College of Policing Stop and Search Training Experiment

Process Evaluation

Appendices

Chris Giacomantonio, Tal Jonathan-Zamir, Yael Litmanovitz,
Ben Bradford, Matthew Davies, Lucy Strang, Alex Sutherland

Contents

Appendix A: Detailed analysis of stop and search encounter data

The quantitative dataset

The methodological approach for the observations was set out in the introduction and the full set of instruments can be found in Appendix C. Data were analysed from 30 structured narratives that detailed police-initiated encounters with suspects during the 30 observed shifts to create a quantitative dataset. This dataset covered police-initiated encounters with 99 members of the public who were treated as suspects by the officer at some point during the encounter.

These encounters took place in 23 out of the 30 observed shifts (in each shift a different officer, who has participated in the stop and search training, was the focus of observation). About one-third of all encounters (34) were carried out by Force D. Twenty-one were carried out by Force B, and the remaining 44 are divided about equally between Force A (12), Force C (10), Force E (11) and Force F (11).[1]

Of all 99 encounters[2], only one was carried out by a female officer. Most encounters (68) were with officers between the ages of 31 and 45; 30 encounters involved officers between 19 and 30; and a single encounter was observed with an officer above the age of 45. Aside from two encounters involving Asian officers, all were White. Twenty-six encounters involved officers who had less than five years of experience; about half (46) were with officers with between 5 and 10 years of experience; and 27 with officers who had over 10 years' experience. Forty-one of the observed encounters were with response unit officers, 36 in neighbourhood and 22 with specialists.

The types of encounters observed were classified as following:

- 17 were classified as 'conversational encounters';
- about one third (31) of all interactions were traffic-related vehicle stops, and involved the (driver being held to account);
- another third (27) were pedestrian stops; and

---

[1] Participating forces names have been anonymised.

[2] All 99 interactions are nested within 79 encounters. In most encounters (64), the officer observed had 'full' interaction with a single individual suspect; in 12 encounters the officer interacted with two, in two encounters the officer interacted with three individuals, and only in one encounter did the observed officer interact with five members of the public.

- only nine were stop and search encounters.[3]

Clearly, the first conclusion that can be drawn from this data is the relatively low frequency of stop and search relative to other types of police-initiated contact. This broadly corresponds with what is known about the nature of police interactions with members of the public from other sources. According to the Crime Survey of England and Wales (CSEW), for example, over the period 2008/09 to 2010/11, some 20% of people reported some kind of police-initiated contact in the previous 12 months,[4] though only 7% of them were subsequently searched.[5]

An important question that can be raised in relation to this kind of research is that of reactivity – perhaps the observed officers conducted fewer stop and search encounters because of the observers' presence. While this possibility cannot be ruled out, it seems unlikely that this is the primary explanation for the relatively low levels of stop and search encounters observed. As noted, the CSEW data referenced above shows stop and search encounters comprise a small proportion of all police-initiated contacts. Further, significant steps were taken to minimize officer reactivity, including, first, assuring officers confidentiality and anonymity, explicitly emphasizing the request to 'do everything as you normally would', and behaving in a naïve, non-judgmental fashion (see more details in Appendix C – the observation instrument).

Second, the observations suggest that while some officers may have actively tried to avoid stop and search encounters in observers' presence, others actively sought them in order to satisfy the observer's interest (as they seemed to understand it). Finally, the relatively low levels of observed searches is in line with frequent comments by officers, both during the observations and in interviews, according to which the frequency of stop and search encounters has dramatically dropped over the last couple of years. This is, again, supported by other data sources, most notably of course the stop and search statistics collected and published by the forces and the Home Office (Delsol and Shiner 2015, Home Office 2015).

Stop and search encounters

The nine stop and search encounters were divided between Force A (2), Force D (2), Force E (2) and Force F (3), and. No stop and search encounters were observed in Force B. In five of the observed encounters, the item being searched for was cannabis; in two, it was stolen property; in one, an item used in theft; and in one, a weapon. The item searched for was found in two of the nine searches. In eight of the nine stop and search encounters, the extent of the search was no more than outer garment/pockets/inside collars/socks/shoes/hair; in only one case was the suspect asked to remove his/her jacket/outer coat/gloves. In terms of the perceived characteristics of the suspects searched, eight of the nine were male. Six were between the ages of 31 and 45; three between 19 and 30. Seven were White; two Black. In only one case was the suspect searched known to the officer.

---

[3] The lengths of the stop and search encounters was as follows (in minutes): 8, 10, 13, 13, 15, 17, 23, 40, 90.

[4] However, the CSEW category is significantly wider than the suspicion based encounters that are our focus here.

[5] Authors' analysis of CSEW data.

Twenty-one items in the observation instrument directly measured what the officers did (or did not do) as part of their interactions with members of the public. Table 6.1 displays the frequencies of 'expected behaviours' that are unique to stop and search encounters.

It should be noted that, where relevant, the actions of *both* the trained officer who is the subject of observation, and those of the officer(s) they were accompanied by, are examined. While this analysis is interested specifically in the behaviour of the trained officer, it may be that his/her colleague took the lead in any specific interaction (this was the case in three of the nine stop and search encounters), and/or carried out a particular act before the observed officer had the opportunity to do so. Thus, where a trained officer has not taken a particular action, this may not necessarily mean that the observed officer did not intend to do so, but simply that it was unnecessary because his/her partner carried it out first (in this case the actions are still recorded in the dataset as having occurred).

Table A.1: How were stop and search encounters carried out?

	Yes - either the officer observed or another officer	No	Could not determine[6]
1. Did the officer tell the suspect that s/he was detained for the purposes of a search?	7	1	1
2. Did the officer explain the grounds for the search to this suspect?	8	1	0
3. Did the officer explain to this suspect what item s/he was looking for?	9	0	0
4. Did the officer provide this suspect with his/her identity (e.g. name and number) or warrant card if not in uniform?	6	1	2
5. Did the officer state to this suspect the station where s/he worked?	5	2	2
6. Did the officer make an official record of the encounter at the time (i.e. not in their pocket note book)?	8	1	0
7. Did the officer provide this suspect with a copy of the search record, or tell them that they are entitled to a copy within 3 months?	7	1	0
9. Did the officer explain to this suspect the legal power being used?	8	1	0

In the nine stop and search encounters that were observed, the officers generally appeared to follow the College learning standards including, for example, telling the suspect that s/he was detained for the purpose of a search, specifying the item being searched for, and making an official record of the

---

[6] This response reflects situations where the observer did not feel comfortable making a definitive observation. For example, the observer may have missed parts of the interaction, or could not fully see/hear what the officer was doing/saying.

encounter.[7] Interestingly, following stop and search encounter 8, the officer explained to the observer that he:

> …did not ask him to hand it [marijuana] over as he thinks some citizens use this as a decoy (give the officer a small bag and hide the rest assuming the officer will stop there). [Thus, he] prefers to just do a search and not open that option.

Nevertheless, in the small sample of stop and search encounters that were observed, the officers overall appeared generally to be applying the 'technical' steps of conducting a stop and search encounter in line with the College learning standards, although this was not uniform, and stop and search encounters were observed where, for example, officers did not tell the person they had stopped their name or collar number. One example of a well conducted stop and search encounter went as follows (stop and search encounter 1):

> O1 is standing immediately in front of C1, his head close to the suspect. He continues to write. He tells the man he is being searched for cannabis under s23 of the Misuse of Drugs Act. His delivery is fast and natural. He begins by asking whether he has anything sharp or anything he shouldn't have on him. C1 shakes his head. O1 then says his name and that he's from XXX Police Station. I don't think he said that the man was detained, but I could be wrong. He then says he's searching the man because there was a strong smell of cannabis and because he walked away on seeing a police officer, which gives him ground to suspect he has cannabis… After checking around C1's neckline, he pats down the man's top and trousers, I also recall seeing the man's trouser pocket lining hanging out…O1 also checks around the top of his socks and shoes.

Another example is that of stop and search encounter 9:

> O1 began by explaining he was now going to carry out a stop and search because C1 smelled strongly of weed, he suspected there is some on him and C1 had previously confirmed this (in this section he again called C1 by his first name). He then went through the elements of GOWISELY, including introducing his full name and station, explaining why he was searching and for what, under what law; his tone did not sound technical or formal, but it was clear from it he was going through a procedure since it was quite quick. O1 then began by looking through C1's pockets, and found a small bag of weed almost immediately. He continued with a thorough but brief search, including removal of outer coat and patting down.

---

[7] Some of the forces may have also advised officers to provide the suspect an opportunity to hand over the item before conducting a search (for safety reasons); more of an optional action than a legal requirement. Here, there was more variation in application of the guidance: out of seven cases where the observer felt comfortable making an observation, the officers did not comply with this requirement in three.

Appendix B: Data tables

Systematic observation data – descriptive data

Encounters by force

	Frequency	Percent
Force A	12	12.1
Force B	21	21.2
Force C	10	10.1
Force D	34	34.3
Force E	11	11.1
Force F	11	11.1
Total	99	100.0

Citizens per encounter

	Frequency	Percent
1	64	81
2	12	15.2
3	2	2.5
4	0	0
5	1	1.3
Total	79	100

Officers' sex

	Frequency	Percent
Female	1	1.0
Male	98	99.0
Total	99	100.0

Officers' age

	Frequency	Percent
19 to 30	30	30.3
31 to 45	68	68.7
46 to 65	1	1.0
Total	99	100.0

Officers' ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent
White	97	98.0
Asian	2	2.0
Total	99	100.0

Officers' years of experience

	Frequency	Percent
2	19	19.2
3	7	7.1
5	1	1.0
6	4	4.0
7	12	12.1
8	9	9.1
9	5	5.1
10	15	15.2
12	9	9.1
13	16	16.2
16	2	2.0
Total	99	100.0

Officers' role

	Frequency	Percent
Neighbourhood	36	36.4
Response	41	41.4
Specialist	22	22.2
Total	99	100.0

Encounter type

	Frequency	Percent
Check on 'nominal(s)'	2	2.0
Conversational encounter	17	17.2
Immediate arrest	2	2.0
Other	10	10.1
Other - intervention in public altercation	1	1.0
Pedestrian stop - person held to account	27	27.3
Stop and search	9	9.1
Vehicle stop - driver held to account	31	31.3
Total	99	100.0

Stop and Search Encounters

Stop and search encounters by force

	Frequency	Percent
Force A	2	22.2
Force D	2	22.2
Force E	2	22.2
Force F	3	33.3
Total	9	100.0

Item searched for

	Frequency	Percent
Drugs - cannabis	5	55.6
Items used in a theft	1	11.1
Stolen property	2	22.2
Weapon	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

Item found?

	Frequency	Percent
No	7	77.8
Yes	2	22.2
Total	9	100.0

Extent of the search

	Frequency	Percent
JOG - The citizen was asked to remove any of his/her jacket/outer coat/gloves	1	11.1
No more than outer garment pockets/inside collars/socks/shoes/hair	8	88.9
Total	9	100.0

Citizen searched – perceived sex

	Frequency	Percent
Female	1	11.1
Male	8	88.9
Total	9	100.0

Citizen searched – perceived age

	Frequency	Percent
19 to 30	3	33.3
31 to 45	6	66.7
Total	9	100.0

Citizen searched –perceived race

	Frequency	Percent
Black	2	22.2
White	7	77.8
Total	9	100.0

Citizen searched known to officer?

	Frequency	Percent
No	8	88.9
Yes, in person	1	11.1
Total	9	100.0

Response data from officer feedback sheets

Data reflects responses across participating forces.

QUESTIONS ABOUT ANY PREVIOUS STOP AND SEARCH TRAINING YOU MAY HAVE COMPLETED

Q4. Have you completed any other training on stop and search in the last five years?							
	Yes		No		I can't remember		Total	
Total	296	54.0%	199	36.3%	53	9.7%	548	100.0%

Q5. Which of the following did you complete (tick all that apply)?									
	Classroom training		Online training		Other		I can't remember		Total	
Total	238	68.2%	80	22.9%	24	6.9%	7	2.0%	349	100.0%

Note - the 296 respondents could select multiple answers

Q6. Overall, how do you think the new training course compare with this earlier training?											
Force	It was a lot better		It was a little better		It was about the same		It was a little worse		It was a lot worse		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	123	42.3%	94	32.3%	62	21.3%	9	3.1%	3	1.0%	291	100.0%	257

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PRE-READ EXERCISE AND KNOWLEDGE CHECK

Q7. How much of the pre-reading were you able to complete?										
	Read all of it		More than half		Less than half		Read none		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	340	63.3%	82	15.3%	49	9.1%	66	12.3%	537	100.0%	11

Q8. How useful did you find the pre-read exercise?

	Very useful		Fairly useful		Not very useful		Not at all useful		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	119	23.7%	287	57.1%	67	13.3%	30	6.0%	503	100.0%	45

Q9. How challenging did you find the knowledge check?

	Very challenging		Fairly challenging		Not v. challenging		Not at all challenging		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	5	0.9%	288	54.2%	217	40.9%	21	4.0%	531	100.0%	17

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE CLASSROOM TRAINING

Q10. What do you think about the length of the classroom session?

	Too long		About right		Too short		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	88	16.1%	458	83.7%	1	0.2%	547	100.0%	1

Q11. What do you think about the speed at which the classroom session was delivered

	Too fast		The right speed		Too slow		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	1	0.2%	507	93.2%	36	6.6%	544	100.0%	4

Q12. How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the classroom session?

Q12a. The training session was well-organised

	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total	
Total	190	34.7%	343	62.6%	14	2.6%	1	0.2%	548	100.0%

Q12b. There was too much information early in the session

	Strongly agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly disagree		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	10	1.8%	37	6.8%	432	78.8%	68	12.4%	547	100.0%	1

Q12c. The trainers provided good answers to questions					
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Total	226	41.2%	313	57.1%	8	1.5%	1	0.2%	548	100.0%

Q12d. The trainers understood the realities of operational policing					
Force	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Total	249	45.4%	284	51.8%	15	2.7%	0	0.0%	548	100.0%

Q12e. I had the opportunity to express my opinions					
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Total	295	53.8%	251	45.8%	2	0.4%	0	0.0%	548	100.0%

Q12f. The trainers understood the training material					
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Total	1	0.2%	284	51.8%	263	48.0%	0	0.0%	548	100.0%

Q12g. I was able to practice what I had learnt in the classroom					
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Total
Total	95	17.3%	312	56.9%	78	14.2%	26	4.7%	548	100.0%

YOUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE TRAINING COURSE

Q13. Overall, how much has this training course improved your understanding of the follow concepts?

Q13a. The history of stop and search

	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total	
Total	219	40.0%	288	52.6%	41	7.5%	548	100.0%

Q13b. The purpose of stop and search

	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	196	35.8%	245	44.7%	105	19.2%	546	100.0%	2

Q13c. The powers of stop and search

	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	209	38.1%	265	48.4%	73	13.3%	547	100.0%	1

Q13d. How unconscious bias can affect decisions to stop and search?

	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	224	40.9%	258	47.1%	63	11.5%	545	100.0%	3

Q13e. How to establish 'reasonable grounds' for stop and search?

	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	235	42.9%	230	42.0%	82	15.0%	547	100.0%	1

Q13f. How to carry out a stop and search

Force	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total	
Total	149	27.2%	227	41.4%	172	31.4%	548	100.0%

Q13g. How to treat someone fairly and respectfully during stop and search

Force	A lot		A little		Not at all		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	149	27.2%	226	41.2%	172	31.4%	547	100.0%	1

Q14. How relevant do you think the training course was to your work?

Force	Very relevant		Fairly relevant		Not very relevant		Not at all relevant		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	315	57.5%	203	37.0%	22	4.0%	7	1.3%	547	100.0%	1

Q15. How likely is it you will put what you have learnt from the training course into practice?

Force	Very likely		Fairly likely		Not very likely		Not at all likely		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	312	56.9%	195	35.6%	29	5.3%	9	1.6%	545	100.0%	3

Q16. Overall, how do you rate the training course?

Force	Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor		Total (valid)		Left blank
Total	158	28.8%	296	54.0%	86	15.7%	7	1.3%	547	100.0%	1

Trainer survey data

1. Which of the following best describes your role during the stop and search training pilot?

	Response Total	Response Percent
I was only involved in training delivery	8	31%
I was only involved in developing or supporting the training	6	23%
I was involved in both training delivery and its development/support	12	46%
Total Respondents	26	100%

2. Overall, how good do you think the 'Guidance for Trainers' document provided by the College was?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Excellent	1	7%
Good	6	43%
Fair	4	29%
Poor	2	14%
Very poor	0	0%
Don't know	1	7%
Total Respondents	14	100%

3. Overall, how good do you think the 'train the trainer' events run by the College were?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Excellent	1	7%
Good	4	29%
Fair	2	14%
Poor	1	7%
Very poor	2	14%
Don't know	4	29%
Total Respondents	14	100%

4. Overall, how good do you think the College's communication was about the training?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Excellent	0	0%
Good	5	36%
Fair	6	43%
Poor	1	7%
Very poor	1	7%
Don't know	1	7%
Total Respondents	14	100%

5. Overall, how good do you think the College's communication was about the evaluation?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Excellent	1	7%
Good	7	50%
Fair	4	29%
Poor	1	7%
Very poor	0	0%
Don't know	1	7%
Total Respondents	14	100%

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know	Response Total
I had a good idea of what the College expected	14.29% (2)	42.86% (6)	28.57% (4)	7.14% (1)	7.14% (1)	14
The learning outcomes of the training were clear	28.57% (4)	35.71% (5)	14.29% (2)	14.29% (2)	7.14% (1)	14
The College training documents were too prescriptive	0% (0)	14.29% (2)	57.14% (8)	21.43% (3)	7.14% (1)	14
The reasons for the training pilot were clear	21.43% (3)	57.14% (8)	14.29% (2)	7.14% (1)	0% (0)	14
The learning outcomes did not address officers' learning needs	7.14% (1)	21.43% (3)	57.14% (8)	7.14% (1)	7.14% (1)	14
I expected the College to provide training products for us to deliver locally	50% (7)	35.71% (5)	7.14% (1)	7.14% (1)	0% (0)	14
I had an opportunity to provide feedback on the College training documents	14.29% (2)	57.14% (8)	7.14% (1)	0% (0)	21.43% (3)	14
The College took my views on the training documents into account	0% (0)	42.86% (6)	14.29% (2)	0% (0)	42.86% (6)	14
There were too many learning outcomes	7.14% (1)	14.29% (2)	57.14% (8)	0% (0)	21.43% (3)	14
The College provided a good response to questions from forces	7.69% (1)	53.85% (7)	7.69% (1)	15.38% (2)	15.38% (2)	13
The learning outcomes were evidence-based	0% (0)	50% (7)	21.43% (3)	7.14% (1)	21.43% (3)	14
The balance between pre-read and classroom was good	0% (0)	53.85% (7)	15.38% (2)	15.38% (2)	15.38% (2)	13
Total Respondents						14

7. Did the training that was delivered locally differ from the 'Guidance for Trainers'?

	Response Total	Response Percent
No	3	21%
Yes, there were <u>minor changes</u>	10	71%
Yes, there were <u>major changes</u>	1	7%
Total Respondents	14	100%

9. Overall, how useful do you think the pre-read material was?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Very useful	5	24%
Fairly useful	13	62%
Not very useful	3	14%
Not at all useful	0	0%
Total Respondents	21	100%

10. In your view, roughly what proportion of officers completed the pre-read?

	Response Total	Response Percent
All	1	5%
Most	10	45%
Some	8	36%
A few	3	14%
None	0	0%
Total Respondents	22	100%

11. Overall, how useful do you think the knowledge check was?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Very useful	5	25%
Fairly useful	12	60%
Not very useful	3	15%
Not at all useful	0	0%
Total Respondents	20	100%

12. In your view, roughly what proportion of officers completed the knowledge check?

	Response Total	Response Percent
All	14	67%
Most	6	29%
Some	1	5%
A few	0	0%
None	0	0%
Total Respondents	21	100%

13. How easy or difficult do you think the knowledge check was?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Very easy	0	0%
Fairly easy	17	81%
Fairly difficult	4	19%
Very difficult	0	0%
Total Respondents	21	100%

14. Overall, how useful do you think the course handout was?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Very useful	2	10%
Fairly useful	12	57%
Not very useful	5	24%
Not at all useful	2	10%
Total Respondents	21	100%

15. In your view, roughly what proportion of officers took the course hand-out away with them at the end of the course?

	Response Total	Response Percent
All	3	14%
Most	9	41%
Some	6	27%
A few	1	5%
None	3	14%
Total Respondents	22	100%

16. Overall, how useful do you think the classroom element of the training was?

	Response Total	Response Percent
Very useful	15	68%
Fairly useful	6	27%
Not very useful	1	5%
Not useful at all	0	0%
Total Respondents	22	100%

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the classroom element of the training?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Response Total
The training material was too complex	5% (1)	5% (1)	80% (16)	10% (2)	20
I felt confident to deliver all aspects of the training	22.22% (4)	55.56% (10)	22.22% (4)	0% (0)	18
The training was focused mainly on knowledge	0% (0)	35% (7)	60% (12)	5% (1)	20
I had sufficient time to cover all of the training material	25% (5)	70% (14)	5% (1)	0% (0)	20
The officers had few opportunities to express their opinions	0% (0)	5% (1)	55% (11)	40% (8)	20
There was too much 'chalk and talk'	10% (2)	5% (1)	65% (13)	20% (4)	20
I felt well-prepared to deliver all aspects of the training	25% (5)	45% (9)	30% (6)	0% (0)	20
The training was operationally relevant to officers	33.33% (7)	47.62% (10)	14.29% (3)	4.76% (1)	21
The officers had plenty of opportunities to practice their learning	10.53% (2)	42.11% (8)	31.58% (6)	15.79% (3)	19
The training was focused mainly on skills	5% (1)	40% (8)	45% (9)	10% (2)	20
I felt able to deal with challenging questions and comments	33.33% (7)	42.86% (9)	23.81% (5)	0% (0)	21
The training material was too sensitive	0% (0)	0% (0)	73.68% (14)	26.32% (5)	19
Total Respondents					21

18. Overall, how useful do you think each of the following elements of the classroom training were?

	Very useful	Fairly useful	Not very useful	Not at all useful	Not used	Response Total
The icebreaker (sit down) exercise	4.76% (1)	23.81% (5)	14.29% (3)	0% (0)	57.14% (12)	21
Presentations delivered by force trainers	50% (10)	40% (8)	5% (1)	0% (0)	5% (1)	20
The discussions with officers	66.67% (14)	28.57% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.76% (1)	21
The Y-stop films	35% (7)	25% (5)	15% (3)	5% (1)	20% (4)	20
The YouTube or body worn video clips	26.32% (5)	10.53% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	63.16% (12)	19
The unconscious bias (photo) exercise	19.05% (4)	33.33% (7)	9.52% (2)	14.29% (3)	23.81% (5)	21
The reasonable grounds exercise	47.62% (10)	38.1% (8)	4.76% (1)	0% (0)	9.52% (2)	21
The GOWISELY (role-play) exercise	19.05% (4)	23.81% (5)	14.29% (3)	0% (0)	42.86% (9)	21
Total Respondents						21

19. In general, how engaged or disengaged do you think officers were in each of the following elements of the classroom training?

	Very engaged	Fairly engaged	Fairly disengaged	Very disengaged	Not used	Response Total
The icebreaker (sit down) exercise	4.76% (1)	33.33% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)	61.9% (13)	21
The presentations delivered by force trainers	42.86% (9)	47.62% (10)	4.76% (1)	0% (0)	4.76% (1)	21
The discussions with officers	52.38% (11)	42.86% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)	4.76% (1)	21
The Y-stop films	15% (3)	55% (11)	10% (2)	5% (1)	15% (3)	20
The YouTube or body worn video clips	19.05% (4)	23.81% (5)	0% (0)	0% (0)	57.14% (12)	21
The unconscious bias (photo) exercise	4.76% (1)	47.62% (10)	23.81% (5)	0% (0)	23.81% (5)	21
The reasonable grounds exercise	47.62% (10)	42.86% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)	9.52% (2)	21
The GOWISELY (role-play) exercise	9.52% (2)	33.33% (7)	14.29% (3)	0% (0)	42.86% (9)	21
Total Respondents						21

20. Which of the following learning outcomes were prioritised during the classroom training?

	Response Total	Response Percent
The history of stop and search	2	9%
The purpose of stop and search and its benefits	4	18%
The different types of police initiated encounters	2	9%
The potential adverse impacts of stop and search	8	36%
The impact of unconscious bias on decision making	8	36%
The impact of conscious bias on decision making	1	5%
How to establish reasonable grounds	12	55%
Vulnerability in the context of stop and search	1	5%
Stop and search under s60	0	0%
The steps taken before a search takes place	2	9%
How searches should be conducted	6	27%
The extent to which individuals can be searched	1	5%
The legal requirement to record stop and search	2	9%
The actions to take when an individual expresses dissatisfaction	2	9%
Total Respondents	22	

21. In your view, which of the following learning outcomes were officers generally most receptive to?

	Response Total	Response Percent
The history of stop and search	2	9%
The purpose of stop and search and its benefits	6	27%
The different types of police initiated encounters	1	5%
The potential adverse impacts of stop and search	7	32%
The impact of unconscious bias on decision making	6	27%
The impact of conscious bias on decision making	2	9%
How to establish reasonable grounds	15	68%
Vulnerability in the context of stop and search	1	5%
Stop and search under s60	2	9%
The steps taken before a search takes place	4	18%
How searches should be conducted	3	14%
The extent to which individuals can be searched	2	9%
The legal requirement to record stop and search	3	14%
The actions to take when an individual expresses dissatisfaction	0	0%
Total Respondents	22	

22. In your view, which of the following learning outcomes were officers generally least receptive to?

	Response Total	Response Percent
The history of stop and search	8	36%
The purpose of stop and search and its benefits	4	18%
The different types of police initiated encounters	3	14%
The potential adverse impacts of stop and search	2	9%
The impact of unconscious bias on decision making	7	32%
The impact of conscious bias on decision making	3	14%
How to establish reasonable grounds	1	5%
Vulnerability in the context of stop and search	3	14%
Stop and search under s60	5	23%
The steps taken before a search takes place	1	5%
How searches should be conducted	0	0%
The extent to which individuals can be searched	3	14%
The legal requirement to record stop and search	2	9%
The actions to take when an individual expresses dissatisfaction	6	27%
Total Respondents	22	

Appendix C: Project research methods tools

This appendix includes:

- The training implementation assessment tool
- The systematic social observation instrument
- The training designers, trainers, and officer interview schedules

Training Implementation Assessment Tool

About the project

This research is a process evaluation of a new approach to Stop and Search training. The evaluation is being led by the College of Policing and is being supported by a team of independent researchers led by RAND Europe. The goal of the research is to examine the implementation of the training and provide lessons for future offerings of this and related training.

The project is being led by Dr Paul Quinton, an Evidence and Evaluation adviser at the College of Policing. If there are any questions or concerns about this research he may be contacted at Paul.Quinton@college.pnn.police.uk.

This evaluation is separate from but related to an impact evaluation into the training being supported by the Research Advisory Service.

Implementation assessment tool: Stop & Search training process evaluation 2015

DATE: _____ FORCE: _____

LOCATION: _____

Using the implementation assessment tool: Explanatory protocol

The tool is a structured observation sheet, which is intended to assist you in taking notes that can be analysed more easily. It assesses four main aspects of the training:

1. **Adherence:** the intervention is delivered as it was designed, with all core components to the appropriate population, staff training, protocols, techniques, materials and locations.
2. **Quality of delivery**: manner of delivery, for example skills, enthusiasm, preparedness, attitude.
3. **Participant responsiveness:** how engaged and involved the participants are in the activities and the content.
4. **Exposure:** number of sessions, length, frequency (this is recorded using a checklist on the last page)

The headings are cues of what to look for in the training, what to write down, what to pay special attention to and where to go into detail. All categories in the sheet include brief guidance and will also be discussed within the team via teleconference in advance of observations, to ensure a shared understanding of the categories, and then reviewed again on 15 September. **All observers should also have reviewed the most recent version of the Trainers' Guide in advance of their first observation.**

During observations, record your notes directly in the section to which they pertain, for example if you have noticed the trainer is asking really sharp questions, is confusing concepts, or is giving mixed messages, you note this down in the 'Delivery' section. You can also take notes in parallel and then use the sheet to make sense of your impressions later, to make them easier to interpret. One useful question to keep in mind while filling out the form is: **is what I am observing serving to reinforce the intended training outcomes or to undermine them?**

Some of the sections, particularly exposure, are straightforward: did this activity indicated in the manual take place? How long was it? This will be easily comparable across observations. Other categories may require more interpretation, for example considering what the central ideas of the training are. For example, we know that we should be looking out for procedural justice elements (respect, neutrality, benevolence, & voice), implicit bias, and practical-legal decision making. But how will they be discussed? Where will emphasis be placed? Will procedural justice aspects essentially be 'knowledge components', didactically presented? Will there be

attitudinal elements as part of which the trainer tries to get officers to buy in through a discussion or group exercise? Will training be skills-based, incorporated in new strategies or scripts that could be employed on the ground, e.g. what to report after a search and how to talk to people you stop? All three approaches might be detectable, and the aim here is to pay special attention to these topics. It is also possible that **key ideas and aspects may be recorded under multiple categories**; for example the officers' responses to presentation of participatory exercises will both reflect on trainers' delivery and on participants' role, and thus may be recorded in one or both of Delivery and Participation, as well as being recorded under the Exposure checklist.

Remember that this tool has not been tested for this context, so if some of the items seem irrelevant, they may be, and unexpected themes may also arise in the field. Keep a notebook with you during observations to record any additional observations that either do not fit in the space provided or are outside of the main observation categories.

Notes should be transcribed into the Observation Sheet template within one day of completion of observations.

Main aspect	Category	Guidance	Your notes
Adherence: 'integrity of function'	Facilities	Enabling? As prescribed?	
	Trainer to participant ratio	2:12 yes/no, if no, what	

	Procedural justice elements	➢ Were central ideas addressed in fashion which could aid 'training transfer'? ➢ With enough depth? ➢ Was their importance underscored? ➢ What training strategies might support these ideas?	
	Implicit bias	➢ Were central ideas addressed in fashion which could aid 'training transfer'? ➢ With enough depth? ➢ Was their importance underscored? ➢ What training strategies might support these ideas?	
	Practical-legal decision making	➢ Were central ideas addressed in fashion which could aid 'training transfer'? ➢ With enough depth? ➢ Was their importance	

		underscored? ➢ What training strategies might support these ideas?	
Delivery	Didactic vs participatory	➢ Questions directed at participants ➢ Facilitating discussion ➢ Contextualises the topic ➢ Makes 'space' for participants to voice their opinion	
	Ethical leadership	‣ Positions the topic of training as crucial to the success of the force ‣ Challenges participants ‣ Responds to their challenges	
	Framing of training	‣ How is the training introduced? ‣ How is the pilot/researcher introduced? ‣ Relating training to other force-level initiatives	

	References of pre-reading	Did trainer incorporate pre-reading in discussions?	
	'Adult education' approach	The why behind the how: did the trainer try to anchor the training as relevant to the officers' daily tasks and their societal role, give them a central place in the training process through joint discussion of their reality/practice	
Participation	Alert, paying attention, taking notes, asking questions, voicing their opinions	In numbers or percentages, possibly assess every 30 min or more and in general	
	References of pre-reading	Did participants incorporate pre-reading in discussions	

	Motivation statements	▸ Internal motivation: Have participants made statements indicating buy-in? ▸ External motivation: Have participants made statements indicating incentives for training?	
	Active connection to everyday roles	Statements indicating ability or barriers to use in everyday, tying to practical aspects	
	Dynamics with trainer	How did they see them? How did they react to them? Any reference to trainer's status?	
	Classroom dynamics	Note anything about dynamics	

		among officers which seems significant to success: inappropriate laughter, tension between participants, respectful/professional atmosphere	

Exposure Checklist – Please give approximate duration (mins). Transcribe notes into exposure spreadsheet within one day of completion of observations

Learning outcomes – which were covered and for how long?					Specific activities – which were done and for how long?				
Activity/area	Covered? (y/n)	Participatory element	Approx duration	Additional comments	Activity/area	Covered? (y/n)	Participatory element	Approx duration	Additional comments
Explain history surrounding S&S*			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		*Reference to assessment from pre-read?*			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	
Explain purpose of S&S and benefits of using it correctly			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		Practical exercise – icebreaker (ever been stopped exercise)			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	
Outline different types of police-initiated encounters			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		Time-line of S&S graphic			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	
Describe potential adverse impact of S&S encounter			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		Definition of fair and effective stop and search			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	
Explain impact of unconscious bias			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		Show Y-Stop film			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	
Explain impact of conscious bias			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		Unconscious bias/ stereotyping (Appx Ex 1)			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	
Explain how to establish reasonable grounds under			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30		Reasonable grounds (Appendix Exercise 2)			<5 | 5-15 | 16-30 | >30	

PACE Code A									
Describe how people may be considered vulnerable in S&S			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		Explain mnemonic GOWISELY			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	
Explain when S&S can be conducted under PACE s. 60			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		Explain mnemonic PLANE			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	
Describe steps that must be taken before a search takes place			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		GOWISELY exercise (Appendix Exercise 3)			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	
Explain how stop-searches are to be conducted			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		Present Betari Box model			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	
Explain extent to which individuals can be searched in public			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		Present Mehrabian Theory			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	
Explain the legal req. of accurate recording S&S encounters			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		Other exercise 1			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	
Explain actions to take when person dissatisfied with S&S			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30		Other exercise 2			<5 | 5-15 16-30 | >30	

Systematic Social Observation Instrument

Stop and search training evaluation – process evaluation

Instrument for systematic observations of police-initiated interactions with members of the public

1. Background and rationale

There are three main goals to the present observations, which form part of a wider evaluation of College's stop and search training pilot in 6 forces:

1. Learn to what extent police officers who have attended a pilot training session appear to use their learning in practice, by carrying out S&S encounters in line with College learning standards (e.g. PACE Code A; GOWISELY).

2. Identify barriers/facilitators to the training having an effect, and on S&S encounters being carried out in line with College learning standards.

3. Gain in-depth understanding of the realities of police-initiated interactions with members of the public. What do these interactions look like? How to the police behave? How do citizens respond?

The ultimate purpose is to gain "real world" knowledge that could be fed back into the training as part of the process evaluation: given what we have learned, do the College need to change anything about the training to ensure it has the desired impact?

Data collected in these observations will include both observable details documented by the observer (such as the time of day, number of citizens on scene, and the actions of both the officer and citizen) and insight into the observed officer's decision-making process using:

1. short debriefing after each encounter concerning the officer's decision making in that particular encounter (e.g. how the officer decided to carry out a search); and

2. directed conversations with the officer throughout the shift about the training more generally.

More details are provided below.

It is important to note at the outset that these observations are NOT intended to identify differences between officers who had participated in the recent pilot training and those who have not, for several reasons:

1. Only officers who have completed the pilot training will be observed (no control/comparison group).

2. The officers who have participated in the training know that they are taking part in a pilot, and know that they are the "treatment group." This knowledge, in and of itself, could impact their performance irrespective of the content of the training they have received.

3. These officers routinely interact and work with officers who have not participated in the training, and thus both groups may affect the performance of the officers in the other group, working to minimize differences between them.

The observation protocol detailed below is intended to minimize observer effect, encourage recall and the ability to write detailed, accurate narratives describing what happened, and be as systematic as possible – that is, all observers follow the same protocol and produce a highly similar outputs at the end of each shift. It is based on earlier studies carried out in the UK and US.

What specific questions are we aiming to answer with the data collected in these observations?

- **Frequency**: How often do police-initiated encounters of different types occur (e.g. informal conversations, pedestrian stops where citizens are held to account by the officer, vehicle stops, and searches)?

- **Officer decision-making – encounter initiation:** When and why do officers decide to initiate contact with the public?

- **Officer behaviour:** To what extent are officers' actions before, during and after encounters in line with the College learning standards (e.g. PACE Code A, GOWISELY, and – where relevant – the definition of a fair and effective search[8])?

- **Barriers/facilitators –** When are officers more (and less) likely to initiate encounters and carry them out in line with the College learning standard? What features of the officer, citizen and situation affect this outcome? What wider contextual issues may also be relevant?

- **The citizen's perspective –** How do citizens generally respond to police officers initiating interactions with them? How do they respond to S&S encounters? Which factors are associated with apparent citizen satisfaction and dissatisfaction at the end of the encounter?

2. Guidelines for sampling and planning the observation schedule

- In terms of the type of shifts that should be observed, as a general rule, in each force a range of different types of shifts should be observed:
  - different days of the week – weekdays and weekends
  - different hours of the day – with a focus on late and night shifts
  - different types of officer – ideally x2 neighbourhood officers, x2 response, and x1 in a more specialist officers (e.g. traffic, proactive, potentially firearms)

---

[8] The definition has not been included in the MPS pilot training, and so is not relevant to the observations.

- o different locations – particularly in the MPS where four Operational Command Units are participating, and BTP which covers England & Wales

The varying nature of these shifts may affect the way S&S encounters are carried out. This approach will result in the most representative sample of S&S encounters.

We recognize that the busier shifts (e.g. the afternoon shift, which begins at around noon and ends at about 9/10pm) will likely include more S&S encounters, and thus focusing on these shifts would increase the sample size. At the same time, we also recognize that this approach might sample a very specific type of S&S encounters.

Additionally, the few S&S encounters that are carried out in the morning may be of a different nature than those carried out after dark.

Both sampling approaches are acceptable, as long as we recognize what they mean in terms of what the sample represents. Sampling from all types of shifts would perhaps mean a smaller sample size, but the sample would be representative of all types of S&S encounters and would include a broader range of situational features that may affect the way they are carried out and their outcomes. Focusing on the busier shifts would, in all likelihood, mean a larger sample size, which would, however, capture a more narrow range of S&S encounters within a limited set of circumstances.

- A day should be set aside for the observer after each observation, where the observer should write down the observation. Wherever possible, **the observer should not carry out a second observation before the first has been fully documented** (narrative + closed-ended questionnaires; see below), as impressions can be easily forgotten or get mixed up. Because this data-collection method is very demanding, it is highly recommended that no more than three observations (preferably two) are done in a week by any single observer.

- As a general rule, observations should take place **over the course of the entire shift** – the observer should meet the officer before or at the shift briefing, observe the shift briefing, and end the shift with the officer. This is to give the officer time to relax and adjust to being observed, which can be a stressful experience. There are, however, some exceptions to this rule. For example, if the officer makes an arrest very early in the shift and will thus be in custody for much of the shift, the observer should make every effort to switch to another suitable officer. Where possible, observations should continue to the end of the shift, even if the shift becomes quiet, in case something relevant to the research happens later on. However, the observation can be ended if the officer says, towards the end of the shift, that s/he would be tied up with other police work not related to the aims of the study.

As participation is voluntary, the observation and all note-taking **should cease immediately** if the officer indicates – at any point – that s/he no longer wishes to be observed. In the unlikely event of this situation arising, the observer should ask the officer to take him/her back to the police station.

If any unique circumstances arise about the shift, RAND observers should contact Chris (07986 505579) and College observers should contact Paul (07740 871 971) for guidance on how to proceed.

Observer safety guidance

As an observer you will be accompanying police officers during their shift duties. In most instances the risks to you should be limited and the police officer should be aware of how to work with a civilian observer present. In most instances it should be non-problematic for you to remain within listening distance of an encounter.

However, if any instances arise where you are unsure of what you should do (e.g. whether you should stay in the car, enter a building), please inquire with the police officer as to how they would prefer you to proceed and follow their guidance. As noted below, in most cases the officer should be able to direct you and you should comply with their requests.

If for any reason you find yourself in a situation that seems threatening or unsafe, or if you feel you need to cease observations (e.g. due to an potentially distressing or sensitive situation to you or anyone else), please remove yourself from the observations at the earliest safe opportunity and clearly communicate to the officer you are observing that you are going to discontinue observations.

Observers may be required to wear a stab vest or high visibility jacket, and carry a police radio during the observations for their own safety and for ease of identification. Different forces have different policies. All safety requests and instructions should be accepted without question. Observers should, however, be sensitive to how any protective equipment may make them appear to members of the public. Observers may also be required to complete a risk assessment or undergo a safety briefing before going on patrol.

RAND and College researchers should ensure that Chris and Paul, respectively, have their mobile numbers in case of emergency, and should contact them (e.g. by text message) at the end of the shift to confirm they have returned safely.

3. What should the observer say to the officer being observed/members of the public about the observations?

- The observer should explain to the officer that we are here as part of the S&S training pilot. We are here to learn not only about S&S, but about police-citizens interactions more generally for the purpose of improving training.

- We should ask the officer to behave as naturally as s/he can. We ask that s/he does everything as she normally would, as much as possible (i.e. not try to only show us the "interesting" parts of the job; not take us on purpose to the "bad" part of town; not try to do more/less S&S because we are there)

- The officers are not being tested or inspected – it is the training that is being evaluated, not them. Observers should emphasise this point to the officers they observe. We are simply there to learn about "what things look like in the real world."

- The observations can never be completely anonymous and confidential (e.g. the identity of the officer will be known to members of the research team and to those who set up the fieldwork). However, we should inform officers that steps will be taken to protect their identities during the

research. Fieldnotes should, for example, only refer to officers by a generic reference number (e.g. O1, O2) rather than their name or collar/shoulder number. Findings from the observations will be reported anonymously in all research outputs (including final report and articles), meaning it will not be possible for any of the officers who take part to be identified. These issues should be discussed with the officers in as non-threatening way as possible, so as to minimise its effect on behaviour. You should ensure the officers are sent a briefing sheet about the observations ahead of the shift, so that are aware of these issues. This would allow you to remind them briefly of what's involved when you meet them in person.

- We should tell the officer that we need to be with him/her as closely as possible in order to see and hear as much as we can. Observers should walk and stand with the officer (unless instructed otherwise), but be mindful about how their positioning may affect the interactions they are observing. The observers should tell the officers that they recognize that safety comes first, and ask them to say when they feel the observers should stand back or stay in the car for a particular encounter. Officers may not get the opportunity to inform the observers about the steps they need to take – as a result of dynamic risk assessment – to help ensure the observers' safety, and which may also prevent them from observing a situation. Observers should, of course, cooperate fully and immediately with the officer; doing so does not, however, preclude them from asking the officers about the situation afterwards. Observers should re-join the officers when they are told it is safe to do so, and should ask if they are unclear.

- In terms of responding to questions from members of the public, if a member of the public asks the observer who they are or what they are doing, they should reply: "I'm following / shadowing the officer today". Should the person pursue this further, the observer should provide him with College logo headed note explaining their role. Please note that some members of the public will automatically assume that you are a plain clothes police officer

4. What should the observer do (and not do) in order to minimize reactivity?

- Show interest in what the officer is doing, be empathic, but avoid judgmental comments (e.g. "you were right for doing that…"). Even if asked directly ("do you think I was right to do that…?") avoid expressing an opinion. We can should try to respond neutrally where possible (e.g. "well, I wouldn't know… I'm here to learn") or respond with a question about what they think.

- Be very general in describing what we are interested in (for example, "what encounters with the public look like in the real world"; "how police make decisions"). Terms such as "respect", "procedural justice", or "fair and effective" can of course be used, if appropriate, when discussing the training, but should not be mentioned as if this is how you *expect* the officer to behave.

- We are impartial about the pilot training. If asked, we should say we have yet to form a view as to its impact or what the College will deliver longer term, and that the research is ongoing. Remind them that the research they are helping with will inform the decision on next steps, so their openness and honesty – and usual practice – is appreciated. They will be able read the result next year, when they are published by the College.

- Feel free to be open with the officer (e.g. where you are from, what do you do, talk about your family) in order to encourage a natural, open conversation, but make sure the conversation focuses on HER, her work, views and decision-making.

- Carry a small notebook with you. Take brief notes on the events/activities that are of interest when possible (preferably in the car after the encounter's conclusion). Be discreet. Avoid being "buried" in your notes and **only take notes on events/activities that are relevant to the research questions**. Don't write anything that would make you uncomfortable if the officer happened to see. Use short sentences, quotes from what the officer/citizen said or acronyms that would later trigger your memory, such as:

  - The time the encounter began and ended
  - C1 = citizen one, the first citizen in each encounter the officer interacts with (more details below)
  - WM = White Male; AF = Asian Female

- As a general rule, the observer should not carry out any police work, both because s/he is not trained for it and because we want to have as little effect on the situation as possible. If the officer asks you to do something trivial (like hold a flashlight or hold his/her notebook for a second) you should, of course, agree. But more substantial requests (e.g. "can you watch this person for a minute and make sure he doesn't go anywhere?") should be denied. The observer should politely say that they are not trained to do any police work and are there to observe. But of course, if an emergency situation arises and/or lives are at stake, use the best of your judgment.

5. Over the course of the shift, what activities/events are we observing and documenting?

Many things take place over the course of the shift. Officers participate in the shift briefing, drive and/or walk around, initiate conversations with members of the public, respond to calls, take breaks, converse with their fellow officers, and more. **In this study, we focus on and document only the activities/events that are relevant to the overarching research questions and are detailed below**. See more details below in the instructions for writing the narrative.

5.1 Shift briefing

The shift briefing is the meeting held by the team supervisor before the shift begins, which all officers on that shift are required to attend. In this meeting, the officers are typically told about special tasks for the day and things to look out for. Here we are particularly interested in guidelines, instructions, performance targets, or anything else mentioned in relation to interactions with the public. For example: Were the officers reminded to be polite? Were they asked to focus on a particular neighbourhood? A particular description? Is there a special event taking place today? Occasionally, officers may self-brief, which involves them reading their daily tasks, intelligence update, and other notices on a police computer. This may happen instead or in addition to the shift briefing.

A particular emphasis should be placed on:

1. the extent to which the officers are encouraged to initiate contact with particular suspects/people in general; and

2. the extent to which the instructions they are given are consistent with the College learning standards.

5.2 Who is the officer?

This information will develop from on-going conversations with the officer throughout the shift. These conversations should be informal. How old is the officer? How long has she been a police officer? Why did s/he want to be a police officer? What does she like and dislike about her job? What does she think about the public and interactions with them? Also in this section, consider the other interactions and activities the officer undertakes within the shift, outside of the specific interactions of interest to this study.

5.3 Police-initiated interactions with members of the public

In the present study we are **not** interested in everything the officer does, nor are we interested in all interactions with members of the public. **We focus on and document ONLY interactions with members of the public that comply with the following conditions:**

1. The interaction was initiated by the observed officer (or the observed officer was directly involved in an interaction that was initiated by a police colleague).

   There is one exception to this rule: a citizen initiated an encounter that later developed into a S&S, arrest, or some other form of meaningful contact. In such rare events the observer should make every effort to record the encounter although s/he may not have been tuned to doing so from the outset.

2. The interaction involves a person suspected of being involved in criminal or disorderly activity (this could be evidenced by the officer challenging, questioning or being uncertain about a citizen and their actions, behaviour, possessions or location, or identifying the person as a person suspected of criminal or disorderly activity).

   Note that a citizen may not clearly be a suspect at the start of an encounter, so it is important to be aware that many interactions with the public may turn into encounters and observations should be made accordingly. If it is unclear if a citizen was a suspect in the mind of an officer, this can be clarified during debriefing/post-encounter.

3. The interaction lasted at least one minute; OR involved at least three verbal exchanges; OR included significant physical contact (this condition excludes very minor verbal exchanges, such as the officer simply saying "good morning" to a citizen she passes by).

Each encounter that complies with these conditions should be documented. Please note that there may be encounters where the officer interacts with more than one citizen (e.g. dealing with both sides in a car accident or interacting with a group of teenagers walking together). The officer may interact very differently with each of the citizens, and this all needs to be recorded. More details are provided below.

5.4 Debriefing

After each encounter, and at the earliest convenience, the observer should try to ask the officer some informal questions in a non-intrusive as manner as possible. This is ideally done in the car after the conclusion of the encounter. The observer can tell the officer that this is just something s/he needs to do as part of documenting the observation, and "if this is not a good time we can do it later..." These need to be handled sensitively; **the observed officers are not being inspected or assessed**, and questioning should be done as conversationally as possible. It may not be possible or appropriate to debrief all of any of the encounters you observe.

In the debriefing, the observer should try to enquire about the following three issues:

1. What were the **reasons** for the officer initiating the encounter? (e.g. "why do you decide to stop that person?")

2. What was the officer's **goal** for this encounter? (e.g. "What were you hoping to achieve when you began speaking with that woman?")

3. What is the officer's estimate that the goal was/will be **achieved?** (e.g. "So do you think she will drive slower from now on?)

5.5 Directed conversations

While the debriefings are about a particular encounter, throughout the shift "free time" between encounters should be used to carry out directed conversations with the officers on their views concerning the recent S&S training they experienced and its application in the "real world." These conversations should flow naturally and be handled sensitively, but some questions to help guide the observer are listed below:

- What did you think about the S&S training?

  o Did you find it clear? Relevant to the "real world"?
  o Helpful in implementing the new scheme?

- Do you do things differently now? Do your colleagues?

- Are there things you think help you put the training into practice? Are there things that you think get in your way?

  o Do your direct supervisors support having a new approach to S&S?
  o Are there any new policies or operations that have affected the way S&S is conducted in [this force]?

6. What outputs do the observers produce from each shift?

6.1 Detailed qualitative narratives

The first output that should come out of each shift observed is a detailed narrative that follows particular, pre-determined categories. The narrative should be completed within 24 hours of the completion of the

observation. While each observer will clearly have his/her writing style, the overall goal we should have in mind is to produce a "screen play," which, in theory, a producer could use to reconstruct the situation. This means providing as much details as possible about what happened (what the officer said, how the citizen responded, what happened next). But importantly, it also means that we need to document *what* the officer and citizen said, its *tone*, and any *reaction*. Observer interpretations are welcome, but should be justified and explained. For example, if you write that the citizen left the encounter happy, you should also explain why you thought so – Was it something she said to the officer? Did she smile? Shake the officer's hand? Similarly, if the citizen declined a request by the officer, you should also explain why you thought so – Was the request voluntary? Did they simply decline or was the citizen confrontational? If so, how?

The headings for the narrative are listed below along with instructions and explanations.

THE NARRATIVE

1. OBSERVER NO:

Enter your observer number

2. SHIFT:

Numbered sequentially per observer (e.g. is this your first shift? Second?)

3. DATE AND LOCATION:

Enter the date the ride began, location (e.g. borough, town, neighbourhood), force, the type of shift and hours (e.g. "afternoon shift; Middlesbrough; Cleveland Police; 12:00-22:00)

4. OFFICER NO:

Enter the number assigned in the study to the officer you observed (NOT the officer's collar number). The officer being observed should ordinarily be referred to as O1; other officers should be referred to using a similar notation (e.g. O2, O3…).

5. OFFICER DESCRIPTION:

Varies in length depending on how talkative the officer was, but as a general rule you should aim to include the following information:

- **The officer's basic socio-demographic characteristics –** Sex, age, race.
- **The officer's background in policing and views of his/her job –** Years' service, main professional background, preferred working style, attitudes about his/her job, and about providing service to the public.

- **Views about S&S** – About the recent S&S training, and about the barriers and facilitators to putting the training into practice. This section should be based on the directed conversations (see section 5.5 above).

6. REACTION TO OBSERVATION:

This section is important for detecting and reporting potential observer effects, and other factors that may impact the quality of the data. It should address two main issues:

- **What was the officer's reaction to the observer's presence?** Did s/he indicate that s/he does not want to be observed? That it makes her uncomfortable? Did she offer to take the observer to the "rough part of town"? To do more S&S than usual? Or did s/he appear to feel comfortable and behave naturally? This may of course change over the course of the shift and should be documented.

- **What was the observer's reaction to the observation?** This section requires some introspection. Were you alert? Focused? Did you feel that you understood what was going on? Were there parts of encounters that you missed? Did you feel that you were able to establish rapport with the officer? Did you forget to ask some debriefing or directed conversation questions? This is not a test to the observer, and we realize that no observation can be perfect. But it is important for us to know this information in order to take it into account in the analysis stage.

7. SHIFT BRIEFING:

What instructions were given to the officers during the shift briefing? Were there any instructions or performance targets that have/may have affected the way officers carry out interactions with the public and particularly S&S (e.g. instructions to do more/less encounters, to engage particular suspects, or focus on a particular area)? Were there any references to ongoing operations or incidents that might impact on S&S (e.g. relating to increases in burglaries, community tensions, or persons of interest in an area)? Did other officers say or do anything that might reveal something about how S&S is used locally.

8. ENCOUNTERS:

Should be completed for all officer-initiated encounters throughout the shift that comply with the conditions specified in section 5.3. Encounters should be numbered in chronological order per shift, and the time the encounter began and ended should clearly appear next to the encounter number in the title of the encounter.

Encounter 2: 10:40-11:32

Type: (e.g. Stop and Search, Stop and Account, etc – can be more than one if multiple citizens involved with different encounter types)

The description of each encounter includes three sections:

1. Detailed descriptive account:

Detail what the officer was doing right before the encounter began and the location of the encounter; describe the citizens involved (using acronyms, e.g. WM=White male) including: their sex, estimated age and race/ethnicity; what they were doing; what exactly the officer/citizen said to each other; and how the person responded. Make sure to draw a full picture, that is not only *what* was said but *how* it was said as well (tones, body language…). Remember that a producer should be able to reconstruct the scene based on your description, so it should be as detailed as you can, not only in terms of what happened but also in terms of the "atmosphere." At the same time, all interpretations should be clearly explained. For example, if you say that the atmosphere was "tense," explain exactly why you felt this – Was it the face that the citizen made? The officer's tone?

The first citizen the officer spoke with in any given encounter should be referred to as C1. The second citizen should be C2 and so on (numbered sequentially per encounter). For each citizen specify their race, sex and age (e.g. "…O1 then saw C2, a WF in her twenties, who was peacefully walking her dog…"). The officer observed is always O1, if another officer joins the scene s/he would be O2.

Importantly, within any given situation, O1 may interact with several citizens, but not all of these interactions may qualify as an encounter (see conditions is section 5.3 above). In the narrative, ALL interactions with all citizens should be detailed as part of the description of the situation and chain of events. At the same time, the Anonymous Citizen Information Questionnaire (see below) should be completed only for citizens who had what qualifies as an encounter with O1 (meet all three conditions specified in section 5.3).

Based on the length and complexity of the encounter, its description can take anything from about 2 paragraphs to several pages.

2. Debriefing:

Detail the officer's responses to the debriefing questions about this encounter (see section 5.4 above).

3. Interpretation (S&S encounters only):

This section should only be completed only for S&S encounters. The observer should try to answer the main research questions based on this specific encounter. No new information about the chain of events should appear here (all details should be in the description of the encounter), but rather the purpose here is to draw conclusion based on the descriptive information provide in detail earlier. In this section, the observer should aim to answer the following questions:

1. **To what extent did the officer appear to follow the College learning standards, including the decision to carry out the stop and the way the encounter was handled**? The observer should consider items 8-25 in the Anonymous Citizen Information Questionnaire (see below) when making the evaluation.

2. **Can the observer identify factors that helped and/or hindered the officer's ability to carry out the S&S in line with the learning standards?** This could be based on what the officer told you or what you observed, but should be justified and explained. For example, you may claim that your impression was that more citizens on scene – and the way they were behaving – made it

more difficult for the officer, but explain what exactly in the situation made you reach this conclusion.

3. **The citizen's response –** How did the citizen respond to being stopped, and at different stages of the encounter? How did s/he appear react to what the officer did? Did behaviours in line with the College leaning standards appear to generate particular responses? Did the officer change their behaviour as a result of the citizen's reaction? Again, all conclusions should be explained.

9. ADDITIONAL NOTES

If anything else occurs during the shift that appears relevant to the study or the S&S training, but does not fit into the above categories, please include here. For example: Did s/he interact with other members of the public (e.g. victims, witnesses, complainants, and informal conversations)? What was the nature of the interaction and how did they communicate with one another? Make a brief note of anything else you think might help with the interpretation what happened during the shift (e.g. inclement weather, an ongoing incident not mentioned during the briefing, the officer being tried up with an arrest or paperwork).

6.2 Coded quantitative data

In addition to the detailed narratives, some information about the encounter, which is particularly relevant for answering the research questions, should be recorded using the questionnaires below about the shift/officer, the encounter, the citizens involved in the encounter.

Observers should note that the priority is for them to *observe* the details of the event. The observer may be able to code some of this information during the encounter through use of the app. As there are many questions, some of which require the observer to think and make an interpretation, it is highly likely that some coding will be completed the after the shift.

Coding instructions are included in the Appendix for those items that require further explanation. These instructions are critical for coding in a systematic fashion, which is that all observers will code the same way. If in doubt on how to code please email Tal Jonathan-Zamir (tal.jonathan@mail.huji.ac.il).

Please note that some items could potentially play more than one role, depending on how we do the analysis.

QUESTIONNAIRE 1 – SHIFT / ANONYMOUS OFFICER INFORMATION

1. Police force:

    a. BTP

    b. Cleveland

    c. GMP

    d. Met

    e. Sussex

f. Thames Valley

2. Shift number *(numbered sequentially for each observer)*

3. Date shift began (See Appendix)

4. Time shift began

5. Date shift ended

6. Time shift ended

7. What was the O1's sex?

    a. Male

    b. Female

8. What was the O1's age?

    a. Young adult (19-30)

    b. Adult (31-45)

    c. Middle-aged (46-65)

    d. Senior (65 and above)

9. What was the O1's race/ethnicity?

    a. Asian

    b. Black

    c. Mixed race

    d. White

    e. Other

    f. Could not determine

10. How many years of experience in law enforcement does O1 have? [ENTER NUMBER]

11. What is the O1's current role?

    a. Neighbourhood

    b. Response

    c. Specialist (e.g. traffic, proactive, firearms, etc.)

    d. Other

QUESTIONNAIRE 2 – ENCOUNTER INFORMATION

The observer code, shift number, encounter number, should be recorded automatically by the app.

1. How did the officer's involvement in the encounter begin?

   a. Initiated proactively by the officer – own observations only (e.g. observed suspicious behaviour or someone in need of assistance)

   b. Initiated proactively by officer – own observations supported by intelligence (e.g. observed active offender)

   c. Initiated reactively following a public call for service (e.g. incident, suspect description)

   d. Initiated reactively following an instruction or other information received (e.g. witness, supervisor, team mate, security guard, ANPR)

   f. Initiated by citizen (generally not measured in the present study. To be coded only if developed into a major encounter – S&S, arrest, etc.)

2. What was the maximum number of citizens (bystanders + participants, including civilian service personnel) present at any time during the encounter? [ENTER NUMBER]

3. What was the maximum number of officers (including O1) present at any time during the encounter? [ENTER NUMBER]

4. What was O1's role in this encounter?

   a. The primary officer in the encounter (often the officer who initiated contact or led the interaction)

   b. A secondary officer in the encounter (contributing to the interaction, but not the lead or a bystander)

   c. Could not determine

5. What best characterizes the location of the encounter?

   a. Street/open residential

   b. Alley/restricted residential

   c. Industrial area

   d. Shopping area

   e. Open ground (e.g. park, car park, field)

   f. Private premise (e.g. inside someone's house)

   g. Business premise

   h. Public building (e.g. hospital)

   i. Other

QUESTIONNAIRE 3 – ANONYMOUS CITIZEN INFORMATION

To be completed for each individual the officer had an encounter with (see section 5.3 above)

**The observer code, shift number and encounter number should be recorded automatically by the app.

1. What was the citizen's sex?

    a. Male

    b. Female

2. What was the citizen's age?

    a. Child (up to 12)

    b. Adolescent (13-18)

    c. Young adult (19-30)

    d. Adult (31-45)

    e. Middle-aged (46-65)

    f. Senior (65 and above)

    g. Could not determine

3. What was the citizen's race/ethnicity?

    a. Asian

    b. Black

    c. Mixed race

    d. White

    e. Other

    f. Could not determine

4. What was the citizen's appearance?

    a. Smart/formal (e.g. suit)

    b. Sports/street fashion

    c. Scruffy (dishevelled)

    d. Uniform (incl. work clothes)

    e. Casual/not distinct

    f. Other

    g. Could not determine

5. What was the citizen's physical state as it appeared at the beginning of the encounter?

a. Sober and healthy

b. Slightly intoxicated (drink, drugs) – slight effects on mental capacity/behaviour

c. Highly intoxicated (drink, drugs) – strong effects on mental capacity/behaviour

d. Mentally health issue – slight effects on capacity/behaviour

e. Mentally health issue – strong effects on capacity/behaviour

f. Could not determine

7. Was the citizen known to the observed officer?

a. Yes, in person

b. Yes, in name / appearance only

c. No

d. Could not determine

8. What type of encounter was observed (at the end of the encounter)? (See Appendix)

a. Conversational encounter (skip to Q.25)

b. Pedestrian stop – person held to account (skip to Q.25)

c. Vehicle stop – driver held to account (skip to Q.25)

d. Vehicle stop – passenger held to account (skip to Q.25)

e. Stop and search

g. Checks on 'nominals' (planned visits to persons of interest, e.g. those on bail conditions) (skip to Q.25)

h. Immediate arrest (encounters with individuals for whom an arrest has been determined before beginning of encounter) (skip to Q.25)

i. Other (skip to Q.25)

9. Did the officer tell the citizen that s/he was detained for the purposes of a search?

a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

c. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not tell them

d. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not tell them

e. No, but explained by another officer

f. Could not determine

10. Did the officer explain the grounds for the search to this citizen?

a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

c. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not explain

d. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not explain

e. No, but explained by another officer

f. Could not determine

11. Did the officer explain to this citizen what item s/he was looking for?

a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

c. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not explain

d. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not explain

e. No, but explained by another officer

f. Could not determine

12. What was the item being searched for? (Based on what officer said)

a. Drugs – cannabis

b. Drugs – other

c. Items used in a theft

d. Stolen property

d. Weapon (e.g. knife, firearm, ammunition)

e. Items used in criminal damage

f. Other

13. Did the officer give this citizen the opportunity to hand over the item?

a. Yes

b. No

c. No, but another officer did so

d. Could not determine

14. Was the item the officer was looking for found?

a. Yes, the citizen handed over the item to the officer

b. Yes, the item was found by the officer during the search

c. No

d. Could not determine

15. Did the police find a different/other item that is illegal to possess?

    a. Yes

    b. No (skip next question)

    c. Could not determine (skip next question)

16. What was the different/other item found?

    a. Drugs – cannabis

    b. Drugs – other

    c. Items used in a theft

    d. Stolen property

    d. Weapon (e.g. knife, firearm, ammunition)

    e. Items used in criminal damage

    f. Other

17. Did the officer provide this citizen with his/her identity (e.g. name and number) or warrant card if not in uniform?

    a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

    b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

    c. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not provide details

    d. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not provide details

    c. No, but provided by another officer

    d. Could not determine

18. Did the officer state to this citizen the station where s/he worked?

    a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

    b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

    c. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not provide details

    d. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not provide details

    e. No, but another officer did so

    f. Could not determine

19. Did the officer make an official record of the encounter at the time (i.e. not in their pocket note book)?

    a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

    b. Yes, on his/her own initiative without asking or being asked

c. Yes, after the officer asked whether the citizen wanted a record

d. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not make a record [skip next question]

e. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not make a record [skip next question]

f. No, the officer asked but the citizen declined [skip next question]

g. No, but another officer did so

h. Could not determine [skip next question]

20. Did the officer provide this citizen with a copy of the search record?

a. Yes

b. No, but told the citizen that they are entitled to a copy of the search record within 3 months.

c. No, and did NOT tell the citizen that they are entitled to a copy of the search record.

d. No, but provided by another officer

e. Could not determine

21. Did the officer explain to this citizen the legal power being used?

a. Yes, in response to the citizen's request

b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

c. No, the citizen requested but the officer did not comply [skip next question]

d. No, the citizen did not request and the officer did not initiate [skip next question]

e. No, but explained by another officer

f. Could not determine [skip next question]

22. According to the officer's explanation, what was the legal power being used?

a. Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, s1

b. Misuse of Drugs Act 1971, s23

c. Firearms Act 1968, s47

d. Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, s60

e. Other

f. Could not determine

23. To what extent was this citizen searched? (Mark the highest applicable option)

a. JOG – The citizen was asked to remove his/her jacket / outer coat/ gloves

b. The officer searched this citizen's outer garment pockets / inside of collars / socks/ shoes / hair

c. The citizen was asked to remove his/her T-shirt

d. The search involved the exposure of intimate parts of the body

24. Did the citizen provide the officer with his/her name or contact details?

    a. Yes, in response to being asked by the officer

    b. Yes, in response to another officer's request

    c. Yes, on his/her own initiative

    d. No, the officer asked but the citizen did not provide details

    e. No, the officer did not ask and the citizen did not provide details

    f. Could not determine

25. What was the outcome of the encounter? (Mark all that apply)

    a. Released person with no further action

    b. Released person with advice

    c. Released person with verbal warning

    d. Issued with a cannabis warning

    e. Issued with a Penalty Notice for Disorder (PND)

    f. Issued with traffic 'ticket' (e.g. FPN, VDRS or HORT1)

    g. Arrested person

    h. Other

    i. Could not determine

26. At the BEGINNING of this citizen's involvement in the encounter, what attitude did the citizen display **toward the observed officer's** handling of the situation? (See Appendix)

    a. Very negative attitude

    b. Somewhat negative attitude

    c. Neutral

    d. Somewhat positive attitude

    e. Very positive attitude

    f. Ambiguous

    f. Could not determine [skip next question]

27. Did the citizen indicate the source(s) of this attitude?

    a. Yes, focused primarily on the officer's decision to initiate the encounter

    b. Yes, focused primarily on the process of how the police treated the citizen at the initiation of the encounter

c. Yes, other

d. No

28. What best describes the citizen's disposition at the beginning of the encounter? (See Appendix)

a. Calm/Neutral

b. Jovial/Friendly

c. Disoriented/Confused

d. Slightly agitated or upset (but not aggressive)

e. Very agitated or upset (but not aggressive)

f. Aggressive or threatening toward police or others

g. Other (describe)

h. Could not determine

29. At the END of this citizen's involvement in the encounter, what attitude did the citizen display **toward the observed officer's handling of the situation**? (See Appendix)

a. Very negative attitude

b. Somewhat negative attitude

c. Neutral

d. Somewhat positive attitude

e. Very positive attitude

f. Ambiguous

g. Could not determine [skip next question]

30. Did the citizen indicate the source(s) of this attitude?

a. Yes, focused primarily on the officer's decision to initiate the encounter

b. Yes, focused primarily on the process of how the police dealt with citizen(s) during the encounter

c. Yes, focused primarily on the outcome of the encounter

d. Yes, other

e. No

31. Did the citizen provide their viewpoint about the matter of interest in this encounter? (See Appendix)

a. Yes, in response to being asked by the officer

b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

c. No, the officer asked but the citizen did not provide [skip next question]

d. No, the officer did not ask and the citizen did not provide [skip next question]

e. Could not determine

32. How did the officer receive the citizen's information/viewpoint? (see Appendix)

a. Active listener – expressed interest in or appreciation for citizen's statement or offered encouragement, asked follow-up questions

b. Attentive listener – listened attentively to what the citizen said, but did not encourage additional participation or show appreciation (verbally and non-verbally)

c. Inattentive listener – accepted the citizen's statements, but did not pay close attention, express appreciation, or offer encouragement

d. Non-listener– cut the citizen off and or dismissed the citizen's effort

e. Could not determine

33. Did the officer explain to the citizen why the police became involved in this situation? (See Appendix)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Not known

34. Did the officer explicitly specify the resolution of the situation? (e.g. "I am arresting you…"; "I am letting you go…")

a. Yes

b. No

c. No, but this was specified by another officer

d. Not known

35. Did the officer explain *why* s/he chose to resolve the situation as s/he did? (e.g. "I am arresting you *because*…") (See Appendix)

a. Yes

b. No

c. No, but this was explained by another officer

d. Not known

36. Did the citizen show respect to the observed officer at any point during the encounter? (See Appendix)

a. Yes, in response to something the officer said/did during the encounter

b. Yes, unprompted by anything the officer said/did during the encounter

d. No

e. Could not determine

37. Did the citizen show disrespect to the observed officer at any point during this encounter? (See Appendix)

    a. Yes, in response to something the officer said/did during the encounter

    b. Yes, unprompted by anything the officer said/did during the encounter

    d. No

    e. Could not determine

38. Was the officer polite to the citizen at any point during this encounter? (See Appendix)

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Could not determine

39. Did the officer ask the citizen about his/her wellbeing or ask others about the citizen's wellbeing in a way that the citizen observed it? (See Appendix)

    a. Yes

    b. No

    c. Could not determine

40. Did the police offer comfort or reassurance to the citizen at any point during the encounter? (See Appendix)

    a. Yes

    b. No [skip next item]

    c. Could not determine [skip next item]

41. Did the officer provide/arrange/offer any physical or practical assistance to the citizen at any point during the encounter? (See Appendix)

    a. Yes, in response to being asked by the citizen

    b. Yes, on his/her own initiative

    c. No, the citizen asked but the officer did not provide/offer

    d. No, the citizen did not ask and the officer did not provide/offer

42. Did the officer provide/offer to provide advice on how the citizen could handle the situation or deal with the problem at any point during the encounter?

    a. Yes, officer initiated on own without citizen request

b. Yes, officer complied with citizen request

c. No, citizen did not request and officer did not initiate on own

d. No, citizen requested, but officer did not comply

43. What best characterizes the extent to which the officer used "effective communication" when interacting with this citizen? (See Appendix)

a. None – the officer did not use any of the principles of "effective communication"

b. Brief – "effective communication" occurred in only a small portion of the encounter

c. Intermittent – "effective communication" occurred several times during the encounter

d. Consistent – "effective communication" occurred constantly throughout the encounter

APPENDIX – CODING INSTRUCTIONS

In principle, anyone should be able to fill out the closed-ended questionnaires based on the narrative. Thus, all the information coded in the questionnaires should also appear in the narrative. Additionally, please make sure there are no discrepancies between the two.

SHIFT INFORMATION

Questions 3-6 – Date and time observation began and ended
Any discrepancies between the officer's shift and the observation (e.g. the observer arrived late, left early) should be noted and explained in the narrative. Otherwise the assumption is that the observation began and ended with the officer's shift.

CITIZEN INFORMATION

Question 8 – Types of encounters
- *Pedestrian stops (or 'stop and account')* – Where a person on foot (or parked vehicle) is asked to account for what they are doing, why they are in a particular area and/or where they are going. Is the person free to leave at any time? Yes. Are officers legally required to make a record of the encounter? No, but some forces have a local requirement. Is the citizen required to give their name? No.

- *Stop and search* – Where reasonable grounds exist for an officer to search a person, or where a s60 power has been authorized. Is the person free to leave at any time? No. Where reasonable grounds or authorization exists, the person concerned can be detained to carry out a search. Questions may be asked about the person's behaviour or presence in circumstances which gave rise to the suspicion. As a result of questioning, the reasonable grounds for suspicion necessary to detain that person may be confirmed or, because of a satisfactory explanation, be dispelled. Are officers legally required to make a record of the encounter? Yes. Is the citizen required to give their name? No.

- *Vehicle stops* – The police have the power under s163 RTA 1988 to stop any vehicle. Vehicles are stopped for a variety of purposes, including to check vehicle ownership, documentation,

construction and use offences, moving traffic offences (e.g. drink-driving). Officers do not require reasons or grounds to conduct a vehicle. Failure to stop is a criminal offence. Are officers legally required to make a record of the encounter? No, but some forces have a local requirement (as per 'stop and account'). Is the citizen free to leave at any time? Drivers no, passengers yes.

- *Checks on 'nominals'* – The police will identify, through shift briefings as well as other forms of intelligence-sharing (e.g. electronic briefings, poster boards in offices) individuals who should be located and checked on ("nominals"). The officer you are observing or his/her team may be formally tasked to find these people within a shift and make inquiries about their activities (e.g. visiting the nominal's place of residence). Code this category if and encounter occurs where: the officer was looking for the *specific* person with whom they are having the encounter; and this is not a vehicle stop or S&S (otherwise, code the other respective category).

- *Immediate arrest* – The police may be looking for a specific nominal where an arrest has been determined before the beginning of encounter. In these instances, the officer has little discretion but to stop and arrest the individual if found. In instances where police begin an encounter knowing that they are required to arrest an individual, select this category. If they do not know, at the beginning of an encounter, that this individual should be arrested, choose another relevant category.

- *Other* – If this encounter fits all criteria for an encounter, but does not fit the other encounter categories, select other and enter a description in the text box that appears.

Questions 26, 29 – The citizen's attitude toward the police handling of the situation

The citizen's attitude should be judged on observable cues from the citizen's behaviour, such as verbal comments the citizen makes to the police, to other citizens or to you (*not* your estimate of the nature of their "inner" feelings). For example: Did the citizen thank the officer? Shake his hand? Smile? Alternatively, did the citizen complain about being stopped, about the length of the encounter? Did the citizen indicate s/he was going to complain?

Question 28 – The citizen's disposition at the beginning of the encounter?

The citizen's disposition (not necessarily toward the police, but in general) should also be judged based on observable cues. Were they speaking calmly? Did they say anything that suggested a friendly attitude, such as joking or laughing? Was their speech convoluted or irrational, or did they appear intoxicated or disturbed? Did they use incomplete sentences? Did they express anger or agitation, and was this consistent or intermittent? Did they raise their voice, or did their body posture or statements reflect a threat toward police or others in the area? Select the option that best describes the citizen.

Question 31 – The citizen's viewpoint about the matter

The citizen's viewpoint about the matter of interest in this encounter may include (but is not limited to) any type of information on the events that took place (what, according to the citizen, happened and did not happen, sequence of events); his/her views about who is at fault; explanations why s/he or others behaved as they did; information about potential witnesses to the event; and suggestions to the officers about what they can do in order to get the complete picture ("you can talk to XXX, he will tell you…" or "there is a camera in the parking lot, it will show that I didn't do XXX").

DO NOT include the citizen's point of view about the way the police handled the encounter. For coding this information see items 26, 28.

Question 33 – Explaining why the police became involved in the situation

Why the officer *became involved* in the situation refers to the initiation of contact with the citizen. For example, "I stopped you because you were speeding at XXX on a XXX mph road." Or "one of the neighbours complained about loud music coming from this apartment."

Question 34 – Explaining the resolution of the situation

The *resolution of the situation* refers to how the officer decided to deal with this event (e.g. such as arrest, cannabis warning, telling a citizen to leave the scene) and why the officer chose a particular course of action.

Questions 36, 37 – Showing respect/disrespect to the officer

Your answers here should be based on your own observations, and independent of any comment made by the officer or anyone else about the citizen's behaviour. "Respect" and disrespect" are coded in separate items as citizens can behave in different way throughout an encounter. In terms of the coding, one does *not* cancel out the other. This behaviour may be prompted by something the officer said or did *during* the encounter, or for another reason (e.g. by virtue of being stopped).

Being casual, matter-of-fact, or having a low-key manner are regarded as baseline citizen behaviours for the purposes of coding (i.e. they do not count as "respect" or "disrespect"). Similarly, if the citizen disagrees with the officer, asks questions or does not comply with a request – but does so politely or neutrally – this behaviour should not be coded as "disrespect". The citizen needs to display explicit signs of "respect" or "disrespect" for the behaviour to be coded accordingly. These explicit signs should be detailed in the narrative, and may include the following verbal and non-verbal behaviours:

- *"Respect"* – for example: being polite (e.g. "please" / "thank you" / "good afternoon"); or apologizing for their behaviour.

- *"Disrespect"* – for example: being rude to the officer; making derogatory, disparaging or sarcastic comments; swearing; ignoring the officer; or particular physical gestures.

Question 38 – Being polite to the citizen

Code "yes" if the officer spoke to the citizen politely (e.g. "please" / "thank you" / "good afternoon" / "I'm sorry for the trouble") or actively tried to put them at ease. This taps into the "respectful treatment" component of procedural justice.

Question 39 – Inquiring about the citizen's wellbeing

"Wellbeing" refers to the citizen's physical, mental or social condition. Code "yes" if the officer made any inquiry that showed care and concern for this citizen's condition or situation. This item taps the "trustworthy motives" component of procedural justice, as reflected by showing care and concern for the citizen and their wellbeing.

Question 40 – Offering the citizen comfort/reassurance

Code "yes" if the officer made any attempt to ease the pain of the citizen, relieve his/her anxieties, soothe or cheer him/her. This item taps the "trustworthy motives" component of procedural justice, as reflected by showing care and concern for the citizen and their wellbeing.

Question 41 – Offering the citizen physical/practical assistance

Physical assistance is any assistance that goes beyond verbal communication. For example, transportation, medical assistance, fixing problems with a car or home, retrieving lost pets, children, and property. This item taps the "trustworthy motives" component of procedural justice, as reflected by showing care and concern for the citizen and their wellbeing.

Question 42 – Using effective communication

Includes the following behaviours explicitly mentioned in the College learning standards:

- The officer introduced him/herself by name and used the subject's name
- The officer recognized the citizen's emotional state
- The officer used non-verbal communication techniques such as eye contact, nodding, and body matching
- The officer acknowledged the subject's feelings and made it clear they are being listened to (e.g. "I understand", "I won't keep you any longer than really necessary")
- The officer avoided words and phrases that could create barriers with the subject (e.g. used the word 'obviously' when the process may not be obvious)
- The officer reduced unrealistic expectations, while emphasizing what s/he *can* do for the subject rather than saying 'no' to unrealistic requests (e.g. "what I can do is…", "what I recommend is…")
- At the end of the encounter the officer checked with the subject if there is any further information or action they require and thanked them; and/or apologized for inconveniencing them if nothing was found.

Training Designers Interview Schedule

Stop and Search – Training designer interview schedule

The following interview schedule should be used as a guide for your interview with training designers and stakeholders in the training design process. Certain questions may be more relevant for some than others. The timings provided should serve as a rough guide for how long you should spend on each section, but please also feel free to explore relevant issues as they arise.

Preface

Thank you for taking part in this research. Your interview today will contribute to the evaluation of the Stop and Search training, and your views and feedback will help the College to improve the training and understand what worked, what didn't, and why. Do you have any questions about the research before we begin?

Your contribution will be reported anonymously in any reports emerging from this study, and we would like to audio-record the interview to ensure we accurately record what you've said. The recording will not be shared outside of the research team, and anonymous quotes may be used in our reports from this research. Is that ok?

Given your unique role in the development of this pilot, there may be instances where we would want to quote you or cite your statements directly, with attribution. In those instances we would first confirm the specific quote with you and the context in which it would be placed, and you'd have the right to decline the use of any attribution in our report.

Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary, and if at any time in the interview you wish to end your participation you are free to stop without providing any reason. Are you happy to begin?

If yes to all, begin recording and ask them to confirm again that they understand the research and are happy to be recorded. If no to recording, take contemporaneous notes.

Introductory questions (5 min)

- It would be helpful if you could provide some background about yourself. Can you tell me about your current role with [the College/EHRC/NPCC]?
    - o Can you tell me about your role in the training design for this training?
    - o Have you ever designed other training courses for police? Which ones?
- Can you tell me a bit about your background with Stop and Search – did you have an interest in the issues related to stop and search prior to taking part in this process [e.g. as a police officer/prior trainings/studying the subject]?

Designing the training (30 min)

- Can you tell me about how the training was designed – particularly who gave what input, how the process was directed, and so on?
    - o What kind of evidence did you rely on when designing this training? In what ways did this evidence inform the training design?

66

- o Would you consider the training to be 'evidence-based'? Why or why not?
- Were roles and responsibilities clear during the design process?
- Was the purpose of the training clear throughout the design stages?
  - o What did you understand the purpose of the training to be?
  - o Were there differences of opinion among the designers or stakeholders?
- What kinds of input did you receive from police forces in designing this training?
  - o Was their input helpful?
  - o What kinds of influence did the forces have over the design of the training?
  - o Can you reflect on a particularly useful suggestion you received from the forces that may have improved the training package?
  - o We understand that there was resistance from certain forces to this training either in principle or due to certain aspects of its implementation – can you reflect on their reasons for disagreement?
    - ▪ How if at all did this have an effect on the training design?
    - ▪ What steps did you take to communicate with those who expressed disagreement or concern?
- Did the focus or structure of the training change substantially over the course of the design process, or was the format more or less the same throughout?
- What other stakeholders were involved in the training design?
  - o How if at all did they influence the design or implementation of the training package?
  - o To your knowledge, did other institutions such as the Home Office or HMIC have any influence on the training design? In what ways?
  - o What was the relationship between the EHRC and the College like during the training design? What impact might this have had on the training package?
  - o Given the prevalence of the Home Secretary's comments in the training guidance, has there been any direct communication with the Home Secretary regarding this training or what should be included?
- [If they've designed training before] Was the design process for this training different from previous design processes you've been involved in? If so, how?
- We understand that there has been substantial discussion around the definition of a "fair and effective" search. Can you reflect on the key points of discussion or disagreement?
  - o How was the final definition decided?
  - o How important is this definition to the training?
  - o Particularly, we understand the MPS has decided not to use the definition in their training. What impact do you think this discussion will have on the training they provide, and its value?
- How were the main areas of focus for the training determined?
  - o Prompts: Conscious/unconscious bias, Reasonable Grounds, Adverse impacts, Legal requirements of recording, etc.
  - o We noticed that concepts around "procedural justice" were not particularly prominent in the trainer's guide. Why was this?
- Can you reflect on a particularly positive experience from the design process – something that you felt went very well?

- How could the design process have been improved?
    - o Was there enough time to design the training properly?
        - ▪ What might you have done with more time?
    - o Was the communication with stakeholders, particularly other forces, adequate?
    - o Were there particular barriers to the process (e.g. individuals, organisational issues, etc)?
        - ▪ What was done to overcome these?

Relationship with the force trainers (15 min)

- What kinds of input did you seek from the force trainers before finalising the trainer's guide and reading material?
- The College chose to put forward guidance for trainers rather than a training product and detailed delivery manual, which meant that trainers were likely to develop and modify training materials locally. Why was this the case?
    - o Do you have any concerns about inconsistencies in the training messages being provided by different forces?
    - o What is your opinion of the exercises provided in the guidance?
        - ▪ Do you think there were enough for force trainers to provide effective training?
        - ▪ On reflection, do you think they were the 'right' exercises to include?
    - o We understand that some trainers have opted not to use, for example, role play in their training. What impact do you think this might have on the effectiveness of the training?
- What was your experience of the 'train the trainers' event? Do you think it was of value to the trainers?
    - o How might it have been better?
    - o Do you think that trainers were prepared to provide all aspects the training, based on that event?
    - o Have you received any feedback from trainers regarding the event?

Delivery of the training (10 min)

- Do you think the pre-read materials and assessment were useful to participants? How might these be improved?
- When you were designing the training, how did you hope it would be introduced by trainers to participants?
    - o What would have been the ideal introduction, in your opinion?
    - o How did you want them to discuss the pilot aspect of the training (including the evaluation), if at all?
- Clearly there was a lot of material that could have been covered on this topic. Which areas would you have thought were the most important for the trainers to emphasise?
    - o Prompts: Conscious/unconscious bias, Reasonable Grounds, Adverse impacts, Legal requirements of recording, etc.
    - o Do you think the trainers had adequate knowledge to provide all aspects of the training?
    - o On reflection, were there any areas that might have been too complex for one-day course?

- o In our experience of the trainings, it seems that the process of establishing and recording reasonable grounds was a predominant focus of discussion – was this the intention of the designers?

Purpose of the training/wider views (15 min)

- What is, for you, the ideal outcome that you could imagine from this training?
    - o Do you think this view is shared by all those who helped design it?
    - o Do you think that training (rather than some other intervention, e.g. legislative) is the best way to improve stop and search outcomes?
        - ▪ Is it important that the training is specific to stop and search, or could similar goals be achieved through other skills development (e.g. skills training around positive encounters or communication)?
- When you began designing the training, what was your sense of the level of training on stop and search available at force level?
    - o Do you think this training duplicates anything participants may have recently received?
- Do you think the training will have any impact? If so, what? If not, why?

Closing questions (if time allows/not already answered) (5 min)

- If you could re-start the design process, how might you do it differently this time?
- If you could make any changes to the training, what would they be?

Trainers Interview Schedule

Stop and Search – Trainer interview schedule

The following interview schedule should be used as a guide for your interview with trainers and force leads. Certain questions are identified as specifically for force leads, though if they appear relevant to any trainer please feel free to ask them. The timings provided should serve as a rough guide for how long you should spend on each section, but please also feel free to explore relevant issues as they arise.

Preface

Thank you for taking part in this research. Your interview today will contribute to the evaluation of the Stop and Search training, and your views and feedback will help the College to improve the training and understand what worked, what didn't, and why. Do you have any questions about the research before we begin?

Your contribution will be reported anonymously in any reports emerging from this study, and we would like to audio-record the interview to ensure we accurately record what you've said. The recording will not be shared outside of the research team, and anonymous quotes may be used in our reports from this research. Is that ok?

Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary, and if at any time in the interview you wish to end your participation you are free to stop without providing any reason. Are you happy to begin?

If yes to all, begin recording and ask them to confirm again that they understand the research and are happy to be recorded. If no to recording, take contemporaneous notes.

Introductory questions (5 min)

- It would be helpful if you could provide some background about yourself. Can you tell me about your current role and how you got here?
    - o Prompts: Time in policing, amount of time as a trainer, previous posts held, kinds of training provided
- Can you tell me a bit about your experience with Stop and Search particularly, both as a trainer and as a police officer?
    - o Prompts: previous S&S training, previous other training, use of stop and search as an officer

Relationship with the College (force leads only – 10 min)

- Can you tell me about your experience with the College of Policing in designing this training?
    - o Prompts: Were roles and responsibilities clear? Was the purpose of the training clear?
- Did the College provide the kinds of support you needed to effectively deliver the training?
    - o Prompts: Were the materials they provided useful? What did you think of the train the trainer session?
- What could the College have done better?

Development of the training (15 min)

- To what extent did the trainers guide help you to plan and deliver your course?
- Did you make any modifications to the course that differed from the trainers' guide – which and why? *(if you're aware of modifications they've made, ask about these specifically)*
- Was there any discussion on how to present the new Fair and Effective Search definition when developing the training?
- How were decisions reached to focus on certain topics and deliver elements in particular ways in the trainings you provided? *(if not the force lead – ask if they were allowed to make their own modifications)*
  - o Prompts: Was this done by you alone, or with the support of others? How did you go about making these modifications, and developing the materials? Did you need to consult others in the force before making these changes?
- Did you make any changes to the training after your first few sessions? If so, why?
  - o Prompt: Did you share these changes with the other trainers?
- FORCE LEADS ONLY:
  - o Were you required to train any of the other trainers in the force?
  - o What was their level of input into how the training was delivered?
  - o Did all trainers provide essentially the same training, or were each allowed to make their own modifications?

Delivery of the training (20 min)

- Do you think the pre-read materials and assessment were useful to participants? How might these be improved?
- What kinds of messages did you use to introduce the training?
  - o Prompts: Why did you use this approach? *(if you've witnessed their training approach, ask specifically about this)*
- Clearly there was a lot of material that could have been covered on this topic. Which areas of the training did you choose to focus, and why?
  - o Prompt: What about the areas you chose to de-emphasize within the training?
- How did you feel about the "Fair and Effective" definition that was used in the training?
- Were there any areas of the training you felt were particularly well-received?
  - o Prompts: Conscious/unconscious bias, Reasonable Grounds, Adverse impacts, Legal requirements of recording, etc. *(if you've witnessed their training approach, ask about any others that you saw)*
- Were there any areas of the training that you thought weren't well received? (prompts as above)

Purpose of the training/wider views (10 min)

- Why do you think police in the UK have stop and search powers?
  - o Prompts: Are these powers essential to police? What might happen if they were removed or curtailed?

- How do you think the public feels about these powers?
  - Prompts: Do you think most people feel the same way, or does this differ
- Did you think this training was necessary? Why or why not?
  - Prompts: Did you agree with the approach to training? Does it duplicate other training participants may receive?
- Do you think the training will have any impact? If so, what? If not, why?

Closing questions (if time allows/not already answered) (5 min)

- If you could make any changes to the training, what would they be?
- What would be the most important message you would give to the training designers for the next version of the training?

Officer Interview Schedule

Stop and Search – Officer interview schedule

The following interview schedule should be used as a guide for your interview with officers who have taken the stop and search training course. Certain questions may be more relevant for some than others. The timings provided should serve as a rough guide for how long you should spend on each section, but please also feel free to explore relevant issues as they arise.

If you did not observe training at the particular force, please discuss the training observations with the relevant team member and review the training materials provided by the force for relevant background information, before beginning fieldwork or interviews.

Preface

Thank you for taking part in this research. Your interview today will contribute to the evaluation of the Stop and Search training, and your views and feedback will help the College to improve the training and understand what worked, what didn't, and why. Please remember, it is the training that being tested here – not you. There are no right/wrong answers. We would like you to be as open and as honest as possible. Please don't tell us what you think we want to hear; we are completely impartial about the training. Do you have any questions about the research before we begin?

Your contribution will be reported anonymously in any reports emerging from this study, and we would like to audio-record the interview to ensure we accurately record what you've said. The recording will not be shared outside of the research team, and anonymous quotes may be used in our reports from this research. We aim to interview 30 officers across 6 forces in total, which means that none of the quotes could be attributed to you. Is that ok?

Your selection to be interviewed was random and your participation in this interview is completely voluntary, and if at any time in the interview you don't want to answer specific questions or wish to end the interview you are free to do so. Are you happy to begin?

If yes to all, begin recording and ask them to confirm again that they understand the research and are happy to be recorded. If no to recording, take contemporaneous notes.

Introductory questions (5 min)

- It would be helpful if you could provide some background about yourself. Can you tell me about your current role at [your force]?
    o How long have you been with the police?
    o What other roles have you held?
- Can you tell me a bit about your background with Stop and Search – is it something you use regularly?
    o Has the way you use stop and search powers changed since you started working for the police? If so, in what ways?
    o When was the last time you received training relevant to stop and search?

The training course (10 min)

- What did you think was the purpose of the training?
- When you were selected for the training, how was this communicated to you?
    - o Did those reasons make sense?
- Were you sent any materials in advance?
    - o If so, were you able to read/complete them before the start of the training?
    - o Did those materials seem useful?
        - ▪ Did those materials seem relevant to your work?
        - ▪ Did you find the knowledge check challenging?
        - ▪ Did you have any issues interpreting any of these materials?
- On the day of the training, how was the training introduced? Do you remember what the trainer said at the start of the day?
    - o What did you think of their introduction?
- Which parts of the training did you think were most helpful?
    - o Did you find any of the exercises particularly useful?
    - o Prompts: Conscious/unconscious bias, Reasonable Grounds, Adverse impacts, Legal requirements of recording, GOWISELY, etc.
    - o Prompts re: specific content (e.g. images exercise for unconscious bias, Y-Stop video, icebreaker exercise; determine from training materials and pre-brief with training observer)
- Were there any parts of the training that you thought were unhelpful? (prompts as above)
- In the training, there was a section on the definition of a 'fair and effective' search – do you remember this? (If they don't recall – remind them of things like reasonable belief, finding things more often than not, least intrusive method, etc. Please also review the definition from the trainers' guide.)[9]
    - o Did that definition make sense?
    - o Was it relevant to all kinds of uses of stop and search that you've done?
- How did you feel about the length and format of the training?
    - o Was it too long/short?
    - o Were certain parts over/under-emphasised?
- Did the trainer(s) seem effective?
    - o Did they know the material?
    - o Were their answers to your questions clear and helpful?
    - o Were you able to express your opinions during the training session?
        - ▪ Were there any instances where you withheld your opinion?
- Did you learn anything new in the training? If so, what was new?
    - o How did this training compare with previous training you've received on Stop and Search?

---

[9] Did not ask in forces where the 'fair and effective' definition was not used.

Using the training (10 min)

- Since you've taken the training, have you conducted any stop-searches?
    - o [if yes] What was the context?
    - o [if no] Have you undertaken other related encounters, such as stop and account or vehicle stops?
    - o [if yes to either] Can you talk me through what happened?
        - ▪ Did these go well? Why or why not?
        - ▪ Would you have done anything differently prior to receiving the training? If so, what?
- Has the training had any impact on the way you see stop-searches?
    - o Prompts: Your understanding of Reasonable Grounds, confidence to conduct searches, impacts of S&S, the recording process, GOWISELY, etc.
    - o Have you tried to do anything differently in stop-searches or other encounters, based on the training? If so, what?
        - ▪ [if yes] Did you find this effective?
        - ▪ Have there been any barriers to using the training?
            - • For example differing guidance at the force level, supervisors' instructions, operational requirements, etc.
    - o Was there anything in the training, for example regarding the steps involved in a 'good' stop and search encounter, that isn't always possible in reality?
        - ▪ If yes, can you elaborate?
- Is there any other guidance from [your force] – outside of the training – to alter how stop-searches are conducted, either in terms of the amount of searches or the way they're conducted?
    - o For example, have there been any operations recently that required a particularly high number of stop-searches?
    - o Or any guidance from senior officers on reducing levels of S&S, or changing how you approach these encounters?
    - o Are performance targets, or comparisons with other officers, issues in how you do S&S?
- Has there been any other training related to stop-searches that you have attended, for example relating to communications skills or bias?
    - o How did this compare to this training?
- Do you think the management of [your force] believes that stop and search practice needs to be improved?
    - o Are your supervisors aware of the new 'fair and effective' definition?
    - o Do you think most supervisors would know, for example, that the smell of cannabis is now inadequate grounds on its own for a search?

Purpose of the training/wider views (10 min)

We now want to ask some questions regarding your views about stop and search more widely, both related to the pilot and your powers in general.

- In your opinion, what is the purpose of stop and search?
    - o Prompts: Are these powers essential to police?

- o Do you think they reduce crime?
- How do you think the public feels about these powers?
    - o Prompts: Do you think most people feel the same way, or does this differ
    - o What about your colleagues – other PCs in [your force] – do they share these views?
    - o Did you think this training was necessary? Why or why not?
    - o Prompts: Did you agree with the approach to training? Does it duplicate other training participants may receive?
- Do you think the training will have any impact? If so, what? If not, why?

Closing questions (if time allows/not already answered) (5 min)

- Do you have any suggestions of how the training might be made better?
    - o Were there any areas you would have liked to spend more time on?
    - o Are there any skills related to S&S that you would like to build in particular, that weren't addressed or weren't adequately addressed in the training? Is there anything that I haven't had a chance to ask that you think should be included in our study, particularly about how stop and search is used in [your force]?

RAND EUROPE

The RAND Corporation is a nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis.

This electronic document was made available from www.rand.org as a public service of the RAND Corporation.

Support RAND

Browse Reports & Bookstore

Make a charitable contribution

For More Information

Visit RAND at www.rand.org

Explore RAND Europe

View document details

Research Reports

This report is part of the RAND Corporation research report series. RAND reports present research findings and objective analysis that address the challenges facing the public and private sectors. All RAND reports undergo rigorous peer review to ensure high standards for research quality and objectivity..

Limited Electronic Distribution Rights