2003) Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: A New Paradigm from the Essex School? *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5(1): 129-142

van Rijnsoever, FJ (2017) (I Can't Get No) Saturation: A Simulation And Guidelines For Sample Sizes In Qualitative Research. *PLOS ONE* 12(7): 1-17

Wacquant, L. (2009a) *Prisons of Poverty (expanded edition)*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis

Wacquant, L. (2009b) *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Duke University Press, Durham

Walshe, K. & Rundall, T.G. (2001) Evidence-based Management: From Theory to Practice in Health Care. *The Millbank Quarterly* 79: 429-57

Walters, R. (2003) *Deviant Knowledge: Criminology, Politics and Policy*. Routledge, London

Weber, M. (1963) *The Sociology of Religion* (translated by Ephraim Fischhoff). Beacon Press, Boston.

Williams, I & Glasby, J (2010) Making 'What Works' Work: The Use Of Knowledge In UK Health And Social Care Decision-Making. *Policy and Society*, 29(2) 95-102

Wright, R, (2000) Are There 'Perils of Publishing' for Critical Criminologists? A Content Analysis of Leading Journals. *The Criminologist*. 25(5), 1-4

Young, J. (1971) The Role of the Police as Amplifiers of Deviance: Negotiators of Drug Control as seen in Notting Hill, in *Images of Deviance*, edited by S. Cohen. Penguin, Harmondsworth

Young, J. (1986) *The Failure of Criminology: The Need for a Radical Realism*, in R. Matthews and J. Young (eds) *Confronting Crime*. London, Sage

Young, J. (2004) *Mayhem and Measurement in Late Modernity*, in K. Aromaa and S. Nevala (eds) *Crime and Crime Control in an Integrated Europe*, Heuni, Helsinki