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1. ***INTRODUCTION***

**MY BACKGROUND IS 40 YEARS IN POLICE RESEARCH / EDUCATION** **& 30 YEARS IN THE MANAGEMENT AREA PRIMARILY IN UK, US & NETHERLANDS (HOOGENBOOM & PUNCH: 2011)**

**CURRENTLY I`M DEEPLY DISTURBED ABOUT STATE OF POLICING & MANAGERIAL STYLE / CHANGE PROCESS IN POLICING & OTHER SERVICES**

**MY SPECIFIC CONCERN HERE IS WITH POLICE RESEARCH / CHANGE & ESPECIALLY EMPHASIS ON EBP / EVIDENCE BASED POLICING & EBR / EVIDENCE BASED RESEARCH**

**I DRAW ON TWO BOOKS:**

* ***THE PURSUIT OF ABSOLUTE INTEGRITY* BY ANECHIARICO & JACOBS: ON ETHICAL CODES IN NEW YORK PROMOTING ETHICAL CONDUCT BUT UNDERMINED BY EXTENSIVE RULES CREATING OWN PATHOLOGY OF UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR – UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF (WELL-MEANING) CHANGE (POPPER – “GREATER THE CHANGE ----- etc.”)**
* ***GURU SCHEMES & AMERICAN DREAMS BY KNIGHTS & McCABE: MAINTAINING THAT MANAGEMENT DISCOURSE IS DOMINATED BY (US) GURUS WITH UNSUBSTANTIATED “SCHEMES” FOR INSATIABALE AUDIENCE IN WISH-FULFILLMENT INDUSTRY***
1. ***SOCIAL “SCIENCE”*?**

**WE ARE *NOT* A SCIENCE: WE DO NOT HAVE THEORIES\* OR LAWS & CANNOT *MEASURE*! HENCE DIFFICULTY ON VALIDITY & RELIABILITY & RARELY REPLICATION**

**\*I BECOME ENRAGED IF STUDENTS, OR SERIOUSLY MISGUIDED COLLEAGUES, WRITE OF “BROKEN WINDOWS [B. W.] *THEORY*” [MORE ON THIS BELOW]**

**NATURAL SCIENCES FUNCTION WITHIN WIDELY HELD PARADIGMS (KUHN) WHEREAS SOCIAL SCIENCES ARE DRIVEN MORE BY FADS & FASHIONS – ALSO BY STATUS DESIRE TO BE SEEN AS “SCIENTIFIC” MEANING THEORY & QUANTIFICATION**

**e. g. I WAS ORIGINALLY TAUGHT PARSONIAN FUNCTIONALISM – NO LONGER EVEN MENTIONED – BUT TURNED TO ETHNOGRAPHY WHICH WAS SEEN AS BOTH UNTHEORETICAL & LACKING QUANTIFIABLE DATA**

**THEN THE MARXISTS (OF DIVERSE PLUMAGE) MOVED IN, DISMISSED POLICE RESEARCH & SAW ME AS A LACKEY OF THE REPRESSIVE STATE APPARATUS!**

**AND NOW THE NAME OF THE GAME IS EBR / RCTs**

**WE CAN TRACE OUR CAREERS & CHART CHANGES IN APPROACHES, THEMES & LEADING LIGHTS IN RECENT DECADES: SO WHAT GETS STUDIED & ACCEPTED DEPENDS ON TIME, PLACE, PERSONALITIES, FUNDING AND NETWORKS/ COTERIES + “FLAVOUR OF THE MONTH” THEMES**

**SHOULD TAKE SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE APPROACH TO OUR DISCIPLINE TO EXPLAIN WHAT GETS RESEARCHED, FINANCED, PUBLISHED & WHY & WITH WHAT PERSPECTIVES IN POLICING & WIDER CRIMINAL JUSTICE (e. g. IMPACT OF GENDER)**

**SO WHAT SORT OF “SCIENTISTS” ARE WE? WE ARE (I SAY) SOCIAL HISTORIANS / CRITICAL CHRONICLERS OF SOCIAL LIFE & AND CHANGE WITH DISCOMFORTING MESSAGE – “IT AIN`T NECESSARILY SO” OR “IT ALL DEPENDS”**

**ALSO ANYONE WHO WAS DONE FIELD-WORK IN ANY ORGANIZATION - BUT ESPECIALLY POLICING - WITNESSES THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF REALITY: PEOPLE ARE CONTINUALLY & CREATIVELY MAKING CHOICES WITH VOCABULARIES OF MOTIVE & MANIPULATION OF ACCOUNTS**

**THERE ARE THEN ORGANIZATIONAL LAYERS, SUBCULTURES & AN UNDERCULTURE IN AN OCCUPATIONAL / MORAL MATRIX: BEHIND THE FRONT THERE`S “BACKSTAGE” (GOFFMAN) WHERE NOTHING IS WHAT IT SEEMS**

**AGAINST THAT STANCE IS THE DESIRE FOR STATUS RELATED POSITIONING OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AS *SCIENCE* – HENCE PROVIDING CONVINCING EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE ON SOCIAL ISSUES – MEDICAL RESEARCH AS MODEL**

***3. MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL***

**ORGANIZATIONS ARE TYPICALLY GEARED TO CONTROL, CONTINUITY, REPUTATION, PERFORMANCE & PREDICTABILITY**

**MANAGEMENT AS DISCIPLINE EMERGED IN FRANCE IN THE MID-19TH CENTURY WITH RAPID INDUSTRIALIZATION: MAIN CONCERN WAS PRODUCTIVITY OF THE WORK-FORCE - PRECUSOR OF “TIME AND MOTION” STUDIES**

**THE MAJOR EXPONENT LATER WAS THE AMERICAN FREDERICK TAYLOR OF “SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT” - WORKERS WERE INDIVIDUAL INSTRUMENTS TO BE DRIVEN BY REWARDS TO MAXIMUM PERFORMANCE**

**COUNTERPART WAS “HUMAN RELATIONS” WHICH WAS FOCUSED ON SOCIAL RELATIONS IN GROUPS, IMPACT OF MANAGEMENT STYLES ON PERFORMANCE & ABILITY OF GROUPS TO MANIPULATE THEIR ENVIRONMENT**

**IN DIVERSE FORMS THESE TWO PERSPECTIVES PERMEATE MANAGEMENT THINKING & PRACTICE: RUNNING THROUGH MANAGEMENT PRACTICE, MOREOVER, IS A DESIRE FOR ORDER, CONTROL & PREDICTABILITY**

**PROBLEM IS THESE ARE DIFFICULT TO DEFINE AND ACHIEVE: e. g. BEST-SELLING *IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE* (PETERS & WATERMAN: 1982) WAS BIBLE FOR 1980s EXECUTIVES - BUT WITHIN FEW YEARS HALF OF FIRMS LAUDED IN DEEP TROUBLE: SOME LATER MEGA-SUCCESFUL COMPANIES HIT ROUGH WATERS IF NOT BANKRUPTCY & CRIMINAL COURTS / PRISON**

**IN SHORT ORDER, CONTROL, CONTINUITY, PREDICTABILITY & SUCCESS ARE ENDLESSLY PROBLEMATIC FOR MANY ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERS**

**HENCE OBSESSIVE SEARCH FOR MAGIC BULLET WITH INSATIABLE APPETITE FOR “QUICK FIX”: MEGA BEST-SELLERS – *ONE MINUTE MANAGER* (13 million!) & *WHO MOVED MY CHEESE*? (26 million IN 37 LANGUAGES!!) – RISE OF GURUS SELLING SOLUTIONS GLOBALLY**

**1980s ONWARDS TRANSFER OF MANAGERIALISM TO PUBLIC SERVICES – RISE OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT / NPM**

***4. NEO-LIBERALISM, NPM & EVIDENCE BASED POLICY***

**FROM BLAIR`s NEW LABOUR INTO CAMERON`s CONSERVATIVE GOVERNMENTS EMPHASIS ON “REFORM” OF SERVICES: PERFORM BETTER + CUT COSTS – STRONG PRESSURE FOR RESULTS**

**ONE ELEMENT HAS BEEN TURN TO EVIDENCE BASED POLICY – NEAR MANIC BUZZWORD (LOUISE CASEY`S SPEECH!)\* – & IN UK WIERD ADMIRATION FOR AMERICANS & US CRIMINAL JUSTICE (BRATTON AS ICON, PCCs FROM SHERIFFS, etc.) BECAUSE TOUGH ON CRIME**

**\*In January 2003 Casey became head of the** [**Anti-Social Behaviour Unit**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-Social_Behaviour_Order) **at the** [**Home Office**](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Home_Office)**. During an after-dinner speech at a private function in June 2005, she said ------ "There is an obsession with evidence-based policy. If No 10 says bloody evidence-based policy to me one more time I'll deck one of them and probably get unemployed."**

**THEN SHERMAN OFFERED CAMBRIDGE CHAIR & STRONGLY PROMOTES EBR HERE – HIS FOCUS SINCE 1980s AT POLICE FOUNDATION, MARYLAND & PENN – LEADING EXPONENT OF EBR / “EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY”**

**SHERMAN (CAMBRIDGE), LAYCOK (UCL), MAZEROLLE (QUEENSLAND), WEISBRUD & MASTROFSKI (GEORGE MASON) ESPECIALLY INFLUENTIAL**

**I AM NOT AGAINST EBR – IT CAN BE VALUABLE ACADEMIC RESEARCH & AS PART OF POLICE REFORM AGENDA – BUT I`M SCEPTICAL OF ITS PRETENTIONS, CONCERNED ABOUT ITS POSITIONING WITHIN OUR DISCIPLINE & WORRIED ABOUT ITS “MISUSE” BY POLITICIANS & PRACTITIONERS**

**THERE ARE ALSO CERTAIN METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES ABOUT RTCs / EBR & AND ABOUT THE VALIDITY OF THE MEDICAL MODEL [I`LL NOT EXPAND AS DOUBTLESS COVERED BY OTHER SPEAKERS]**

**IDEALLY, MEDICINE IS DRIVEN BY RCTs & DOUBLE BLIND EXPERIMENTS, IMPLYING CERTAINTY & UNIFORMITY: YET MUCH RESEARCH CONDUCTED IN INDUSTRIAL LABS (POTENTIAL BIAS) WHILE “BIG PHARMA” IS AGGRESSIVE IN MARKETING PRODUCTS EVEN WHEN NEGATIVE SIDE EFFECTS EVIDENT (PUNCH: 1966)**

**THEN MANY DOCTORS DON’T READ THE JOURNALS OR FOLLOW ALL THE GUIDELINES BUT RELY ON “CRAFT” KNOWLDEGE - EVEN RESISTANT TO CHANGE (SHERMAN : 1998)**

**ALSO 1800 PEOPLE DIE p. a. IN DUTCH HOSPITALS DUE TO MISTAKES: & THIRD CAUSE OF DEATH IN US IS MEDICAL ERROR: SO MEDICAL EBR DOES NOT ELIMINATE HUMAN / CORPORATE ERROR & IS NOT UNIVERSALLY IMPLEMENTED**

**5. *SOME CRITICAL ISSUES WITH EBR***

**CONFLUENCE BETWEEN NEO-LIBERAL THRUST OF GOVERNMENT & EBR EXPONENTS? RISK OF CONFLATION OF POLITICAL, ACADEMIC AND CORPORATE INTERESTS?**

**GOVERNMENT OBSESSION WITH CRIME REDUCTION: DESPITE *EVIDENCE* THAT CRIME IS FALLING – POLITICIANS CHERRY-PICK FINDINGS & IGNORE INCONVENIENT CONCLUSIONS**

**e. g. THERESA MAY: POLICE NOT “SOCIAL WORKERS” & ONLY JOB IS “CUT CRIME” – FLIES IN FACE OF 50 YEARS OF RESEARCH (STARTING WITH BITTNER: 1967 & PUNCH: 1979):**

**ALSO SOLID BODY OF “EVIDENCE” THAT POLICE CAN`T DO MUCH ABOUT REDUCING CRIME (REINER: 2007 & 2010 & SKOGAN & FRYDL: 2004)**

**YET GOVT. FUNDING OF EBR PRIMARILY GEARED TO CRIME CONTROL: DANGER OF MONOPOLY THAT EXCLUDES OTHER RESEARCH & CO-OPTION BY CRIME FIGHTING LOBBY**

**EBR AT TIMES VALUABLE BUT CONFINED TO SPECIFIC AREAS – BUT HOW MANY RCTs HAVE THERE BEEN & TO WHAT EFFECT?**

**DOMINANCE OF CAMBRIGE, SHERMAN & ACOLYTES (NOT UNUSUAL IN ACADEMIA- “SCHOOLS”, HEADED BY DOMINANT FIGURE): INCESTUOUSNESS, SECT-LIKE “TRUE BELIEVERS” – STOCKHOLM LIKE “MORMONS” – AND AS IF EBR ONLY “REAL” RESEARCH**

**YET INCAPABLE OF CONTRIBUTING TO SIGNIFICANT AREAS OF POLICING – PUBLIC ORDER, CORRUPTION, MISUSE OF FORCE, DISASTER MANAGEMENT, HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS (SAVILLE, N. IRELAND): ESPECIALLY COVERT PRACTICES & SPONTANEOUS EVENTS: YET THESE RAISE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES REGARDING STATE, ABUSE OF POWER, ACCOUNTABILITY, ETC.**

**THEN THERE ARE ISSUES OF TRANSFER / IMPLEMENTATION AS WELL AS MISUSE / MIS-INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS**

**QUESTIONABLE IF POLICE ORGANIZATION / CULTURE IS OPEN TO EBR / EBP: e. g. HONEY`S THESIS [PORTSMOUTH] ON “MET” WHERE IN-HOUSE RESEARCH IGNORED & RESEARCH-BASED STRATEGIC POLICY UNIT WAS MARGINALIZED & UNDERFUNDED [BETSY STANKO WOULD DOUBTLESS DISPUTE THIS & PERHAPS FULLER STORY TO BE TOLD – ALAS IT`S NOT IN STANKO & DAWSON: 2016: ARE THERE MORE POSITIVE EXAMPLES ELSEWHERE?]**

**ANOTHER LIMITING FACTOR IS UNANTICIPATED CONSEQUENCES OF POLICY CHANGE: e. g. *MINNEAPOLIS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EXPERIMENT* (SHERMAN & BERK: 1982): CONCLUDED THERE SHOULD BE ROUTINE ARREST OF THE OFFENDER (USUALLY MALE) TO BRING DOWN PARTNER VICTIMIZATION: LED TO WIDESPREAD ADOPTION OF THIS MANDATORY ARREST POLICY DOMESTICALLY & ABROAD**

**THE UNANTICIPATED CONSEQUENCE WAS THAT POLICY LED TO *MORE* PARTNER VICTIMIZATION IN MORE VIOLENT CASES & NOT LESS: SHERMAN SINCE STATED THAT THE ORIGINAL POLICY IMPLICATION IS NOT SOUND & MANDATORY LAWS ARE “UNWISE AND SHOULD BE REPEALED” (BOWLING: 2006)**

**IN FACT IMPLEMENTATION OF RESEARCH BY COPS HAD LED TO FOCUS ON LESS VIOLENT CASES: SHERMAN HAD EVEN WARNED ABOUT THIS - BUT POLICE IN US & UK ALMOST UNIVERSALLY & UNCRITICALLY ADOPTED FINDINGS**

**ANOTHER DISTORTION OF RESEARCH WAS THE FALL IN REPORTED CRIME IN NEW YORK DURING THE “BROKEN WINDOWS” ERA FROM THE MID-1990s ONWARDS. THIS EVEN BECAME DOMINANT POLICE PARADIGM OF RECENT DECADES IN US. IT WAS BASED ON A DUBIOUS EXPERIMENT BY ZIMBARDO AND LED TO FOCUS ON LOW-LEVEL STREET CRIME & “NUISANCES”. IT WAS PROMOTED BY KELLING (AN ACADEMIC & CONSULTANT TO NYPD), POLICE CHIEF BRATTON & MAYOR GUILIANI (PUNCH: 2006)**

**ALSO REFERRED TO AS “ZERO TOLERANCE” IT BROUGHT WORLD-WIDE ATTENTION TO NYPD AND MUCH COPYING BECAUSE OF CRIME DROP: FALL WAS HAPPENING ANYWAY AND WAS REINFORCED BY INTIMIDATION FROM ABOVE, NON-REPORTING OF OR DOWNGRADING OF CRIMES AND MASSIVELY MANIPULATING DATA (ETERNO AND SILVERMAN: 2012)**

**IT CAN BE ARGUED THAT THIS POLICY BOLSTERED BY FLAWED DATA LED TO FOCUS ON LOW-LEVEL OFFENCES, PRESSURE TO PRODUCE, REWARD FOR PRODUCTIVITY & MORE ASSSERTIVE POLICING. LOOKING FOR EASY HITS FOSTERED UNDUE ATTENTION TO YOUNG FROM MINORITIES FOSTERING THE ALIENATION WE SEE IN US SOCIETY WITH DISCRIMINATION & UNDUE VIOLENCE: ALL THIS SOCIETAL MAYHEM STEMMED FOM A DUBIOUS “EXPERIMENT”**

**BUT BEHIND B. W. METAPHOR WAS TOUGH CRIME CONTROL POLICY FOCUSING ON POOR & OUT-GROUPS: ALOS MANAGERIAL MODEL WITH PRESSURE FROM ABOVE, SCRUTINY OF SENIOR OFFICERS WITH SOMETIMES PUBLIC HUMILIATION IF NOT DISMISSAL, FIXATION ON STATS, QUOTAS FOR COPS AND NUMBERS ABOVE SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY – COMBINATION OF US HARD-LINE BUSINESS, SPORT COACH “BEATING ASS” & GOOD OLD SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT: AND PEOPLE FROM ALL OVER THE WORLD CAME TO SEE AND COPY THIS “MIRACLE”**

**SO A PERVERSION TO SPEAK OF BW “THEORY” AND EBP HERE: ILLUSTRATES THAT IN SOME CONTEXTS RESEARCH & FINDINGS ARE MERELY TOOLS IN SOCIO-POLITICAL ARENAS TO BE QUOTED AND MISQOUTED PER OCCASION – SIMILAR IN BUSINESS**

**THEN LABOUR & CONSERVATIVE MINISTERS PARADED BRATTON AROUND AS A POTENTIAL MET COMMISSIONER!: THE POLICE FEDERATION WAS LAMBASTED BY ONE HOME SECETARY BECAUSE THE NYPD HAD CUT CRIME & “WHY COULDN`T THEY DO THE SAME?**

***6. CONCLUSION***

“**If it works in New York it will work anywhere” (Bratton)**

**AT ONE LEVEL THERE ARE SMART PEOPLE WORKING ON POLICE & CHANGE WITH SOUND MOTIVES, RATIONAL AIMS AND RELYING ON EBR OR OTHER SOURCES OF DATA FOR POLICY MAKING: CAN BE PERSONALLY DEDICATED TO PUBLIC CAUSE + ETHICAL SELF-PERCEPTION: SAME IN CORPORATIONS – SOME VERY IMPRESSIVE PEOPLE**

**AT ANOTHER LEVEL, YOU HAVE THE (BARELY) HIDDEN AGENDAS OF POLITICAL PARTIES, POLITICIANS, GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, SENIOR POLICE: TO ACHIEVE RESULTS, TO SCORE IN THE MEDIA, TO OUTDO RIVALS, etc.**

**LEADS TO DIRTY TRICKS, MISUSE OF RESEARCH, LEAKS TO MEDIA, SEARCH FOR CATCH PHRASES AND ADOPTION OF GURUS PLYING SWIFT SOLUTIONS: DARK, CYNICAL SIDE OF POLITICAL & ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE:**

**HENCE UNCRITICAL ACCEPTANCE OF NY “MIRACLE”: THREE MAIN PLAYERS ASSOCIATED WITH CRIME DROP HAD HUGE EGOS, HIGH AMBITION, NOT ADVERSE TO PUBLICITY & MONEY: AGE OF CELEBRITY POLICE CHIEFS, ACADEMICS AS MERCENARY CONSULTANTS, QUICK FIX SOLUTIONS FOR A GULLIBLE, GLOBAL AUDIENCE DEMANDING OFF-THE- SHELF / “ONE SIZE FITS ALL” PRODUCTS**

**ONE ELEMENT OF THAT IS UNDERLYING UNCERTAINTY WITH SEARCH FOR CONTROL: EARLY INTRODUCTION OF PATROL CARS WITH RADIOS WAS DRIVEN BY SCIENTIFIC MANGEMENT / TAYLORISM & DESIRE TO CONTROL POLICE WORK & OFFICERS: SIMILAR MESSAGE FROM SHERMAN MUCH LATER (1998)**

* **Federal rules could also require police departments to appoint a certified police criminologist (either internally or in partnership with a university or research organization), who would become the agency’s evidence cop ---- the departmental criminologist would be responsible for putting research into practice, then evaluating the results. Whether the criminologist is actually an employee or a university professor working in partnership with the police may not matter as much as the role itself. The criminologist could help develop more effective guidelines for preventing repeat offending, and could develop expected versus actual repeat offending data by offense type for each police district or detective unit. A criminologist could add the scientific method to the NYPD Compstat process --- providing statistics at each meeting on each patrol district’s crime trends and patterns (or even its complaints against police officers) in relation to the district’s risk level. Building the capacity to import, apply, and create evidence within each police agency may be an essential ingredient in the success of this paradigm. We may also find that the traditional distance between researchers and police officials shrinks when researchers provide more immediate managerial information. Criminologists have long refused to provide police managers with data on particular officers, deeming it contrary to the ethics of basic research --- By finally providing the data in a scientifically reasonable format, criminologists may become far more effective at pushing research into practice.**

**DISPLAYS FAITH IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & CERTIFICATION (RECENTLY “ALL COPS BE GRADUATES”): SLIDES OVER DIFFERENCE POLICE EMPLOYEE & EXTERNAL STAFF (FROM ACADEMIA OR PRIVATE FIRM), MANIPULATION & DISTORTION & RESISTANCE (SEE DECADES OF RESEARCH ON OCCUPATIONAL DEVIANCE, POLICE RESISTANCE TO MANGERIAL CONTROL & [ESPECIALLY IN US] TO OVERSIGHT), PRIVACY & RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES & PROFESSIONAL ETHICS**

**ABOVE ALL EXUDES PARADIGM OF TOTAL CONTROL & DEFINITIVE SOLUTIONS**

**HENCE, EBR & EXPERIMENTAL CRIMINOLOGY CAN BE ADOPTED BECAUSE PROMISE CERTAINTY & HAVE “VALIDITY” THROUGH ACADEMIC LEGITIMACY: e. g HOME OFFICE & COLLEGE OF POLICING (MODELLED ON KNOWLEDGE BASED COLLEGE OF MEDICINE) DEMANDING ONLY EBR & EBP WITH MANTRA “WHAT WORKS?”**

**BUT “WHAT WORKS?” AT COST OF “WHAT MATTERS?” AVOIDANCE OF FUNDAMENTAL DEBATE (e. g. ON FIREARMS / FATAL FORCE, ACCOUNTABILITY / ETHICS, etc.)**

**BECKER – “GOOD RESEARCH MAKES SOMEONE ANGRY”: IF NOT ANGER THEN DISCOMFORT & FOSTERING CRITICAL QUESTIONING**

**AND THEN I`D SUPPORT MULTI-METHOD PROJECTS DRAWING ON:**

* **HISTORICAL RESEARCH**
* **SURVEYS**
* **PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING**
* **INTERVIEWS (INDIVIDUAL & GROUP)**
* **COMPARATIVE (WITHIN A SOCIETY AND CROSS-NATIONAL)**
* **FIELD WORK / PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION**
* **CASE STUDIES**
* **EXPERIMENTAL AND QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL**

**SO WHY NOT AN “EBR” PROJECT WITH A CASE STUDY AND INTERVIEWS? ALSO DEPENDS ON WHAT MEANT BY “EVIDENCE”: MOST POLICE RESEARCH HAS NOT BEEN CONDUCTED ON EBR LINES BUT HAS BEEN PRODUCED USING DIVERSE METHODS AND OFTEN OF A *QUALITATIVE* NATURE – DOES NOT MAKE IT LESS EVIDENTIAL**

**FINALLY CAN`T HAVE THIS DICOURSE IN A VACUUM: TRENDS (UK & PARTLY IN NETHERLANDS, SWEDEN) – INCLUDE CENTRALIZATION / ECONOMIES OF SCALE, NARROWING OF MANDATE TO ONLY “CUT CRIME”, EMPHASIS ON TERRORISM & ORGANIZED CRIME, NPM WITH AUSTERITY, CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE**

**SIGNALS FROM THE FIELD (UK): CHANGE FATIGUE, DEMORALIZATION, RETREAT, FLIGHT, CYNICISM ABOUT LEADERS + HOME OFFICE + POLITICIANS, ABSENTEEISM**

**DUTCH CHANGE PROCESS HAS ALSO RUN INTO DIFFICULTIES – HIGH ABSENTEEISM WITH STRESS A MAJOR FACTOR**

**THIS IS NOT SURPRISING AS CHANGE BEING CONDUCTED IN TOP DOWN FASHION, WITH PRESSURE FROM ABOVE, CONSTANT REFORM CYCLE, LOW CONSULTATION, RULE-BOUND PROTOCOLS, etc.: FORM OF TAYLORISM WHICH INFANTALIZES WORK, UNDERMINES CRAFT + DISCRETION**

**THE HIGHER ORDERS INDULGE IN FADS & DREAMS – PICKED UP FROM EXPENSIVE MANAGEMENT COURSES ABROAD - IGNORING UNANTICIPATED, BUT FAIRLY PREDICTABLE, CONSEQUENCES – DEEP ALIENATION WITH DETERIORATING PERFORMANCE**

**SO HOW SHOULD ALL OF US GO ABOUT RESEARCHING THE EMASCUALTION OF A BRITISH INSTITUTION WITH RETREAT FROM PUBLIC PRESENCE EXTERNALLY & SAD HUMAN CONSEQUENCES INTERNALLY – DISILLUSION, DISTRESS, DEPRESSION?**

**Maurice Punch, Amstelveen, May 2016**

(res.) punchm13@gmail.com / (off.) m.punch@lse.ac.uk
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