Exploring the Delivery of Officer Safety Training: A Case Study
Introduction

“When…the police officer is rolling around the floor of a public house in mud, blood and beer, their inability to cope with violent encounters becomes apparent” (Buttle, 2007, p. 165).

Of any occupation, the police are most exposed to violence (Waddington, Badger, & Bull, 2006) with data from England and Wales alone suggesting 23,000 reported assaults on police officers in 2015/16 (Home Office, 2017). Police safety and use of force decisions are an ongoing source of concern for both the police and the public (Andersen & Gustafsberg, 2016) but research investigating police violence and use of force remains limited (Buttle, 2007).

Indeed, relatively little is known, in comparison to other factors, about police officers’ ability to adequately manage violence or factors that influence this ability (Renden, Nieuwenhuys, Savelsbergh, & Oudejans, 2015a; Renden, Landman, Savelsbergh, & Oudejans, 2015b). Volatile and violent encounters present “complex, multi-faceted and sometimes subtle problems” (Waddington, et al., p.182), but in preparation for violent situations, police officers are trained in a “largely off the shelf” and “rather stereotyped catalogue” (Waddington et al., 2006, p.181) of arrest and self-defence skills (ASDS) – known in the UK as officer safety training (OST). Surprisingly, few studies are concerned specifically with OST and training around use of force (Andersen & Gustafsberg, 2016; Buttle, 2007) and this research looks to address this gap by generating empirical evidence about OST, its content and delivery.

Delivery of OST is based on the experience and preferences of trainers and feedback from officers, rather than a rational analysis of training needs “a case of the blind leading the blind” (Buttle, 2007, p.177) – with little evidence supporting the efficacy of prescribed training regimes (Waddington et al., 2006). Indeed, experiences of officers suggests that they struggled
to apply taught arrest and self-defence techniques (e.g. Jager, Klatt, & Bliesner, 2013; Renden, et al., 2015a) yet paradoxically, officers competent in use of force have a wider range of techniques and use less force than unskilled and often frightened officers who are more likely to use excessive force (e.g. Andersen & Gustafsberg, 2016; Geller & Toch, 1996; Buttle, 2007).

The underlying presumption of OST is that its content and delivery provides all police officers with sufficient experience of conflict and the use of force. In addition, hard-pressed officers and trainers, with insufficient time to reflect deeply on the content and delivery of training, are likely to end up simply reproducing it (Karp & Stenmark, 2011), and in these terms, develop and legitimise practice for compliance purposes (Beighton & Poma, 2015), that is to ‘get officers through’ the requisite training rather than be concerned with training effectiveness. Therefore, there remains a need for empirical research into police training as a means to establish ‘what works’ in a professionalised police force, using the best available evidence; what the College of Policing in the UK describe as ‘evidence based policing’ (College of Policing, 2017; Beighton & Poma, 2015). However, there is limited empirical evidence that examines directly police use of force training (Morrison & Garner, 2011; Staller & Zaiser, 2015) and with little or no evidence base OST remains entirely unproven (Buttle, 2007; Waddington et al., 2006) in terms of the outcomes it produces.

The amount of time and financial resources for police training are limited and OST is time compressed training (refreshed annually over two days, with the time spent on ASDS only between 8 and 12 hours per year (Timmer & Pronk, 2011)). Time spent on task is a key variable in ‘deliberate practice’ (Ericsson, 2014) and is related to instructional design skills, and the skill of the instructor/trainer. Hence training needs to maximise engaged activity. The time spent by officers appropriately成功fully engaged in subject matter-related tasks and having an ‘opportunity to learn’ links with officer achievement and is a process indicator of learning
Importantly, Berliner (1979) argued that teachers (sic instructors) can influence achievement directly by arranging their instruction in ways that maximise the time the learner spends in direct and successful contact with learning tasks. Activity alone is not sufficient, as learners need to have task engagement, and if the task is too easy or too difficult engagement will not be sufficient for learning.

Further, in addition to the skills of the trainer and ‘time on task’, there is a consensus in the police and military literature that the type of practice activities is key, with repeated experiential based practice linked to performing more effectively in situations that requires use of force (e.g. Broome, 2011; Dror, 2007; Miller, 2007; Murray, 2004; Staller & Zaiser, 2015 *inter-alia*). Importantly, Renden et al. (2015a) stated “how individuals train is crucial in skill acquisition” (p.16), hence considering ‘what to teach’ (which techniques or what ‘system’) needs to be balanced with a consideration of ‘how to teach’ (instructor methodology) to ensure officers can apply techniques learned in training in real life situations. Such an approach pushes more responsibility to the trainer who is responsible for considering and deciding about all aspects of the training session (Morrison & Garner, 2011; Staller & Zeiser, 2015) thus making trainer practice worthy of investigation.

Recent work by Renden and colleagues (2015) indicated that police officers wished for more ‘realistic’ training delivered in a way that is “more comparable to the high-pressure situations that officers face in the line of duty” (Renden et al., 2015a, p. 17). Officers describe a difference between their training experiences and incidences of violence which involved increased pressure, (physical, cognitive and emotional) (Staller & Zaiser, 2015) and that occurred in chaotic circumstances (Jager et al., 2013) resulting in perceptual deterioration associated with high stress arousal (Andersen & Gustafsberg, 2016). Training programmes
depend on the transfer of skills learned in the training environment to real world contexts or the ‘criterion environment’. Hence the more representative or ‘real’ the learning environment, the better the transfer of skills from that environment to performance situations (Broadbent, Causer, Williams & Ford, 2015). Indeed, Wheller et al. (2013) Wheller and Morris (2010), and Miller and Alexandrou (2016) identified that ‘modelling behaviours’ through scenario training is more likely to impact ‘street-level’ officer behavior and can improve ‘traditional’ delivery of police training beyond “talking heads” to interactive adult education (Rosenbaum & Lawrence, 2017, p. 319). Currently however, training practices may not simulate the conditions an officer experiences in real-world encounters (Andersen, Pitel, Weerasinghe, Papazoglou, 2016; Waddington et al., 2006). Importantly, from a learning perspective, it is not just the learner’s perception of the ‘reality’ of the training, instead, the “functional alignment with the learning task, the instructional design, and the instructor will have far greater impact in immediate learning, retention and transfer to new settings” (Hamstra et al., 2014, p. 389).

Existing research shows that there remains an important relationship between training room processes and learner achievement; time and activity are tangible and observable process indicators of learning (in OST the skills are movement based and directly observable) – appropriate and successful task engagement (expressed in time or frequency) are widely accepted as ‘proxy’ indicators for learning (Siedentop, 2002a; van der Mars, 2006). Hence, the quality of instruction combined with the type of practice activity undertaken makes a difference to learning achievement and course delivery effectiveness. The purpose of this research therefore, was to provide empirical evidence concerning the structure, organisation, content, and delivery of OST and consider how it is configured to provide adequate time and regularity of practice to deliver its outcomes. The significance of this work lies in providing evidence of current practice and in advancing understanding OST to open discussion about
ways for improving police OST. Until research is conducted on OST that considers its content and delivery specifically, any arguments about its effectiveness or otherwise remain speculative, and training will continue to be organised and conducted without the benefit of objective and empirically based evidence.

6 Methodology

As the research was bounded by a specific time frame, and by a particular case, data were collected using a case study methodology. Berg (2007) defines a case study as “a method involving systematically gathering enough information about a person, social setting, event, or group to permit the researcher to effectively understand how the subject operates or functions” (p. 283). The purpose of the case study reported here was to gather “rich, detailed and in-depth information” (p.283) on a single phenomena and “uncover the manifest interaction of significant factors characteristic of this” (p. 284). Hence case studies are an appropriate methodological approach when the purpose of the study is to understand the ‘case’, in depth. Moreover, and according to Yin (2013) case study is the most appropriate research design to adopt when examining a phenomenon that has previously not been explored. Importantly, the value of case studies to generate context dependent knowledge, with the aim that readers might elicit case knowledge that offers authenticity and transferability (Grunbaum, 2007) and recognise where the ‘case’ aligns with their own biographies and experiences.

This case study was conducted with frontline police officers in a large county constabulary. The case was descriptive and illustrative generating local knowledge about OST. The courses provided the analytical frame with the object being the process and experience of the training (Thomas, 2011). Access was gained to three annual officer-safety training courses.
All UK police officers are required to attend OST annually – the courses are ‘attend only’, and the only assessment is a pass or fail fitness assessment at the beginning of the course. The trainers have a substantial ‘manual’ to guide the training that contains ‘approved’ techniques – the trainers however have considerable latitude to draw from this manual to devise the courses. The courses ran over two days from 8.30am to approximately 4.30pm each day. During the two days all aspects of officer safety training were covered (first aid, self-defence, control and restraint, cell clearance, and scenario training including first aid and law based issues) – though the order of delivery varied for each course.

Methods

Participant observation

Participant observation is “an omnibus field strategy” (Patton, 1990, p.206) in that it “simultaneously combines interviewing of respondents and informants, direct participation observation and introspection” (Denzin, 1978b, p.183). The extent of participation is a continuum that varies from complete immersion as a full participant to complete separation from the setting as a spectator (Patton, 1990). There is a great deal of variation along the continuum between these two extremes and the extent of participation can change over time. In the present study, the researcher took part in the first course as a full participant, to experience the training from a learner’s perspective. In course two and three the researcher only participated in some aspects of the training. For example, taking part in demonstrations or acting as ‘subject’ in scenarios, but was for the majority of the time observing behaviour – an observer participant. Extensive field notes were taken in addition to a ‘time-on-task’ analysis. The fact that the courses were being observed was made apparent to the participant officers and this allowed for informal conversations and interviews about the course and officer
safety training in general during the respective courses. In total, 59 officers attended the three
courses where each course was staffed by two trainers. Two of the trainers delivered twice,
though partnered with a different instructor each time, and hence were observed on two courses
(five of the eight full-time trainers were observed including the ‘lead trainer’). The ratio of staff
to officers varied over the three courses from 2:12 to 2:28.

Time on Task

The timing content and duration of each element of the course was noted to produce an
overview of each course’s ‘micro-structure’, that is the moment-to-moment nature of the
course. Specific attention was paid to what individual officers were doing (activity types) and
with whom (individual, pairs, groups) and what trainers were doing (e.g. giving
instruction/feedback, demonstrating/modelling). This enabled the type and duration of learning
activities to be recorded, as well as giving an insight of the pedagogy employed by the
instructors.

Data Analysis

The data analysis was grounded both conceptually in the ideas and objectives informing the
research. That is, understanding training room processes and learner achievement, as well as
the structure, organisation, content, and delivery of OST. As well as empirically in observations
about relationships in the data. Specifically, the analytic process involved two phases. First, a
data-driven inductive thematic approach was employed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The data were
subject to two main operations: (1) breaking down raw data into meaningful ‘meaning’ units,
such as discrete phrases, sentences or series of sentences that conveyed one idea or one related
set of observations and (2) grouping units with similar meanings into broader categories. This
involved a detailed line-by-line examination of all field notes as well as data concerning the course timings and structure. Second, similar features between meaning units were identified, meaning units were grouped together to organise common meaning units into distinct sub-categories. Sub-categories were named according to the common features that all its meaning units shared. As the data analyses proceeded, a further level of interpretation compared sub-categories to organise them into larger and more inclusive themes. These themes were identified in relation to the aims and purpose of the study and responses presented. For the time on task observations and data this resulted in seven themes that reflected the learning activities undertaken on the course. While for the fieldwork data this resulted in three themes; time on task/practice activities, curriculum content and delivery, gender issues.

Results

As can be seen from table 1 the largest percentage of time on all the courses (on average 54%) was spent watching demonstrations, receiving briefings for tasks and getting feedback on previous practice. These activities were done to the entire group and were always instructor led with the officers as passive receivers. The most common type of practice was working in pairs (on average 28%), though on course one this was shared with group practices.

Analysis and Discussion

Time on Task/Practice Activities

Across all three courses, police officers spent most time passive, standing and listening to briefings, getting feedback on tasks, or watching an instructor demonstration of techniques – in course 3 this was two thirds of the training time, but on average was half the time. Training
methods were exclusively didactic (c.f. Beighton & Poma, 2015) across the three courses, with perfunctory attempts to engage officers with questions or discussion. The instruction, feedback and demonstrations delivered were always directed to the entire group who would typically stand and observe. In addition, individual feedback was scarce despite a range of abilities, experience and competence with the various techniques – and despite the variability in officers’ practice attempts offering numerous ‘teachable’ moments. The following example illustrates something of the considerable variability in officers’ ability and the lack of differentiation in the training to allow more practice for those that needed it.

I’m paired with an officer to practice a ‘transport wrist lock’, this is reasonably fiddly, involving a twisting of the palm to the sky, then rotating the hand between the body and the elbow into the lock. Fortunately, I recognise it as a lock from jujitsu, so I have a couple of successful attempts and we switch. My partner can’t do the lock he fiddles a couple of attempts but can’t put me in the lock. There is an uncomfortable pause while we look at each other. I have to show him how to put the lock on in the absence of any other help. He just about masters the basic mechanics of the lock but time is called on the practice and we are called in and briefed as a group on the next technique. (Field notes)

In the following excerpt a ‘teachable’ moment is missed, and the data illustrates something of the of gender differences (around ‘strength’) apparent on the courses (see also section below ‘Gender Issues’).

A female officer has a male colleague face down on the mat and is pinning them down, trying to manoeuvre their right arm to the ten to two position and keep it straight. This means pressure can be placed on the shoulder joint and the subject ‘pinned’ while the
arm is positioned so a handcuff can be applied. The male subject is resisting this, and is a lot stronger. If he is able to bend at the elbow and place his palm on the mat he can ‘push up’ and the control will be lost. However, no instruction or guidance is given and the female officer is left in a battle of strength and while she holds on or as long as possible, not giving in, the subject eventually, and inevitably wins the battle. (Field notes)

Werth (2011) describes police training methods as traditionally instructor-centric and based in behavioural education ideology. In the present study, this was the case where training was based on a ‘non-cognitive’ behavioural paradigm with instructors, as evidenced by the time-on-task data, talking most of the time in order to share accumulated wisdom, demonstrating simple or part drills (often without repetition), and giving some corrective information in de-briefs. The expectation being that officers would passively absorb said wisdom then imitate the instructor.

Such an approach may result in improvement in some performance in the immediate and short term (Soderstrom & Bjork, 2015) – and is hence appealing to instructors as rewards can seem to be gained immediately, and reinforces a perception of a ‘correct’ teaching approach – but in the long-term performance will decrease particularly when encountering difficult and stressful conditions i.e. learning has not taken place (Soderstrom & Bjork, 2015). This argument is supported by evidence that suggests that under threatening conditions police officer’s performance of ASDS decreases as the training undertaken is insufficient to inhibit stimulus-driven reactions (fear of getting hit) and avoidance behaviours (Renden, et al., 2014)

Curriculum content and delivery

While the course time on task data shows a ‘pattern’ of delivery, each course had considerable variability within each activity, with each course delivered differently, in a different order, and
instances of content variability. For example, ‘control of the subject on the ground’ was practiced for thirty minutes on course one, and included movement and resistance from the subject, it was not covered at all on courses two and three. This was connected to what appeared as a lack of a shared training strategy. While all of the trainers observed were both enthusiastic in their approach and knowledgeable and skilful practitioners in their own right, there did not appear to be a shared training strategy for the courses or between instructors, meaning that the experiences of officers on the course would vary according to which course they attended and which instructor was present.

In the training office prior to the start of the course – the two instructors are drinking tea and discussing what each will cover and who will lead which aspect. There appears to be core elements to be covered but these seem ‘up for grabs’ between the two of them, and the order of the morning changes several times before agreement is reached. (Field notes)

Part of this apparent lack of training strategy was also illustrated through a disconnect between different sections of the course. The curriculum was delivered in blocks where it seemed the content went from topic to topic, self-defence to hand cuffing to use of baton and so on, without the previous topic informing or being integrated with the next.

It’s not clear how the training goes from a self-defence scenario to a control and restraint or take down scenario, these are presented and structured as discrete elements and in different parts of the course, sometimes on different days – in a different part of the course we’re controlling subjects already under control who are passive and do not resist, and cuffing on the floor subjects who have conveniently already laid down, or who are entirely compliant. (Field notes)
It also appeared from the three courses that methods were selected and taught in a piecemeal and disjointed fashion. The trainer’s limited discussions regarding the planning and delivery of the courses and the delivery itself, not unlike practices reported by Kaminski and Martin (2000), did not explicitly consider any criteria of delivery effectiveness (e.g. consideration of structure of practice to ensure the training and maintaining of skills) or outcomes (e.g. developing competent officers) – suggesting that training was in a self-confirming ‘loop’; a cycle which meant that it has failed to keep up with developments in the field. The piecemeal nature of training was also highlighted with officers being taught using a range of methods from different ASDS ‘systems’ with some instructors having a proprietary interest in their use (cf. Kaminski & Martin, 2000).

“We’re looking at multiple attacker, that’s come from (instructor) the techniques are based on (system) and (instructor) does a lot of that training – so it’s good to have different things, different input – we’re looking to get that ‘approved’ and put into the manual.” (Instructor)

“(Instructor) came over from (force), he’s an instructor and also trains and competes in (system). He showed us some techniques that they’re using with (force) training. It was good stuff, he’s trying to get that official, we’re using it here as an option.” (Instructor)

However, the training discourse was not about effectiveness or skill development, but instead was about time pressures and getting officers through the course uninjured rather than about developing highly skilled practitioners.

“We’d like to do a bit more with them, make it a little more realistic, but then you get injuries, or a perception that it will cause injuries, and complaints about the training being too hard.” (Field notes, Instructor)
“There are too many stops and breaks that seem related to ‘health and safety’, it doesn’t produce better or realistic training, which we need. In reality, some staff are just not fit enough, and the organisation doesn’t seem to challenge this and seem more concerned about injuries.” (Field notes, Officer)

The instructor calls time on the practice. An officer remarks to no-one in particular, “is that it, are we done?” Another officer walking past him “yep, that’s it done for another year”. “That’s a relief, box ticked and in one piece” (Field notes)

Narrow views of training risk in fact reinforce operational incompetence if they exclude practices that encourage the development and application of more complex skills (Beighton & Poma, 2015) and hence this overly cautious approach could have the effect of deskilling officers rather than producing officers highly skilled in ASDS.

Realism in Training

In and of themselves, the self-defence and control and restraint techniques seemed appropriate and adequate. However, all of the OST observed lacked realism and instead took place under isolated and low-pressure conditions, were conducted under predictable circumstances and were linear, both literally (in a straight line) and contextually (situation a moved to b moved to c). This limited realism to practice meant that techniques were not connected or transferred across the scenarios trained – thus missing an opportunity to layer or reinforce learning from different parts of the course.

The self-defence techniques advocated against a ‘haymaker’ punch, tackle and bear hug in the main are effective, but are out of context. There is no context to the scenario, no verbal exchange and ‘ramping up’ of the situation before the attack. The subject provides
a prescribed attack at a comfortable speed and always in a linear fashion from the same
direction – head on. (Field notes)

As these officers observed:

“Having fun in training is important, but the training needs to have more realism,
and examples that we come across in communities.”

“It’s fine having practical techniques, but you need to learn to use them under stress,
and make mistakes in training, not on the street.”

“The training just isn’t realistic enough, the latest trend out there is MMA (mixed
martial arts) fighting, and I’m dealing with people who are better trained than I am.”

The reality for police officers performing in violent situations, is increased pressure,
(physical, cognitive and emotional) (Staller & Zaiser, 2015), and chaotic circumstances. In
contrast to the OST observed and as Jager et al. (2013) suggest, “the attackers don’t stand
around and attack you stupidly, they charge at you, its chaos” (p. 346).

All of the data sources pointed to a lack of realism in OST that did not deal with the surprising
character, aggressiveness and demanding nature of violent situations, an issue that could be
addressed with more realistic training. The officers that were interviewed in the present study
agreed that if OST were more reality based they would feel less anxious dealing with resistive
or violent situations, that their performance in these situations would improve, and they would
feel more confident in using force in such situations as this example suggests:

“I’d definitely feel more confident in dealing with situations, knowing I’d been through
similar examples in training. I’d know that things work under pressure, that I work under
pressure, make good decisions and be better able to apply force and use the correct
techniques” (Officer – interview).

Linked to training realism was the low level of engagement with practice with some officers
often practicing a technique just once in the allotted time, rather than taking the opportunity to
practice.

We’re in pairs to practice the last technique demonstrated – after one or two repetitions
the practice stops and the groups are standing around talking and not doing practice
repetitions. After a minute or so the instructor interjects “carry on getting your reps in”.
Some groups practice the technique just once in that block. (Field notes)

This, in the main, was down to the ‘blocked’ nature of practice, that is, practice one technique
at a time in the same way – so if the technique to be practiced was deemed too easy, or the
perception from officers was ‘they could do it’ the likelihood of engagement with the task
repetitions was low. Given this relatively low level of engaged activity and the limited amount
of repetitions combined with the ecologically weak practice conditions (lack of realism), that
research suggests will makes it less likely that police officers will perform in high-pressure
situations on duty (c.f. Renden et al., 2015, 2014, Jager et al., 2013). The following data further
highlights something of the unrealistic training conditions – cell clearance techniques not in a
cell.

The far-left corner of the sports hall has two ‘padded walls’. Mats are placed on the floor
in the corner and this is used to replicate a cell and is used for practicing dealing with an
aggressive subject in a cell, cell entry and extraction. However, the practice cell has only
two walls and no door or doorframe. Teams of five officers deal with the subject in turn
– depending on numbers this resulted in up to twenty officers sitting out waiting their
turn. Today, on this course, the practice cell area is not used, but mats placed on the floor
to represent a cell area. All the groups are working, but this ‘cell’ has no walls or door,
so the practice starts with the team already in the ‘cell’ and the subject on the floor, with
officers walking in and out of the ‘cell’ through what would be the walls. (Field notes)

Skill transfer can be fostered in a range of practice activities in the training
environment, however a simulation of reality (via scenario based training) is the only viable
way of testing the effectiveness of technical skills and tactical solutions to problems
encountered in the field (Staller & Zaiser, 2015) – for police OST this must include surprise
attacks (timing and direction), aggressiveness and increasing amounts of pressure (physical,
cognitive and emotional) (Jager et al., 2013; Jensen & Wrisberg, 2014). Practicing using sober,
pain-compliant police officers playing the, often passive, role of suspect in the low pressure
and controlled environment of the gymnasium, as was the case in the present study, creates a
false sense of achievement for officers and instructors (Soderstrom & Bjork, 2015). Therefore,
the evidence in this case suggests that training should be more reality based and sufficiently
specific in order to simulate the eventual performance environment and maximise its effects
(Murray, 2004; Nieuwenhuys et al., 2009).

Gender Issues

OST is a form of training that is very focused and specific in that it attempts to transmit a series
of skills and techniques, however, in addition to its overt curriculum, an informal or ‘hidden
curriculum’ exists in police training which socialises officer’s attitudes, values and
expectations (Cooper, 2009; Prokos & Padavic, 2002). Work by Prokos and Padavic (2002)
has demonstrated how the hidden curriculum in police training is powerful in constructing and
reinforcing notions of masculinity, and can demean and objectify women. The current research
surfaced a particular hidden curriculum that was expressed through and impacted OST, around notions of masculinity and gender. While a distinctive occupational subculture (Waddington, 1999) in this case seemed to show OST contributing to an aspect of that subculture promoting masculine values that engendered particular views of women and their role as police officers (Franklin, 2005; Dick & Jankowicz, 2001). In the present study, female officers were underrepresented on the courses and an informal differentiation occurred during the training that served to demarcate them as ‘other’ and for some was the basis, of the devaluation of women officers.

After listening to the briefing and watching a demonstration the group divides itself to practice. The female officers, as a minority on the course, work together throughout, and are pretty much left to get on with it themselves. (Field notes)

The female officers work together without any rotation – and get no practice with anyone other than female officers. On this course, the female officers are referred to as the ‘lady’s group’ – which seemed to be an ongoing joke for some participants “lady’s that lunch”, “lady’s on a tea break” – the constant referral to this group seemed to epitomise some attitudes towards female officers. (Field notes)

Course trainers across the three courses did nothing to address this demarcation that served as a vehicle to highlight differences between the sexes on the courses, and importantly such differentiation when left unabated can become the basis for devaluation in hierarchical systems (Reskin, 1988).

Women’s presence on the course seemed to serve for some as a foil in the construction of boundaries between men and women and was used as a means to elevate men’s status (cf. Prokos & Padavic, 2002) as these data suggest:
One officer has been particularly aggressive during the drills he is sweating and his
demeanour suggests that he appears to be enjoying the physical contact both as a ‘subject’
and as an officer. The group is paired off to practice defending a rugby tackle/bear hug.
For the first time on the course, the females are paired to practice with males. The
aggressive officer has been partnered with a female officer. The pairs are about 5 metres
apart, the instructor signals to go. The ‘subjects’ approach the officers and attempt an
attack. The aggressive officer charges the female who does not use the technique to
defend against this attack. He tackles her and lifts her up onto his shoulders and starts
walking round the gym carrying her – the group explode into laughter, including the
instructors. Shouts of “health and safety” along with laughter fill the room. The
aggressive officer puts the female officer down. There is no instruction or re-instruction,
or demonstration of the correct technique. I’m left wondering how the ‘lifted officer’
feels about the efficacy of the technique and what messages this moment has sent to her
as well as the remainder of the group, not only about the technique but about the
capabilities of female officers to deal with violent situations. (Field notes)

From the behaviour exhibited throughout the training, it was clear that the aggressive
officer in this case wished to elevate his own status and demonstrate hyper-masculinity
(Franklin, 2005) to the group through his confrontational and aggressive approach to all the
drills. At the same time, these actions, with the instructors unwitting complicity, served to
devalue an individual female officer demarcating her as ‘other’. Highlighting the physical
differences between the sexes in this way produced inequality and reinforced notions that
men are superior to females – confirming the masculine nature of the job and that females
are unfit for it (Prokos & Padavic, 2002). For female officers, these issues acted to
exacerbate the issues and limitations of the training, while reifying notions of female weakness and a lack of respect for women’s abilities.

The group is practicing cell clearances. The mock cell (padded corner of the gym) is being used. A subject plus five officers are taking part the remainder of the group about 23 officers are sitting on benches organised in an ‘L’ shape observing. The cell clearance team consist of one officer for each arm, one for head and torso, and one for legs who is required to be on their knees and ‘wrap up’ the subject’s legs around the knees. The practice begins ‘passively’, with the subject allowing each officer to take their positions before he resists. The last person to take up position is the leg officer, who is female. Because she has approached from directly in front rather than off to the side (which is to avoid getting kicked), she is now kneeling in front of the subject’s groin. At this point, a few calls go out from the observing group, “oh ‘ello”, “Oi, Oi”, then there’s laughter from the observing officers. Some are not laughing however, but look to the ground, but they don’t say or do anything. The instructor’s wait also not saying anything and one eventually walks into the ‘cell’ and moves the leg officer into the correct position – the laughter continues. (Field notes)

At best this type of incident is demeaning, at worst sexual harassment. In training, these types of behaviour contributed to a hidden curriculum that served to disparage female officers through both physical and verbal denigration as well as objectifying them (Prokos & Padavic, 2002). Moreover, the lack of action taken by ranking officers on the course, as well as the course instructors, could send and reinforce the message to all officers that such behaviour is condoned by the institution. The association of violence, masculinity and females in policing is an element of police culture that warrants further investigation – and
certainly the impact of this relationship on the essential element of officer training. Indeed, one female officer commented “not much intimidates me but there’s something about these courses (OST) that scares me, which probably isn’t the objective of the course”. The findings in this case suggest that this relationship further undermines the effectiveness of this training while also doing little to challenge barriers faced by women officers.

Lastly, the structuring of the courses meant that women officers, with few exceptions, practiced techniques against each other, being denied the opportunity to practice against bigger, stronger or more experienced subjects – thus, as the data has suggested, appearing less competent (to themselves, colleagues and to the trainers). While individual trainer attention was limited overall, women officers received less and sometimes no individual attention. Given these experiences of training it is perhaps unsurprising that the women officer respondents on the courses felt less confident using OST techniques. These participants reported negative reflections and comments suggesting that they would try to avoid violent situations, and commenting on their use of force being too little or too late: “I should have been better at using these skills”, or “I’m just not confident at going in and I end up not using enough force”. Interestingly, like data from the male officers interviewed they suggested that more reality-based training would improve their confidence, reduce anxiety and improve their performance in resistive or violent situations.

**Conclusions & Recommendations for Practice**

*Considering existing training structures*

Developing training environments that ensure the development of officers competent in the use of force is crucial in police officer training and in meeting an ethical ideal of how police officers use force (Neyroud & Beckley, 2001; Buttle, 2007). There is support in the literature for more
training (e.g., Buttle, 2007; Renden et al., 2015) and recognition from the interviewed officers in this case of the benefits of this. However, in the current political and economic climate increases in frequency and duration of OST is unlikely. Thus, it is essential that training delivery offers the maximum opportunity that is realistically possible to ensure skill transfer and learning. However, research on the performance of officers in conflict situations supported by comments from training observed and the officers interviewed in this case suggests that training falls short as it is not sufficiently realistic to allow officers to over-ride their stimulus driven reactions and avoidance behaviours (cf. Andersen & Gustafsberg, 2016). Therefore, given this, and the findings from the present study there is a need to ask if the current training delivery results in officers sufficiently prepared to manage violence during their work. While more practice leads to more automated skill execution (Renden et al., 2015), OST course observations illustrated a number of issues including a lack of realistic training, limited time on task, and poor engagement with tasks during training. Instructors bemoaned the lack of training time “you only get a day and a half a year, some of you just a day”, however, the time-on-task data suggests current available training time is not maximised.

The findings from the present study highlight a need to maximise practice time-on-task, which includes reality-based practice under pressure. Training under more threatening or pressured circumstances is effective at inhibiting avoidance behaviour and maintaining goal-directed behaviour (Renden et al., 2014; Nieuwenhuys & Oudejans, 2012). Optimal training must include dynamic processes, training the necessary skills in an increasingly stressful and realistic environment; and providing opportunities for increasing one’s confidence in his or her ability to perform during stress (cf. Andersen & Gustafsberg, 2016). However, training under pressure involves increased physical demand, with the interview and observational data in this case suggesting a perception that this would lead to more injuries. As a result, a risk-averse
training culture appears to have evolved that has a focus on ‘getting people through’ – and as Waddington et al. (2006) suggests such provision “discharges organisational obligations for ‘due diligence’” (p. 183) without addressing evidence of training effectiveness.

An alternative approach – reality-based training

In developing more reality-based training one possible route to explore involves the so called ‘reflex based’ or ‘flinch response’; instinctive reflexes to protect the body (Cobb & Pincus, 2003; Hulsof & Spapens, 2014; Renden, Savelsberg & Oudejans, 2017). Training that teaches officers to convert their primary reflexes into tactical responses and practicing these in representative scenario-based training has been shown to improve police officer performance in high pressure arrest situations (e.g. Cobb & Pincus, 2003; Hulsof & Spapens, 2014; Renden et al., 2017). Suggesting that “reflex-based self-defence training better prepares officers for performing in high-pressure arrest situations than the current form of police arrest and self-defence skills training” (Renden et al., 2017, p. 669)

Therefore, rather than append different aspects and techniques to the existing programme ‘structure’ a revision to a more integrated training could be considered – including dialogic training approaches based on problem solving and representative scenarios repeated under increasing pressure. Officers need to accumulate experience by performing skills under complicated circumstances, as can be suggested from the findings of the present study time and effort are wasted when movements are trained in a simple and ‘blocked’ way (Soderstrom, & Bjork, 2015), hence training strategy is an important contributor to performance and learning. Training strategy could also consider taking a more cyclical approach to carrying out, reviewing and evaluating tasks rather than the current model of front-loaded presentation/demonstration by instructors and reproduction and repetition (or not) by officers.
Given the consistency of the pedagogy employed by different instructors in the training observed, it would suggest a ‘way of training’ has evolved, based on the instructor’s own training and on perceptions of ‘what training should look like’ and ‘what works’. The instructors, as suggested, are time pressed and have limited time for reflection on their own practice and are therefore constrained and limited by what they know. Hence, further research is required that reviews instructor training provision, to fill the gaps for instructors and those responsible for training with the latest developments in the training of ASDS, and more innovative pedagogy for the delivery of such training.

Addressing the ‘hidden curriculum

Lastly, the present study identified some elements of negative police culture, namely evidence of sexism. In this case, these issues exacerbated factors that impacted negatively on training effectiveness for female officers. In the design of OST more critical thought is required about how the course is structured (grouping of officers), and how ASDS is practiced and feedback provided – so female officers have the necessary practice (with male and female subjects) and corrective feedback so to not appear and feel less competent (to themselves, other officers and instructors). It is also important for all participants in OST to consider how their behaviour contributes to a ‘hidden curriculum’ constructing notions of masculinity and acts to reinforce notions of women officers as different, inferior and objectified.
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