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Abstract

As key partners within Integrated Offender Management, police officers routinely perform an offender supervision role which works not only as a deterrent against reoffending, but in support of offenders to help them turn their lives around. In order to achieve this aim, they develop a working relationship with their offenders which this study explores through an in-depth analysis of fourteen semi-structured qualitative interviews with seven pairs of police officers and offenders who have developed relationships with each other. Conducted as an exploratory study, this thesis makes a unique contribution to knowledge by exploring these relationships in the context of multi-agency arrangements, police culture, criminological theory and sociological theories of relationships. Using grounded theory to analyse interviews, this study found that what makes these relationships distinct is the correctional context in which they exist, which despite adversarial boundaries of crime control allowed a variety of predominately positive relationships to succeed. Furthermore, police officers in this study worked with offenders to support positive change with methods which included the use of their relationship as a therapeutic intervention. Finding that these relationships reflect the complexity of all relationships and can be similarly understood through typologies which characterise relationships by how behaviourally interdependent they are, this study concludes that in a criminological context these relationships are ultimately beneficial for supporting both compliance with the law and offenders efforts to desist from offending. This study therefore has implications for both policy and practice, as well as research into desistance from offending within a multi-agency setting.
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Part One: Introduction to the Research Problem

Chapter 1: Background to the Research

1.1 Introduction

Ideologically, police officers and offenders have historically been opposing players within the criminal justice system. This adversarial boundary works on the assumption that the police operate as a legitimate apparatus of the state, empowered by statute to enforce the law by apprehending individuals who have broken it. This naturally creates an ‘us and them’ divide and arguably fosters a mentality of ‘cops versus robbers’ in both police officers and offenders alike. Recognising this traditional arrangement this thesis will argue that both Integrated Offender Management (IOM), and in particular the relationships developed between police officers and offenders within these schemes not only challenge this traditional arrangement, they transcend it. Within IOM, police officers work not only as a deterrent against reoffending, but in support of offenders to help them turn their lives around. In order to achieve this aim they routinely develop a working relationship with their offenders which is arguably more than a simple correctional relationship (Lewis, 2014 (a), p.15). This fascinating relationship built between two seemingly adversarial parties is at the heart of what this thesis is all about. Whilst the word ‘relationship’ in this context may seem problematic especially as free will and consent are frequently absent within the correctional context, it has been chosen as a useful concept to capture the interpersonal processes, decisions and activities which are enabled when a relationship or working alliance is formed (Burnett & McNeill, 2005, p.222). It also provides a mechanism in which perceptions about each other can be captured and attends to the problem that these relationships are neither frequently recognised as such, nor considered within a wider theoretical context.

1.2 Aim of this Thesis

This research is all about exploring the relationships that develop between police officers and offenders within IOM and should be viewed as an exploratory study. Exploratory research is neatly defined by Bachman and Schutt (2003, p.11) as a way of finding out ‘how people get along in the setting under question, what meanings they give to their actions and what issues concern them’. Therefore the overarching
research question simply asks; what is going on in these relationships? By using a conventional research instrument in a new field of investigation to identify new and emerging issues, it is hoped that this study will make a unique contribution to knowledge by informing the significant gap which exists in the research literature regarding IOM generally, but also the police and offender relationship within IOM specifically. In addition, this study also seeks to make a new contribution to our understanding of police offender management and police roles generally, recognising that in many ways the police and offender relationship in IOM runs counter intuitively to the enforcement aims and objectives of the police organisation as a whole (Nash, 2014, p.2). Lastly, this thesis also aims to share findings from the research experience, recognising that the research question was a challenging question to pose in a challenging environment. Therefore, in keeping with the exploratory style of this study this thesis also questions whether the researcher could be considered either a ‘friend’ or a ‘foe’ within this research arrangement.

In order to undertake exploratory research of this nature four main objectives were chosen to complement the overarching lack of research in this area, the nature of the qualification applied for and the desired methodology. This research also attends to several articles within the literature which call for more research in this particular area (Williams & Ariel, 2012, p.132, Senior, Wong, Culshaw, Ellington, O’Keeffe & Meadows, 2011, p.32).

The four objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To explore the relationship between police officers and offenders within Integrated Offender Management, both generally and in specific relational pairs.

2. To critically consider the nature of the relationships developed between police officers and offenders within IOM in comparison to the organisational objectives of the police service.

3. To create new knowledge which will be used to inform and influence policy, procedure and practice.

4. To include an auto-ethnographical tone to the study, deconstructing the reflexive experience of the practitioner-researcher by sharing learning about the experience of doing research on the police, from within the police.
1.3 The Significance of these Relationships

As you would expect the practice of police officers developing working relationships with offenders has proven to be quite provocative, with strongly contested views on either side of the debate. Although this thesis is not aimed at being either antagonistic or controversial, the very nature of the subject and the complexity of the issues surrounding these relationships undoubtedly make it so. It would be remiss therefore to move forward without first acknowledging the breadth and depth of feelings which exist towards these relationships. On the one hand there are those who fundamentally oppose the very nature of police officers supporting offenders to make positive changes, with staunch advocates of the enforcement role of the police arguing that relationships of this nature threaten the power, control and autonomy of the police diverting them away from their traditional enforcement work (Warburton, 2014, p.1, Senior, et al, 2011, p.iv). In addition, others are more concerned that the police role may become compromised, developing into a role more congruent with the probation service or social work for example (Culshaw, 2008, p.35, Marlow, 2007, p.35). In contrast, there are those who hold more liberal views favouring the development of relationships of this type to increase compliance, provide positive role models (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006, p.160, Millie & Erol, 2006, p.699), encourage desistance (Williams & Ariel, 2012, p.133) and improve attitudes towards those in authority (Shaw, 2004, p.184).

1.4 Care versus Control

Ultimately, what these opposing arguments translate into is two distinct ways of viewing these relationships: namely that of ‘caring versus controlling’. The first, presents the ‘control’ position which espouses the use of the relationship to monitor the offender, enforce offending and increase compliance. The second option presents the ‘care’ position, whereby the relationship is used as a means of providing emotional, moral and practical support for the offender. In criminological terms the ‘care versus control’ paradigm is expertly explored by Moore and colleagues (Moore, Gray, Roberts, Taylor & Merrington, 2006) in their examination of Intensive Community Programmes. Although this work predominantly deals with schemes that monitor young offenders, the parallels with adult programmes are clear. It recognises that schemes of this nature have to manage a welfare agenda with a punitive one which
the authors acknowledge is often difficult. Other authors too have recognised this challenge as schemes attempt to incorporate vastly different penal philosophies such as deterrence, incarceration and rehabilitation into one seemingly cohesive strategy (Farrall, Mawby & Worrall, 2007, p.357, Worrall, 2002, p.288, Ellis & Boden, 2005, p.16). Despite this paradox, Paparozzi and Gendreau (2005, p.461) found in their USA study that where parole officers balanced law enforcement with a social care approach greater reductions in recidivism could be seen in comparison to a purely law enforcement or social care approach. In support, Worrall, Mawby, Heath and Hope (2003, p.26) became convinced through their evaluation of the Stoke on Trent prolific offender project that it is was not disingenuous for a project to be attempting to do more than one thing, commenting that this is perhaps the way in which reducing reoffending in modern society is best tackled. In summary, whilst some authors would argue that viewing these relationships in this way is overly simplistic because neither ‘care’ nor ‘control’ are mutually exclusive in practice, (Turner, 2012, p.350, Skeem, Eno Louden, Polaschek & Camp, 2007, p.398, Harris, 1980, p.169) and nor are they without tension for practitioners (Worrall, 1997, p.67). Others have found that it is less problematic for offenders and practitioners than it is for the wider academic and political community (McCulloch, 2005, p.17). Despite this position, this theme has been chosen as the central tenet of this thesis for three main reasons. Firstly, the comment made by McCulloch is ripe for auto-ethnographical comment based on the fact that I was a serving police officer working within IOM at the time of conducting this research and experienced the ‘rub’ of working to rehabilitate and resettle offenders in a police role which is beset with a catch and convict objective. The second reason relates to the ideological overlay between ‘care and control’ and the two main approaches of IOM, namely ‘catch and convict’ and ‘rehabilitate and resettle’. The third reason is in response to the findings of the literature review which make it clear that police officers working within IOM display these two different working styles in their management of offenders.

1.5 The Method

Whilst the natural position from here would be to question whether police officers and offenders should form relationships with each other in the first place, as well as whether these relationships are effective at reducing reoffending, due to the narrow scope of this study it would be imprudent to make anything more than a comment on
these particular areas. Instead this study is devoted to uncovering the complexities that exist in these relationships through an in-depth analysis of fourteen semi-structured qualitative interviews which were collected between September 2013 and April 2015 with seven pairs of police officers and offenders (N=14) who had formed relationships with each other. Using grounded theory to analyse these interviews, the study found that what makes these relationships unique is the correctional context in which they exist, which despite adversarial barriers of crime control allowed a variety of predominantly positive relationships to succeed.

1.6 Theoretical Framework

A review of the literature has shown that on the one hand there are schemes where police officers purely manage offenders under the catch and convict work stream; arresting their offenders, conducting investigations and putting the offender back before the court (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006, p.159, Novas Scarman, 2011, Vennard & Pearce, 2004). In criminological theory this has significant resonance with Procedural Justice Theory which premises that law-abidingness results from a sense of obligation that flows from seeing legal authorities as moral and legitimate and gives an explanation about why people comply with the law (Bachman & Schutt, 2003. p.36). Procedural Justice studies have shown that preparedness to comply with the law is a function of the perceived fairness of procedures and the personal style of the officials carrying out these procedures, as much as it is about the perceived fairness of the outcomes (Hough, 2010, p.15). This approach therefore suggests that if police officers predominantly work in this way there is a potential to increase offender compliance with the law. This position also supports the argument against using police officers as ‘quasi-social workers’ (Worrall et al, 2003, p. 21) and reinforces a more ‘hard edged’ style of policing (McCarthy, 2014, p.5).

On the other hand, in some schemes police officers developed a style which is more akin to a caring approach as they work to rehabilitate and resettle their offenders by building warm, caring and trusting relationships (Homes, Walmsley & Debidin, 2005, Dawson, Stanko, Higgins & Rehman, 2011). Across the literature police officers are frequently expected to adopt this approach without formal training, qualifications or guidance, navigating their way through this work by observing other police officers in the same role or mimicking multi-agency approaches to the supervision of offenders.
This approach resonates more with theories which seek to develop positive relational approaches to reducing reoffending, such as Desistance Theory. Desistance theory explains the cessation of offending, not as a single event but as a journey which is often shaped by lapse and relapse (Serin & Lloyd. 2009, p.343). Desistance concerns itself with three main theoretical perspectives; age and maturation, life transitions and the social bonds associated with them (marriage, parenthood), and narrative changes in personal and social identity (McNeill, 2012, p.19). In this regard the second two theories have the greatest resonance with this study. Social bonds suggest that prosocial relationships with others will have a positive effect on the offender as they transition towards desistance (King, 2013b, p.139). This of course relies on the premise that offenders can be re-socialised and unlearn anti-social or criminal behaviour through Social Learning Theory. Social Learning Theory, states that offenders can observe positive behaviours and imitate them, using them in accordance with their own goals (Jones, 2001, p.381). In relation to this study arguably the police officer represents the prosocial other. Further, narrative changes help offenders to construct new identities which accompany the change between ‘offender’ and ‘non offender’ and work through conditioning (King, 2013a, p.148). Operant conditioning concerns itself with learning by trial and error and occurs when behaviour is displayed and rewarded, with the reinforcement increasing the likelihood of the behaviour occurring (Pakes & Pakes, 2009, p.2). Whilst there is conflicting evidence as to whether persistent offenders in primary desistance stages begin to alter their internal narratives, King (2013a, p.162) found that early desistance narratives do occur in offenders as they begin to consider the alternatives of adopting new identities.

Chosen as the theoretical backbone of this thesis for the symmetry and fit with the two main ideological standpoints of IOM, namely catch and convict and rehabilitate and resettle, Procedural Justice Theory and Desistance Theory have much to offer in supporting the development of theories regarding the relationships in question and for that reason they have been chosen as the main criminological theories within this thesis.

1.7 Chapter Summary

Quite clearly there are a maelstrom of social and cultural arrangements, broad theoretical implications and a plethora of practical and ethical consequences
surrounding these relationships which need further debate within this thesis. In order
to attend to these elements this thesis is broken down into three sections, each with
thematic chapters. Although there were many layouts that could have been chosen for
this thesis, a chronological / exploratory style was adopted in keeping with the way in
which the research evolved. The first section, titled *an introduction to the research
problem*, has introduced the practice of police officers developing relationships with
their offenders within IOM and how these can be demarked by either a caring or
controlling style. It also introduced the theoretical framework which runs throughout
the study. Developing this introduction further, the second chapter titled *situating the
research* will go on to contextualise IOM by placing it in a political and historical context
through an explanation of how the ‘care versus control' paradigm came about. This
chapter also comments on effectiveness and ‘what works’. The third chapter in this
section titled *towards a theoretical understanding*, will ground these relationships into
criminological discourse, before considering in greater depth Procedural Justice
Theory, Desistance Theory and caseworker models. In addition this chapter will
introduce the ethical issues surrounding these relationships.

The second part of this thesis titled the research process, explains the blue print of the
research. Chapter four titled *methodology*, details the research objectives, the setting
and the inspiration for the research before going on to assure the reader of the
originality of the study by clearly explaining how it contributes new knowledge and how
it should be viewed in the world of scholarship. This chapter also details the
methodology chosen for this study, its limitations and research alternatives. Chapter
five, titled *research design and experience* details how the research techniques,
sampling selection, participant recruitment, data analysis and ethical considerations
were planned, compared to how they were conducted in practice. This chapter also
discusses the researcher / practitioner dichotomy and the unique nature of conducting
research in the police.

The third part of this thesis presents the findings and conclusions of the study. Chapter
six presents the findings and chapter seven, titled *discussion and conclusion* draws
together the main theoretical themes from the literature review together with the
findings of the study to present theories about these relationships. In addition, the final
chapter brings this thesis to a close by summarising the main findings and implications
of the study before making suggestions for future research.
In regards to the literature review, a decision was taken to synthesise and weave the findings throughout the thesis to complement the exploratory nature of the study. In effect it became artificial to separate the literature into a bespoke literature review, especially as both the study and the research journey were evolutionary.

Chapter 2: Situating the Research

2.1 Introduction

Deconstructing what it is that makes the police officer and offender relationship in IOM so controversial is inherently difficult as each argument is shrouded in the same attitudes that have preoccupied scholars and criminal justice policy makers for centuries: How do we deal with offenders and the problem of crime? On the one hand it is easy to argue that because ‘prolific offenders’ persistently commit crime, often against repeat victims (Everson, 2000, p.265), consistently in their own communities (Townsley & Sidebottom, 2010, p.910) they shouldn’t be helped by any one, but especially not the police. Instead they should be punished because of their low status in society and their ‘bad’ behaviour. With this in mind, it would be incredibly easy for measures against prolific offenders to be more in keeping with ‘just deserts’, rather than a fair measure of justice (Joyce, 2006, p.6). Although Faulkner (2009, p.3) argues that uncertainty still surrounds the nature and purpose of punishment, as well as what it means to be ‘tough’ ‘effective’ and ‘consistent’, it is clear that a punitive approach compounds prison overcrowding (Benn, 2002, Knepper, 2007, p.128, Falkner, 2009, p.2), does little to reduce the ‘revolving door’ phenomenon (Padfield & Maruna, 2006, p.338) and does not reduce the likelihood of future offending (Raynor, 2012, p.178).

On the other hand, whilst public attitudes are not nearly as punitive as is often thought, (Allen, 2007 in Allen 2008, p.394), selling rehabilitation, especially in relation to this group of offenders is particularly difficult because of the prevalence of their offending, their depiction in the media and the frequent message that nothing works with them (Pollak & Kubrin, 2007, p.61). In trying to manage these alternative views, schemes have fused consequentialist forward looking theories of deterrence, incapacitation and rehabilitation whilst adopting a backward looking style of retribution and a promise of ‘just deserts’ (Muncie, 2004, p.250 in Moore et al, 2006, p.19). Whilst this win - win approach might appease both sides of the divide, authors question whether projects of this nature can implement in practice what they intended in theory (Moore et al,
2006, p.30). As will be shown in this forthcoming chapter the pivotal question of punishment versus rehabilitation has been influenced by political thinking, changes to the criminal justice system and a devotion to understanding what works to prevent reoffending overall. It is therefore against this backdrop that the practice of police officers managing offenders within IOM will be considered next.

2.2 History of Integrated Offender Management

Integrated Offender Management (IOM) was launched by UK Government in 2009 as an overarching framework that brings together agencies in a local area to prioritise interventions with offenders who cause crime in their locality (Home Office, 2010a, p.1). The guiding principles, which were recently updated in 2015 continue to closely reflect the same principles established in 2009; namely that all partners should manage offenders together to deliver a local response to local problems, by using interventions that support offenders to face up to their responsibility or face the consequences. To achieve this schemes should make the best use of existing programmes and governance arrangements to achieve long-term desistance from crime (Home Office, 2015a, p. 2). The ultimate aim of IOM is therefore to reduce reoffending by encouraging the development of a multi-agency problem-solving approach, focussing on the offenders not the offences (Home Office, 2012a). Although IOM arrangements differ significantly across the country with schemes designed to correspond with local priorities (Home Office, 2010a, p.2, Lane & Kangulec, 2012, p.155), each IOM is predominantly served by key statutory agencies, namely the Police, National Probation Service / Community Rehabilitation Company and Drug/Alcohol Services, as well as the Prison Service and Local Authorities who all work together in a pragmatic fashion to exchange information, conduct intensive supervision and support offenders to change. Essentially IOM is an overarching umbrella or way of working, which brings agencies together to tackle particular types of offenders by improving partnerships, pooling resources and reducing duplication.

Whilst many of the original guiding principles from 2009 remain the same as described above, there is one notable change as updated in the 2015 guidance which relates to the type of offender ‘within scope’ for inclusion within IOM (Home Office, 2010, Home Office, 2015a). Originally all offenders who posed a ‘high risk of serious harm’ were in scope for inclusion within IOM (Home Office, 2010, p. 10). However more recent guidance states that ‘local schemes should keep their approach under review to
maximise opportunities for extending the benefits of the IOM approach to a range of different offender cohorts’ (Home Office, 2015a, p. 7). Operationally this means any type of offender is within scope, including dangerous offenders which are more commonly known as sex or violent offenders managed under Multi Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), Persistent Perpetrators of Domestic Abuse managed under Multi Agency Risk Assessment Conferences (MARAC) or Prolific and Priority Offenders (PPO) managed by the Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme. Arguably this change in the guiding principles of IOM encourages schemes to adopt a diverse offender cohort, thus taking IOM in a new direction (Home Office, 2015b). Whilst this change could be said to offer an indicator of the success of IOM generally, given that the effectiveness of IOM is not yet proven with the current PPO cohort (Hopkins & Wickson, 2012, p.2, Moore et al, 2006, p.xvii, Townsley & Pease, 2002, p.327, Worrall & Mawby, 2004, p.268), care should be taken to consider the type of offender now ‘in scope’ for inclusion in local schemes. Practice must therefore ensure that professionals working in IOM are sufficiently trained and skilled to reflect these changes, to ensure offenders receive the most appropriate support to help them desist from offending. However, in order to provide clarity for this research it is the prolific and priority offender cohort which this thesis is particularly concerned with, predominantly because the PPO scheme was subsumed into local IOM arrangements when it was launched in 2009 (Home Office, 2010a, p.1) and because PPO’s frequently make up the vast majority of offenders supported within IOM schemes at present (College of Policing, 2013, p.13, Ministry of Justice, 2013, p.7).

Introduced in 2004 in response to the Narrowing the Justice Gap initiative which sought to increase the number of offenders brought to justice (Robinson, 2011, p.39), and operating under the multi-agency arrangement of the Crime and Disorder Act (Legislation.Gov.UK,1998), the Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme quickly expanded from a broad foundation of Prolific Offender Projects (POP) that had sprung up across the UK and Europe in the late 1990’s in response to a renewed interest in the punishment of persistence (Merrington, 2006, p.348, Pratt & Dickson, 1997, p.379, Carter, 2003, p.4). Having evolved from the earlier 2002 Persistent Offender Scheme which had failed to identify the right offenders for the national cohort (HMIC, et al, 2004, p.15), the subsequent PPO scheme was designed to be devolved and managed at a local level with statutory oversight by Community Safety Partnerships (CSP). In
order to ensure the right offenders were selected, schemes could identify ‘other’ offenders, (Dawson & Cuppleditch, 2007, p.3) namely those who it could be said posed a significant risk to the community (Blunkett, Falconer, Clarke & Goldsmith, 2004, p.2). Founded on the premise that a relatively small number of offenders are responsible for a disproportionate number of offences (Home Office, 2004, p.1), the PPO scheme was designed to take advantage of the skills and experience of the different agencies involved (Ministry of Justice, 2010, p.25). To complement this requirement three distinct strands were developed; namely Catch and Convict, Rehabilitate and Resettle and Prevent and Deter, with the police service, probation service and youth offending team taking the lead respectively. To illustrate; intensive surveillance, monitoring and pro-active enforcement are activities synonymous with the catch and convict strand, whilst criminogenic pathway support and the development of relational strategies which build social capital, reduce social exclusion and support change are strategies under the rehabilitate and resettle strand. Prevent and deter is subsequently managed through the Deter Young Offenders Scheme (DYO) and is therefore commonly precluded from the adult PPO/IOM landscape (Home Office, 2009, p.3).

A simple way of demarking a particular scheme is to understand the type of offenders who are included in the scheme. One particularly important division relates to whether statutory or non-statutory offenders are included. A statutory offender is an offender current to either the National Probation Service or Community Rehabilitation Company having either served a prison sentence which results in them being released on prison licence, or those with a community order. In contrast, a non-statutory offender is under no statutory obligation to engage with a scheme but may do so on a voluntary basis. Some schemes manage only one or the other, whilst others manage both statutory and non-statutory offenders. Across the literature there is an equal division. In schemes where non-statutory offenders are included, part of the local design element is to decide which agency will be the lead agency and who will engage with the offender on a voluntary basis. In some schemes, like the scheme examined for this study the police service is the lead agency for managing non-statutory offenders (College of Policing, 2013, p.64, Frost, 2011, p.31, Dawson et al, 2011). Although this practice is not mandated across the country several other schemes dedicate police officers to managing non-statutory offenders in response to one of the key principles
of IOM: namely that the intensity of management for offenders should relate directly to their severity of risk, irrespective of whether they are statutory or non-statutory (Home Office, 2010a, p.10). Arguably this design has resulted in the practice of police officers routinely managing non-statutory offenders in place of other professionals, most notably probation officers who are precluded from working with non-statutory offenders under the national offender management model (Home Office, 2012a, p.16, NOMS, 2006, p.9). Whilst authors argue that this approach is beneficial for supporting offenders who would otherwise not be the responsibility of any one agency (Robinson, 2014a, p.2), worryingly this has become the default position in many schemes without any real consideration as to whether it is efficient or effective. In addition the whole area of how non-statutory offenders are included, monitored and supported within these schemes has been underexplored and overlooked (HMIP, et al, 2009, p.47).

In essence, the role in which the police assume in this context is that of ‘offender manager’. Labelled as such in the job description for police officers working within the scheme researched, Nash (2014, p.1) recognises that police offender management roles are in many ways removed from what might be thought of as both traditional policing and ‘real’ police work. Yet, using Hough’s (2010, p.17) description of the case manager / intervention model, whereby professionals decide the package of intervention based on the offender’s needs, this model fits with many of the descriptions of the tasks police offender managers undertake. Other models such as the ‘therapeutic relationship model’ where the relationship is the intervention and the ‘case – worker / craft model’ where the ‘craft’ of the keyworker is in managing a process of moral persuasion as the primary means of effecting change (Lewis 2016, Hough, 2010) do not fit descriptions of the police role as consistently within the literature. In addition as it is the programme of interventions which is assumed to be the thing that really makes a difference, arguably less well trained staff can assume the offender management role. Given that police officers in this scheme receive no formal training in offender management (HMIP & HMIC, 2014, p.29), further significance can be attributed to this argument.

Across the literature, there are few studies which provide detail about the specific police experience in IOM and even less that explore the police role in relation to building relationships with offenders. Much of the guidance and literature on this subject expects police officers working in IOM to operate with a flexible approach,
whilst remaining clear about their own purpose and the aims of their home agency (Worrall & Mawby, 2004, p 282). Inadequate guidance on IOM, mixed messages and flexible expectations indicate that little thought has been given to how this might affect the police role or police officers individually. One enlightening evaluation found that police officers felt ‘tricked’ into working in IOM, agreeing to the role only to find that it was less about enforcement and more about supporting offenders. Sold as a role which would ‘catch and convict’ offenders, this inaccurate description negatively influenced the effectiveness of the scheme and proved problematic for individual police officers (Dawson et al, 2011, p.31). Whilst there are a few other indicators of the ‘miss-selling’ of the police role in IOM (Senior et al, 2011, p.23), the pilot completed for this study found that not all police officers were comfortable in this role having to alter their operating locus in order to fit more comfortably in a rehabilitate and resettle environment (Cull, 2012). Furthermore, Worrall and others (Worrall, et al, 2003, p.22) warn that unclear roles and responsibilities within multi-agency arrangements can cause practitioner stress.

2.3 Transforming Rehabilitation

Whilst creating an IOM is not mandatory, each local authority area is encouraged to develop Integrated Offender Management to its fullest (Home Office, 2009, p.14). How they do this relates to the resources available to them and the way in which they intend it to operate. What is fairly confusing however, are the mixed messages which exist across the literature. For example police forces are warned to deviate from a catch and convict ethos at their peril, with the latest joint inspection into IOM stating;

‘We are clear that police officers working in this environment should have some knowledge of the theories and practices associated with assisting an offender to achieve desistance, but their principal role should be gathering and disseminating intelligence and enforcement’ (HMIP & HMIC, 2014, p.8).

Yet in this time of austerity there is no additional funding available to plug the gap with non-statutory offenders (Flynn, 2011) and schemes are expected to operate without a need for new investment, which the Association of Chief Police Officers state necessitates a realigning of roles and responsibilities within agencies (ACPO, 2011, p.7). In addition, changes to the management of offenders through the transforming rehabilitation agenda have complicated matters even further which will now be explained.
Launched in 2012, transforming rehabilitation initiated a set of reforms which are aimed at changing the way that offenders are managed within the community (Ministry of Justice, 2013). At the time of writing these reforms had just been instigated, with the probation service being divided into the national probation service (NPS) which was created to manage high risk offenders and private community rehabilitation companies (CRC) who manage other statutory offenders on a payment by results tariff. Significantly, IOM was restructured into the CRC with decision making in this area arguably relating to commercial considerations and the high costs associated with managing difficult offenders (Robinson, 2014b, p.271). The impact of these reforms are still relatively new, but several concerns have been raised. The first is in relation to the practical management of risk. IOM functions on the premise that all offenders who are high risk of harm or at a high risk of re-offending are in scope for inclusion within IOM (Home Office, 2010a, p.2, Ministry of Justice, 2009, p.9), yet this principle is counterintuitive as IOM comes under the realm of CRC’s, with the NPS managing the high risk offenders. In addition CRC’s are not empowered to advise on sentences or take breaches back to court. This change in emphasis creates a two tiered approach within IOM where information exchange is both reduced and delayed, and where offenders are able to challenge legitimacy. Moreover, Robinson (2014b, p.271) warns that this situation has the potential to cause inter-agency conflict which may be heightened by commercial considerations and a pressure to generate profit. In these cases we might reasonably assume that there would be financial incentives not to return offenders to court (Evans, 2015, p.201). Locally, IOM has started to see the effect of these arrangements; for example some IOM offices have moved into CRC premises and employment ‘shops’, liaison between CRC and NPS offender managers relating to the mixed economy cohort of offenders has been testing and various streams of information which had once been provided to IOM have now ceased. Arguably, further theoretical and practical questions about the overall effect of these reforms on IOM still need to be attended too.

Perhaps the most pertinent question in relation to this study is how these reforms might affect the relationships under examination. Practitioners within CRC’s are likely to have a reduced professional status and be paid less than comparable probation officers, which poses questions as to how likely they are to build meaningful relationships with their offenders (Evans, 2015, p.201). What is interesting to
acknowledge is that the police might well become the overarching consistent agency, pulling both the NPS and the CRC’s together. Consequently, this may bond police officers and offenders closer together through consistency and dependability. Secondly, reforms made under transforming rehabilitation, namely the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014 which received royal assent in March 2014, now stipulate that all offenders will receive at least 12 months statutory supervision in the community on release from custody (Ministry of Justice, 2013, p.2). Figures suggest that this number will be in the region of 45,000 (Ministry of Justice, 2014). As an aside, whilst these reforms aim to counteract the problem of short term offenders who commit the highest reoffending rates, it is implausible to believe that current resources will be able to offer any type of meaningful supervision for this group as current resources are already financially restrained despite payment incentives which aim to focus provider efforts on ‘relentlessly reforming offenders’ (Home Office, 2013, p.2). In addition, it seems illogical that the transforming rehabilitation agenda which is driven by austerity cuts and a realisation that current incarceration cannot continue as it has before (Berman & Dar, 2013, p.3) has adopted reforms that present an increased likelihood of offenders failing supervision only to be returned to custody. Notably, in IOM terms this new legislation means that most offenders included on schemes will become statutory. Whilst this may provide continuity of supervision, in reality it is likely that prolific offenders will simply be on long term supervision which raises countless ethical questions about proportionality. It also seems probable that demand will continue to necessitate police officers providing offender management. As reforms progress, further research will be needed to re-evaluate these relationships in light of these changes.

Lastly, further research will be needed to consider whether these reforms have altered the shape of IOM by forcing diversion from the founding principles. However, unless IOM is totally eradicated through these reforms, which Senior (2014) argues is unlikely, this study will still have resonance as police officers continue to maintain an integral role in multi-agency partnership and the management of prolific offenders. In addition, a review of the literature suggests that police officers support both statutory and non-statutory offenders equally (Feasey et al, 2007, Dawson et al, 2011, Feasey, 2009, Novas Scarman, 2011, Vennard & Pearce, 2004) therefore even if schemes
alter to consider statutory offenders only the learning produced from this study will still be applicable.

2.4 Evolution and Ideology

In its current incarnation Integrated Offender Management should not be considered new. Having evolved from previous schemes it is perhaps more useful to think of IOM as a fourth generation intensive monitoring scheme, with the first three being demarked by Worrall and Mawby (2004). What is important to recognise is that this evolution has had an important influence on current IOM ideology, which has in turn been influenced by popular penal strategies of the day. Moreover this evolution arguably presents one of the most interesting dynamics to explore in relation to the police offender relationship, namely that of ‘care versus control’. Worrall and Mawby (2004, p.269) detail the first generation ISP as emerging in the 1970’s with the launch of the IMPACT (Intensive Matched Probation and After-Care Treatment) experiment in 1972. Generally considered unsuccessful (Mair & Burke, 2011, p.130), this experiment occurred at a time when probation were operating in a welfare based approach, rehabilitating offenders by working on the premise that a greater frequency and intensity of ‘treatment’ would prove beneficial for a reduction in offending (Raynor, 2012, p.177). Where it differed with more recent ISP projects is that there was no multi-agency intervention and the emphasis was on ‘treatment’ leading to rehabilitation rather than punishment. Recognising that what had gone on before for adult offenders leaving prison was a sporadic aftercare experience which had predominantly been provided by charities such as the Discharged Prisoners Aid Societies in the 19th and 20th centuries and latterly the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NACRO) (Maguire & Raynor, 2006, p.21), IMPACT offered an alternative strategy. At that time the probation service was still operating upon the guiding principles of ‘Advice, Assist, Befriend’ so it is not surprising therefore that what IMPACT initially brought within the ISP context is an undertaking that offenders need to be cared for in order for society to achieve reductions in reoffending. However, it is important to state that what IMPACT best exemplifies in the context of ISP is that the welfare approach does not work alone, if indeed it does work at all (Martinson, 1974, p.49). The result of these uninspiring findings concerned advocates of the welfare approach and consequently penal policies strong on punishment, surveillance and control were espoused subsequently (Vanstone & Priestley, 2008, p.65).
The second generation of ISP projects began in the 1980’s and early 1990’s in response to a demand for incarceration which exceeded prison capacity and a lack of respect for community penalties (Worrall & Mawby, 2004, p.270). The Conservative Government of the day was stuck with a dilemma: how could they show they were ‘The’ party for law and order when they simply could not afford to incarcerate any more offenders?’ (Canton & Hancock, 2007, p. xxv). Whilst the government continued to voice rehabilitative attitudes towards offending whilst articulating that prison ‘can be an expensive way of making bad people worse’ (David Waddington, Home Secretary, 1991, in The Guardian, 2010), authors recognised that what was actually happening was ‘punitive bifurcation’ (Cavadino & Dignan, 2002, p.366) whereby reforms were really based on a strong ideology of law and order and heavy on punishment (Mair, 2011, p.217, Carter, 2007, p.6). As a result a ‘just deserts’ approach which promised to be ‘tough’ on offenders prevailed which resulted in offenders being disproportionally punished for the crimes they committed (Moore et al, 2006, p.24-25). Public perceptions too were heavy on punishment, despite crime rates being in decline during this period (Tseloni, Farrell, Mailley & Tilley, 2010). At the same time the government was keen to stress that the police could not deal with crime alone and that crime prevention was everyone’s business (Rogers, 2004, p.5). In addition, it was recognised that effective ways of tackling criminality should be strongly embedded in a multi-agency problem solving approach with relevant partners (Berry, Briggs, Erol & Van Staden, 2009, p.1). In response to this position, two multi-agency crime prevention initiatives were launched in the United Kingdom; The Five Towns Initiative in 1986 and the more comprehensive Safer Cities project in 1988 (Mair & Burke, 2013, p.142). Whilst the success of both were variable (Gilling, 2005, p.64), strides were made in multi-agency working during this period. Nash and Williams (2008, p.104) reflect that the origins of crime prevention strategies within a multi-agency framework were built on the successes of these initiatives and further developed from James Morgan’s Safer Communities review published in 1991. Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1993, p.1) argue that Morgan’s review in particular, along with Home Office Circular 44 published the previous year had a significant influence on thinking around multi-agency crime prevention and subsequently shaped the direction of many ‘on the ground’ initiatives which aimed to keep communities safe from crime and disorder. However, multi-agency partnership work was not without its critics during this time as authors recognised the challenge of bringing agencies together with ‘different
interests’ (Squires, 1997, p.3). Despite this criticism, momentum in multi-agency partnership work continued unabated during this period in response to what Crawford (1994, p.500) argues was a managerial solution to criminal justice system failures which included the inflated number of offenders incarcerated.

Continuing to articulate that diversion from custody was needed in order to halt rising prison numbers, the green paper Punishment, Custody and Community and the Tackling Offending Action Plan were published in 1988 which led to the establishment of eight intensive probation schemes aimed at halting offending by offenders aged between seventeen to twenty five (Mair, Lloyd, Nee & Sibbitt, 1994, i.x). Again results were mixed. On the one hand it was successfully implemented with the right offenders targeted, yet on the other hand reductions in reoffending were not as anticipated (Mair et al, 1994, p.117). What was seen as successful however was the way in which the participants valued the scheme, appreciating the extra support and attention they received (Mair et al, 1994, p.119). In these schemes probation officers were typically given a smaller case load with the emphasis being on more intense supervision. In fitting with the penal attitudes displayed during this period, the scheme was initially perceived as being strong on the control of offenders, yet in reality it was rarely about this approach (Mair et al, 1994, p.119).

Following a paradigm shift from a relational approach to an enforcement approach of risk management (Robinson, 2005, p.308), which Vanstone and Priestley (2008, p.63) argue was as a result of a political obsession with punishment, the probation service also evolved during this period to operate with greater accountability in relation to the management of risk (Knight, Kemshall & Dominey, 2007, p.67). This shift in ethos from a proportionate approach to crime control to a risk management approach shifted the emphasis on to a strategy of managing offenders with a greater use of surveillance and control (Nash, 2007, p.304). In addition, the police were being encouraged to protect the public from ‘dangerous and persistent offenders’ (Home Office, 1996, in Hudson, 2001, p.155) by targeting intelligence on offenders who were ‘inflicting’ the greatest damage upon communities (Mawby & Worrall, 2004, p.63). In the same way the first generation demarked the ‘rehabilitate and resettle’ part of the ISP ideology, the second generation in contrast demarked the beginning of the ‘catch and convict’ approach with its strong ethos on the surveillance and control of offenders. Yet as the
intensive probation experiment of this period demonstrates, it would seem that neither strategy would work without the other.

In the early part of 2000, the third generation of ISP projects was initiated when the PPO scheme was launched. At that time the favoured title given by the Home Office was Intensive Supervision and Monitoring (ISM), although individual projects were often referred to as Prolific Offender Projects (POP) (Worrall et al, 2003, p.4). In this period the earlier ideological positions merged as schemes aimed to manage both catch and convict and rehabilitate and resettle. In fact the first joint inspection into the Persistent Offender Scheme clearly stated that interventions with prolific offenders should have the explicit twin aims of rehabilitation and crime reduction (HMIC et al, 2004). Whilst this amalgamation was also encouraged in a series of government papers (Home Department, 2002, p.108), at its heart was a growing realisation that prison sentences were not turning the majority of offenders away from crime (Maguire & Raynor, 2006, p.22, Social Exclusion Unit, 2002) and that what was actually needed was ‘greater control and surveillance… combined with help’ (Italics added) (Carter, 2003, p.4, Dobson, 2004, p.150). During this time the police role in these projects also began to alter in response to changes in multi-agency working, where by professionals such as probation officers could no longer go to considerable lengths to preserve their individual relationships with their clients as they once had (Rumgay & Cowan, 1998, p.135). Whilst guidance was clear; the police service would be primarily responsible for the catch and convict side of the operation, in practice they were not maintaining their own unique identity as they had been instructed to do (Moore, 2011, p.20). At the same time authors were beginning to recognise that perhaps police officers and probation officers were beginning to morph into ‘polibation officers’ (Nash, 1999, Mawby & Worrall, 2004) and that existing partners were beginning to find themselves taking on new roles and responsibilities (Lane & Kangulec, 2012, p.156). This situation created concern as authors began to write about mission distortion and the perils of blurring professional roles (Murphy & Worrall, 2007, Mawby & Worrall, 2011, p.89). Despite these concerns, multi-agency working took a new direction during this period with the creation of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in 2004. Formed from a recommendation contained in Patrick Carter’s 2003 Correctional Service Review into the increased use of correctional services, spiralling costs and crisis management approach within the criminal justice system (Dobson, 2004, p.145),
NOMS joined the prison and probation service together with the aim of establishing an offender management model which would provide a consistent framework for offender management (Mair, 2013, p.164). Designed to offer 'end to end offender management’ through a reduction in prison sentencing, greater use of effective community sentences and increased access to services for offenders, the establishment of this new service was not without criticism as it had been created without consultation (Nash, Williams, 2008, p.123). Fascinatingly although there was a significant amount of discussion about multi-agency working and the challenges and opportunities it presented throughout this period, there have been few studies which explore this theme within recent literature.

2.5 Rehabilitative Police?

Moving beyond the third generation, it is perhaps timely to consider whether or not IOM moves ISP projects into a successive fourth generation. Whilst much of IOM is simply an operational development of the PPO scheme, there are subtle practical and ideological differences which arguably offer the beginnings of a paradigm shift in favour of using the rehabilitative potential of the police. Indicators can be found in the practice of police officers managing non-statutory offenders and in the ideological statements produced by government. For example the white paper Breaking the Cycle asserts that:

‘Many of the skills needed for good policing have also proved well-suited to help manage offenders into a law abiding and disciplined way of life’. (Ministry of Justice, 2010, p.25)

Whilst it is not clear how this view was reached, it does pose an interesting question about the intent of the statement. Is this quote suggesting there is a place within the criminal justice system for rehabilitative police officers? Or is it simply the case that police officers will do because no one else is available? Whilst there may not be explicit intentions to rebrand the police service as a rehabilitation provider, changes to the criminal justice system through the transforming rehabilitation agenda may surreptitiously make this so as police officers offer to bridge the gaps created between the CRC’s and NPS in this new landscape (Evans, 2015, p.204).

In addition, other authors have recognised that this practice offers us an alternative rehabilitative approach. In her article Shaw (2004, p.174) states that ‘a changing
relationship has to occur between the police and prolific offenders in order for the problem of persistent criminal activity to be addressed successfully’. Conceptually, Shaw sees the role performed by police in this area as an extension of a restorative justice approach by utilising the police role to assist community re-integration. Whilst the police are the conduit in a restorative approach between the ‘offender’ and the ‘victim/community’, it is debatable whether this can really be said to be restorative justice because it is widely acknowledged that social inclusion is the result of RJ, but the activity itself is more in keeping with repairing harm directly with those affected (Wenzel, Okimoto, Feather & Platow, 2008, p.376). What this theory does recognise however is the link between these relationships and social inclusion which has recently been acknowledged by Senior (2014, p.8). More-over, this theory will be explored in relation to the findings of this study as Bain and Parkinson (2010, p.63) recognise that social inclusion is less about reducing recidivism or counting cases, but more about ‘self-worth, development and motivation to change’ which arguably these relationships offer.

Other authors who also present a compelling argument for a style of policing which supports offenders to desist from offending are Sherman and Neyroud (2012) in a model they call ‘offender-desistance policing’. Combining various theoretical models, such as life course criminology, offender focused policing and restorative justice with practical tools such as statistical crime forecasting and greater diversion from custody, the authors question whether the police can rehabilitate using a different tactic. As a central argument Sherman and Neyroud argue that prosecution appears to have no benefit in reducing repeat offending; instead they argue that there is good evidence that it increases repeat offending (Sherman & Neyroud, 2012, p.10). Furthermore, it is suggested that perhaps the most useful tool in the police armoury is not using the full force of the law but using the threat of punishment as a more effective deterrent: pushing the offender towards desistance (Sherman, et al, 2012, p.21). Thinking about offender-desistance policing in relation to police and offender relationships within IOM there are significant parallels. For example it is quite possible that the relationship itself acts as a deterrent against offending. Just knowing that the person who you are working with is a police officer who may decide to take you into custody may have the potential to deter the offender from further offending. However, whilst parts of this model are in keeping with desistance theory there are perhaps more significant
parallels with procedural justice theory. Introduced into this thesis as an example of how the police role is changing conceptually, this model in particular presents an interesting approach which needs further theorising and research going forward.

2.6 Defining the Prolific Offender

Since the introduction of the PPO scheme there has been consistent debate about what a prolific offender is. Over the years there have been a plethora of different labels used such as; career criminals, habitual criminal (Wilkins, 1966, p.313, Pratt & Dickinson, 1997, p.363), persistent offender and chronic offender (Wolfgang, Figlo & Sellin, 1972, p.88, Farrington & West, 1993). In fact the labelling of persistent offenders goes back hundreds of years, as does the fascination with identifying and dealing with society’s ‘incorrigible’ offenders (Rowbotham, 2009, p.107). Or as C. Stoss would call them, society’s ‘social parasites’ (Timasheff, 1939, p.457). Unlike the earlier persistent offender scheme which classified persistent offenders by the number of offences they committed, suggesting that those who were aged 18 or over with six or more convicted offences in the last year of liberty should be considered to be a persistent offender (Homes et al, 2005, p.10), the subsequent PPO scheme left local areas to decide upon who their prolific offenders were. This is now commonly decided through a scoring matrix (College of Policing, 2013, p.5). Whilst this does offer schemes the autonomy to include those offenders causing the most harm in their communities, it does present some methodological and practical issues. Firstly, the lack of a common definition makes comparison between schemes difficult. Secondly, it places challenges on national policies and guidance as schemes operate differently to others. Thirdly, there is no guarantee that the most prolific offenders in a community are selected (Townsley & Pease, 2002, p.325). Fourthly, it is difficult to say when any one offender has become ‘persistent’ (Soothill, Fitzpatrick & Francis, 2013, p.82). Lastly, a broad label doesn’t consider subsets or differences in the levels of offending, or the time scales in which they occur. For example should there be a distinction between ‘prolific’ offenders who could be said to commit offences in the short term with heavy bursts, or ‘persistent’ offenders who commit offences over a long period of time who are not considered ‘prolific’? (Hopkins & Wickson, 2012, p.8)

Whilst there is no universally agreed definition regarding prolific offenders, what clearly distinguishes this particular type of offender from other offender typologies is the
volume of offending they commit. Research also indicates that prolific offenders tend to be more criminally versatile than other offender groups (Farrington & West, 1999, p.499), with acquisitive offence types often favoured (College of Policing, 2013, p.4). In addition, prolific offenders also tend to be problematic drug users (Keene, Rodriguez & Badger, 2005, p.5, Dawson, 2007, p.6) who frequently abuse heroin and crack cocaine (Bennett in Hough and Mitchell, 2003, p.30). They can also be frequently identified through open market drug dealing (Kirby, Quinn & Keay, 2010, p.13). In regards to accommodation needs, PPO’s are also less likely to be in suitable or permanent accommodation and have double the needs in relation to accommodation and drug treatment in comparison to other offenders (Dawson, 2007, p.6, Easton, 2007, p.31). They also have substantial needs in relation to education, training and employment (Dawson, 2007. p.6). Men are at a much higher risk of becoming a prolific offender than women, with evidence suggesting that both men and women convicted at a young age are much more likely to become prolific offenders than their older counterparts (Soothill, Ackerley & Francis, 2003, p.407, Worrall, 2008, p.40). It has also been said that prolific offenders could be considered to be more ‘criminal’ than other offenders, especially in relation to the link between prolific offending and repeat victimisation (Pease, 1998, p.31, Everson, 2000, p.265). In addition, prolific offenders have lower I.Q scores than other offenders (Wolfgang et al, 1972, p.88) and are more likely to become prolific offenders where an absence of protective factors exist (Rennie & Dolan, 2010, p.17).

Although prolific offenders are not one homogeneous group, this list of research indicates the complex and challenging nature of working with this group of offenders. Therefore to be successful schemes that support prolific offenders need to espouse support in all of these areas as well as in health and social care (Rennie, Senior & Shaw, 2009, Stewart, Gossop, Marsden & Rolfe, 2000, Grover in Peelo & Soothill, 2005, p.57). They also need to aim to decrease offending through treatment which reduces social isolation and accommodates the complexity of their needs (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002, Maguire & Raynor, 2006, p.22, Local Government Association, 2005, Dyer & Briddle, 2016, p.48).

As an aside, whilst this section has attended to the importance of defining the ‘prolific’ offender, it is also important to briefly recognise what this means in relation to labelling theory. Since the 1960’s writers have argued that people obtain labels from how others
view their behaviours and how they perceive themselves in relation to their behaviour. Considering criminal behaviour specifically, in his book *Outsiders* Howard Becker (1963, p.2) explains that if the rules created by society are enforced, the perceived rule breaker is seen as a ‘special kind of person’; an ‘outsider’ who can be considered deviant. The consequences of being labelled as a deviant builds on the work of Tannenbaum from his ‘dramatisation of evil theory’ (Tannenbaum, 1936 cited by Pond, 1999, p.63). In this work, Tannenbaum believed that if the actions of an individual were seen as evil, then the next step would be for the individual to be seen as evil. He argued that this causes isolation and results in the individual perceiving themselves as a ‘criminal’. The public act of labelling, especially where custodial sentences are given also acts to turn the person into the thing they are described as being, namely a ‘criminal’ (Pond, 1999, p.63). Once the label of ‘offender’ or ‘criminal’ is successfully applied, the individual is categorized and blamed for their position even when circumstances would suggest otherwise. This has the effect of stigmatizing, ridiculing and marginalising the offender (Bain & Parkinson, 2010, p.66). Furthermore, the theory goes on to premise that labelling theory produces behaviour changes as the offender begins to live up to their label (Joyce, 2014, p.25). Whilst the effect that labelling theory has on probability, frequency and seriousness of further offending is not particularly understood with these linkages considered controversial (Farrington, 2003, p.277), labelling theory is an interesting phenomenon to consider in relation to prolific offenders. Colloquially, prolific offenders refer to themselves as ‘prolifics’ and if referred to as something else they frequently change it back to ‘prolifics’. They also ask each other if they are a ‘prolific’, thus identifying themselves by this label. Recognising that both the design and name of the scheme heavily labels and defines offenders by the prevalence of their offending, it is not surprising that this label has become normalised by offenders and professionals alike. Nevertheless, in a scheme designed to support rehabilitation and resettlement further consideration ought to be given to how labelling theory affects offending narratives. In addition, labelling theory also needs to be considered in relation to the police officer and offender relationship and is therefore revisited again in the concluding chapter.

For the purpose of clarity and in the interest of creating a common understanding it is necessary to state for the purpose of this study ‘prolific offenders’ are those demarked and labelled as such by the local scheme in question. In addition, for the duration of
this thesis this type of offender will be referred to as a ‘prolific offender’ in keeping with
current terminology within the criminal justice system. That said, more favourable
positive language was used in direct correspondence with the offenders.

2.7 Grounding IOM in Criminological Discourse

Grounding IOM in criminological discourse is a difficult task to achieve due to the
existence of conflicting criminological theories. Whilst some authors advocate that
schemes of this nature are designed on sound criminological reasoning (Townsley &
Pease, 2002, p.323), others question the ‘plausibility’ of these schemes entirely
(Hopkins & Wickson, 2012, p.16) and comment that central government doesn’t
always design polices which are framed within the context of well-tested criminological
theory and that often theoretical explanations come along afterwards to rationalise
them (Goode & Brookes, 2006, p.156). On the one hand, IOM adopts many of the
classical school approaches. For example, it uses a carrot and stick approach which
assumes that human beings are rational actors who will choose pleasure over pain,
reward over punishment (Paterson & Pollock, 2011, p.7). A central tenet being that
offenders must face up or face the consequences, with the ‘stick’ acting as a deterrent
against further offending. This position is based on the premise that offenders choose
to commit crime, also known as rational choice theory. This theory presumes that
offenders make a calculated decision by weighing up risk versus reward before they
choose to commit an offence (Palmer, 2003, p.21). Whilst this may be true of some
offenders and some offences, it is important to consider this theory in relation to prolific
offenders. In their article, Shover and Copes (2010, p.128) explore rational choice
theory by examining the lifestyle of street level prolific offenders finding that many
exhibited the characteristics of ‘life as a party’, which represents the good times, a lack
of obligations, repeated socialisation and an absence of social responsibilities. The
authors note that when efforts to maintain the party lifestyle were successful, offending
existed to continue the party. In contrast however, when party pursuits were less
successful offending was used as a way of forestalling unpleasant conditions, which
for example could include the notion of offending in order to stave off withdrawal from
drugs and alcohol. Whilst enjoying party pursuits, offenders calculated legal threats to
be an acceptable risk. Whilst it is possible that persistent offenders do make rational
choices to commit some offences, their nonchalant approach to legal threats, the
circumstances surrounding their lives and the existence of physical addictions from
drugs and alcohol make the total application of rational choice theory less dependable as an explanation of offending in this group.

In keeping with the classical approach to criminology, it is also theorised that offenders can be moulded through crime control and societal governance in order to comply with the law (Paterson & Pollock, 2011, p.7, Walklate, 2005, p.80). Strategies in this area include surveillance, increased monitoring and the use of technology such as CCTV and electronic tagging which are used at both the state and community level in an attempt to control crime (Bullock, 2014, p.10). In applying this theory, IOM becomes part of the ‘crime triangle’ (Goode et al, 2006, p.159) which is derived from routine activity theory which explains that a predatory crime occurs when a likely offender and suitable target come together in time and space without a capable guardian present (Walklate, 2005, p.82). In IOM, a capable guardian might be made up of combined methods of surveillance and monitoring, such as electronic tagging, CCTV, home visits, street surveillance, the scheme itself and pivotally the police / offender relationship. This theory, as well as other classical approaches concerns itself with the prediction of offending as a part of the routine activities and patterns of everyday life and less with offending as an individual pursuit.

Contemporary criminology however has advanced in line with a more positivist approach which has attempted to identify the ‘science’ behind crime, criminals and offending (Tierney, 2009, p.56). Determinism for example takes into account social, environmental and cognitive conditions such as poverty, negative peer groups, immaturity and mental health conditions, arguing that these factors can affect an individual’s ‘free will’ to offend (Joyce, 2014, p.13). The focus of this approach shifts from penalties that fit the crime to penalties that fit the individual (Joyce, 2006, p.4) and recognises that offending occurs less from choice and more from circumstance. In this way offenders are still seen to be taking responsibility for their actions, but now there is some explanation as to why this may occur. This theory sits more neatly into the ‘rehabilitation and resettle’ strand of the IOM scheme as professionals work to reduce the social, cognitive and environmental factors by targeting their support on improving ‘criminogenic pathways’. In other words trying to reduce the circumstances which increase the likelihood of offending; poverty, homelessness and substance misuse.
From a purely theoretical point of view it would seem that IOM has all bases covered, yet authors note that the problem has always been that there is no existing penal framework which has the answer to what needs to be done with habitual offenders (Pratt & Dickson, 1997, p.370). Furthermore, schemes of this nature also have to be effective practically and show that it works which as we shall explore next presents several challenges.

2.8 Effectiveness

Whilst the premise behind IOM is simple in that targeting prolific offenders will have a greater impact on reducing victimisation and preventing crime than targeting those who are not considered prolific, there are disagreements over most aspects of this approach. The first argument relates to whether ‘prolific’ offenders actually exist. Official figures suggest that 100,000 persistent offenders are responsible for half of all crime and 5,000 of those commit 9% of all crime (HMIC et al, 2004, p.7). Despite these figures being widely quoted throughout the literature there are authors who question their accuracy (Garside, 2004) and consider them over-estimated (Hopkins & Wickson, 2012, p.60). Whilst there are studies which show little evidence that a group of nominated offenders contribute disproportionately to the amount of crime (Townsley & Pease, 2002, p.330), methodologically superior longitudinal birth cohort studies do show that a subset of more prolific offending does exist (Wolfgang et al, 1972, Farrington, 1983, in Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p.34).

The second disagreement relates to whether the scheme is effective at demonstrating reductions in reoffending. In the eyes of the government these schemes do demonstrate reductions in reoffending, (Home Office, 2010b, Fox, 2011, p.172, Wood, Kade & Sidhu, 2009, p.676, Dawson, 2005, p.7, Dawson & Cuppleditch, 2007, p.v, Machin & Marie, 2005, p.24), yet authors question whether these reductions truly exist because the measurement of reoffending used is often over simplified, drawn from differing data sets (Townsley & Pease, 2002, p.326), not controlled for changes in recording practices (Fox, Mackay & Hope, 2006, p.7) and not methodologically rigorous enough to withstand scrutiny (Perry, Newman, Hallam, Johnson, Sinclair & Bowles, 2009). In addition, most studies are not sophisticated enough to show which intervention within the scheme has had the most significant impact on a reduction in reoffending (College of Policing, 2013, p.6), whether reductions in reoffending can be
attributed solely to that intervention or another (Worrall, 2002, p.290) or whether these schemes can be considered successful overall (Tupman, Farlow & Hong Chui, 2002, p.48). Generally we simply do not know whether IOM or PPO schemes are effective at achieving reductions in reoffending due to the lack of critical analysis in this area (Hopkins & Wickson, 2012, p.2, Moore et al, 2006, p.xvii, Townsley & Pease, 2002, p.327, Worrall & Mawby, 2004, p.268). Moreover the use of reoffending or reconviction data to demonstrate scheme impact has considerable methodological weaknesses. Primarily using reconviction to measure rehabilitation is limited as it fails to give an indicator of behavioural change. McNeill (2012, p.6) explains this beautifully through a medical analogy saying that ‘judging a rehabilitative intervention by reconviction is a bit like judging the success of health interventions by whether anyone shows up at the doctor again’. This tells us nothing of how effective the treatment is. Furthermore, reconviction is only a measure of the reconviction itself because the offence in which the offender is caught and convicted for may, or may not, be representative of the total crime they have committed. Moreover, offences may fail to reach conviction as cases are discontinued and offenders are released on legal technicalities (Pitts, 2004, p.34). Lastly, measuring impact purely on reconviction does little to show the benefits or additionality that a scheme such as IOM offers (Wong, 2013).

In addition, it is widely acknowledged that sentencing offenders to short periods of custody is ineffective and often counterproductive (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002, Allen, 2008, p.389). This is of course the type of sentencing which frequently occurs within IOM/PPO cohorts (Knepper, 2007, p.128, Falkner, 2009, p.2). Although the government widely accepts the argument that the majority of non-violent offenders can be treated in the community without risk to the public, (Ministry of Justice, 2007a, p.3) in reality few prolific offenders are diverted from custody (Allen, 2008, p.390). Also custodial sentences of twelve months or less are markedly less effective at reducing reoffending than both community orders and suspended sentence orders (Ministry of Justice, 2011), whilst short term prisoners are sixty percent more likely to reoffend than other prisoners (National Audit Office, 2010, p.4). What this means in practice is despite the best of intentions to reduce reoffending, IOM / PPO schemes are working with offenders most likely to reoffend, with a strategy of custody, which is less successful at reducing reoffending. Furthermore, police officers in this role are
frequently asked to achieve positive results with voluntary offenders. In sum, these factors do not seem particularly conducive to success.

Reoffending rates aside, the aggregate cost of crime in 2000 was estimated to be £60 billion a year (Albertson & Fox, 2008, p.30) and therefore it is also important to evaluate the success of a scheme in relation to value for money. In this regard it is interesting to note that there is little evidence which shows that these schemes represent value for money (Worrall & Mawby, 2004, p.268, Walton, 2000, p.53). The Diamond Initiative for example seems to be the only evaluation where a cost benefit analysis was completed, finding that there were no economic savings (Dawson et al, 2011, p.56). In addition, it is also right to question whether or not the use of police officers for rehabilitative purposes present value for money (College of Policing, 2013, p.64) or whether or not schemes are able to demonstrate long term impacts to justify the cost (Millie, 2004, p.175).

Despite overwhelming uncertainty in relation to whether these schemes are effective or not, arguably there is more to success than simply demonstrating reductions in reoffending. In addition, this position is borne out in much of the literature as many schemes were able to demonstrate positive outcomes for their participants. Rezansoff, Moniruzzaman and Somers (2012, p.571) found that participants in their scheme were able to access health care professionals in a way which they would not have been able to do without being part of the scheme. Worrall (2002, p.291) also presented case studies which showed the importance of recognising ‘small gains’. Whilst success is often subjective without looking deeply at other influences such as social, economic and moral factors, as well as the lives of individuals and their social conditions, (Faulkner, 2009, p.3, McCulloch, 2006, p.29) the vast majority of literature in this field does suggest that schemes offer an effective way of supporting offenders. In addition there is strong support for schemes continuing to support short term offenders despite their non-statutory status (Revolving Doors Agency, 2012).

2.9 ‘What Works’?

What is perhaps most promising in relation to indicating whether these schemes are effective or not is the potential links which can be made with other rehabilitative programmes. Whilst there is no agreement about what works to reduce reoffending overall, (Hough, 2010, p.13) due in part to insufficient, inconsistent and incomplete
research (Harper & Chitty, 2005, p.xx) as well as the complexity of the task at hand, there are criminological areas of promise for IOM/PPO schemes. Although research indicates that punishment does not work alone (Andrews & Bonta, 1994, p.64), nor does the tougher enforcement of community sentences (Hearnden & Millie, 2004, p.55), it cannot be said that ‘nothing works’ either (Martinson, 1974). What criminological research has established over the last few decades is that some things work for some people, but a one size fits all approach will not work for everyone (Hough, 2010, p.16). An individualistic approach is therefore key.

Positively, the area which shows most promise in criminological terms is in regards to the Risk, Need, Responsivity model whereby several studies have demonstrated significant reductions in recidivism when the model was incorporated into a therapeutic framework (Rezanoff et al, 2012, p.564, Dowdon & Andrews, 2004, p.204, Shaffer, Pratt, 2009, p.104). The ‘risk’ element of this approach assumes that criminal behaviour can be predicted, which Andrews and Bonta (1994, p.174) show evidence for. It asserts that the level of intervention should correspond to the level of risk of reoffending. As IOM offers intensive support for those considered to be a high risk of reoffending this could be considered congruent. However, it should be remembered that offender selection is not a failsafe procedure and it cannot always be assumed that the right offender has been selected or correctly assessed against their actual level of risk. The ‘need’ principle suggests that the intervention should address specific criminogenic areas of need such as support with accommodation, employment and substance abuse. In the case of IOM, schemes are built upon the principles of multiagency working and partnership buy-in from relevant agencies such as housing and drug and alcohol services which support this principle. The ‘responsivity’ aspect suggests that an intervention is most effective if it is tailor made to the individual by taking into account the mode and style of delivery to complement the offender’s ability and learning style. In this area cognitive behavioural approaches have seen some success (Perry et al, 2009, p.5). What is perhaps most debatable however, is whether IOM achieves this last principle. On the one hand it is frequently a blunt instrument delivered to, not with a group of prolific offenders who are all labelled together as such. Whilst there is some evidence to the contrary to suggest that professionals in particular adopt an individualistic approach to working with offenders, stringent guiding principles which require offenders to ‘face up, or face the consequences’, combined with reduced
time available for probation supervision within stringent national standards, it is more likely that in practice IOM operates a generalised approach. Although there may be a great deal of desire to offer a more bespoke approach on a micro level, the reality is that competing aspects make it difficult to fully operationalise a risk, needs and responsivity model in practice (Pitts, 2004, p.27). As a result the positive therapeutic alliance needed to encourage offenders to change is reduced (McNeill, 2012, p.4).

Lastly, research indicates that the effectiveness of a rehabilitative scheme is likely to be influenced by several factors; namely the quality and integrity of the programme (Robinson & Crow, 2009, p.63), the strength of the therapeutic allegiance between practitioner and offender (Dowden & Andrews, 2004, p.212), how well designed the programme is against the risk, need and responsivity of the offender (Shaffer & Pratt, 2009, p.103) and the ethos, behaviour, personal qualities and skills of the staff (Wood et al, 2009, p.664). In their examination of seven pathfinder projects which sought to settle short-term prisoners, Lewis and colleagues found that successful schemes needed experienced staff who could work with offenders on their attitudes, motivation and practical needs, as well as have access to relevant resources and opportunities (Lewis, Vennard, Maguire, Raynor, Vanstone, Raybould & Rix, 2013, p.660).

**2.10 - Conclusion**

As a final thought in summing up this chapter, it is timely to acknowledge the bottom line in regards to the rehabilitation of offenders. Firstly, the process of ‘rehabilitating’, or helping offenders to turn their back on crime is a slow and uncertain process. This is largely due to the complexity of the task at hand (Pitts, 2004, p.35). Secondly, eventually most offenders desist from crime either instantaneously or gradually over time (Serin & Lloyd, 2009, p.348, Kurlychek & Bushway, 2012, p.96). On this journey the rehabilitative programme, or the probation officer/police officer or IOM scheme is just a small part of a jigsaw which supports the process itself, rather than ‘rehabilitates’ the offender. In amongst this is a complex set of internal processes which the offender must navigate in order to desist from offending. Whilst one school of criminological thinking asserts that future offending is likely to be influenced by an offender’s thinking as well as their circumstances (Maguire & Raynor, 2006, p.24), others argue that it is not as simple as ‘if you think straight, you will go straight’ (Pitts, 2004, p.31). Therefore rehabilitative programmes cannot be heralded as the answer to offender rehabilitation.
and their effects must be seen as modest. Thirdly, in rehabilitative programmes which do show positive results such as cognitive behavioural programmes for example, the results are often rather humble, difficult to achieve on a large scale and exceptionally expensive (Newbold, 2008, p.397). Taken as a whole it seems that rehabilitative programmes try to simplify the complex and where results are positive they need to be placed into the wider sociological context of crime control.

Chapter Three - Towards a Theoretical Understanding of Police and Offender Relationships

3.1 Introduction

Theorising about the police and offender relationship in IOM and making comment on their value is difficult for a number of reasons. Firstly offenders and police officers do not form homogeneous groups, so generalisable theories could be considered flawed. Secondly, although some comparisons can be made between offender relationships which form within the police organisation and partnership agencies such as probation, they must be specifically understood within the context of the organisation where the relationship develops (Lewis, 2016, p.45). Thirdly, there are few studies which support theory development in this area as evaluations about the relational approach to offender supervision have been infrequently conducted (Burnett & McNeill, 2005, p.231). Lastly, the idea of a ‘relationship’ is conceptually problematic not only because it is not easily defined, but because approaches and styles differ within both a sociological and psychological context. For these reasons it is a challenge to articulate the unique nature of these relationships in theoretical form except to acknowledge that there are deeply theoretical questions which need to be attended to. Furthermore, it is also important to recognise that there is perhaps something intangible and special about these relationships which may not be fully captured or articulated in these theories. Likewise, the practice of police officers developing relationships with offenders is so acutely unfamiliar to what the public, the police and offenders ‘think’ the police do, that care needs to be taken to understand these relationships within the context of criminological theories, but to also fairly reflect the nature of the relationships so as to prevent sensationalism. This chapter will therefore attempt to unravel the key theoretical aspects pertaining to the police officer and offender relationship within IOM before moving on to explore the practical and ethical issues.
3.2 Exploring the Police and Offender Relationship in IOM within the Literature

In analysing the literature it is illuminating to note that there are a number of different scheme designs. For example there are schemes where police officers manage statutory offenders under a catch and convict ethos (Novas Scarman, 2011, Vennard & Pearce, 2004, Williams & Ariel, 2012, Worrall et al, 2003), under a rehabilitate and resettle ethos (Homes et al, 2005) and those without a discernible ethos, or certainly not one clearly articulated in the text (Feasey, 2009, Marlow, 2007). In regards to the police management of non-statutory offenders not surprisingly there were no identifiable evaluations which managed non-statutory offenders under a purely catch and convict ethos, but there were examples of management under a rehabilitate and resettle ethos (Dawson et al, 2011) and examples where it is not clear who managed non-statutory offenders at all (Feasey, Bird, Meadows, Robinson & Senior, 2007). However, some schemes secured additional funding for probation support officers to manage their non-statutory offenders (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006, Easton, 2007). There were also evaluations where the offender type and the ethos were not established (Erol & Millie, 2005, Culshaw, 2008, Dawson, 2007). Across the literature it is interesting to note that this diversity is neither recognised nor debated. The ethos of the scheme, as well as the practical management of statutory / non-statutory offenders surely has an impact on the way in which relationships are constructed?

Practice would suggest that police officers who predominantly arrest their offenders time and time again would have a different type of relationship with them than if they were primarily supporting positive change. This may be especially relevant with non-statutory offenders who engage voluntarily. However, the literature does not support this assumption and presents a different but complex picture with clear patterns and themes emerging.

Firstly, it would seem that there is the potential for a relationship to flourish in each of these circumstances, irrespective of the type of offender supported or the ethos of the scheme (Dawson et al, 2011, Easton, 2007, Feasey, 2009, Erol & Millie, 2005, Millie & Erol, 2006, Williams & Ariel, 2012). Simply being a police officer in itself was not a barrier and although the relationships started off suspiciously because the offender was often apprehensive about police involvement (Homes et al, 2005, p.24) and hesitant about what their peers would think of this association (Marlow, 2007, p.36, Erol & Millie, 2005, p.18), this barrier could be overcome by building trusting
relationships over time (Easton, 2007, p.64). In order to build this trust, offenders accepted police officers more readily if their involvement in the scheme was made explicit from the start (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006, p.160). Furthermore, a common tactic adopted by offenders to justify and accept these relationships was to separate police officers on IOM from those in the general police population, viewing them as different and not like ‘real’ police officers (Homes et al, 2005, p.24). Overwhelmingly, in studies where offenders where interviewed the majority tended to make positive statements about the police role within IOM. Whilst some offenders across the literature voiced a lack of trust in the police officers working in these schemes, the vast majority showed that offenders recognised that trust existed reflecting on this with surprise (Erol & Millie, 2005, p.24). Although some offenders viewed police involvement in the scheme as intrusive (Worrall et al, 2003, p.10), others found intensive monitoring useful to prevent their reoffending (Dawson & Cuppleditch, 2007, p.12). Also, interestingly Easton (2007, p.44) notes that the relationships could be frustrated if engagement was tokenistic from the police officer and the relationship thrived where the police officer and the offender ‘clicked’ (Feasey, 2009, p.22).

The second important theme from the literature supports the previous argument in favour of the ‘rehabilitative’ police officer. Whilst the literature indicates that the ethos of the scheme seems less important than trust, understanding and honesty, schemes seemed keen to explore the benefit of devoting a police officer to the rehabilitate and resettle strand. This is evidenced by three schemes predominantly working under a catch and convict ethos but subsequently recruiting police officers to focus predominantly on rehabilitation and resettlement (Cinamon, et al 2006, Vennard et al, 2004, Worrall et al, 2003). In addition, other schemes also changed their use of police resources from involvement with statutory offenders under a catch and convict ethos, to the management of non-statutory offenders with a rehabilitate and resettle approach (Novas Scarman, 2011, Vennard et al 2004, Williams et al, 2012, Senior et al, 2011, p.35). It would appear that this is in response to several studies which find that the relationships built between police officer and offender were more positive if the police in IOM concentrated more on the rehabilitate and resettle aspect of the scheme, rather than concentrating on the catch and convict aspect (Feasey et al, 2007, p.19). Given these indicators, there are numerous authors within the corpus who argue that the police should move away from a catch and convict ethos towards a rehabilitate and
resettle approach, which they claim could have a greater effect on the outcomes of a scheme (Feasey et al, 2007, p.19, Senior, 2014, Williams & Ariel, 2012).

The third theme across the literature is that police officers working in these environments are clearly maintaining and juggling a myriad of different functions, many of which could be considered less ‘traditional’. Whilst they undertook traditional roles such as monitoring, performing arrests, holding offenders to account and upholding the law, they also undertook home visits, worked closely with partner agencies to fast track access to services, offered practical advice and assistance, attended support meetings, performed a mentor type role and continued to explore ways to embrace the offender back onto the scheme even after arrest (Millie & Erol, 2006, p.699, Williams & Ariel, 2012, p.126). Whilst these additional duties do have the very distinct purpose of reducing reoffending through rehabilitation, they are also the very activities which build strong, meaningful relationships.

3.3 Relationship Theory

The Longman Dictionary describes a ‘relationship’ as a way in which people are connected to each other (Longman, 1991, p.1357), whilst relationship scholars further explain the connection in terms of two individuals sharing some type of behavioural interdependence (Berscheid & Peplau, 1983 in Guerrero, Anderson & Afifi, 2013, p.6). Understanding why relationships form is not always straightforward, but they can be understood through sociological theories called exchange theories. Exchange theories have in common the view that relationships between individuals involve processes of exchange, each partner incurring costs in the hope of receiving future rewards (Hinde, 2007, p.83). Exchanges that maximise the rewards and minimise the cost are the most favourable (Woodarski & Dziegielewski, 2002, p.203). In the police / offender relationship this theory presents an interesting position. Arguably it might be a cost for the offender to develop a relationship with a police officer because a peer group might see this relationship detrimentally. Conversely, the relationship might bring rewards through reductions in sentences or a reduced likelihood of a police officer advocating arrest or prison for example. From a police officer perspective the cost might be negative comments from colleagues, whilst for others it might be sharing some of their personal story. Equally the reward might be increased intelligence or being in a position to help someone turn their life around.
Building on this approach is equity theory, which although a type of exchange theory, rests on the principle that the relationship is fair and equitable for both parties. It premises that rewards and punishments should be distributed or given based on inputs or contributions, with the ratio of costs and benefits being equality divisible (Guerrero et al, 2013, p.263). However, not all theorists are convinced with this explanation of social organisation arguing that the reliance on ‘fairness’ and a sense of ‘justice’ is but one of the aspects which are important within social organisation (Leventhal, 1980, p.28) and that equity as a comparable rate is difficult to evaluate (Folger, 1986, p.146). Power differentials within the police-offender relationship would also make equity theory more difficult to utilise.

A further set of relevant theories are entitled reinforcement, or need satisfaction theories. These theories are based upon the idea that relationships form because of the reinforcements that are received. In social learning theory, humans learn that if a certain set of circumstances or stimuli are in place an individual can expect a particular emotional reward or punishment. In a relational context, this theory suggests that humans will seek out relationships whereby common interests or attraction create positive feelings (Dwyer, 2000, p.47). Again, total application of this theory in relation to the relationships studied may also be problematic because arguably neither party seeks out the other to reinforce positive feelings. However, the relationship may have this desired effect eventually, especially as the relationship grows and develops.

Overall, many of these theories are problematic and rest on the assumption that both parties choose to develop a relationship for either a reward or positive reinforcement. Considering the relationships examined in this study, it is important to question how much choice either party has to form a relationship with each other in the first place. The offender may feel obliged to engage with the police officer in the scheme because it is part of their prison licence and failure to comply may mean a recall to prison. Likewise, relationships matched within IOM can often be based on the availability of a particular police offender manager, rather than their suitability.

One useful way of understanding relationships is to consider typologies. Vanlear, Koerner and Allen, (2006, p.95) state that the most obvious distinction to base a typology of relationships on is volition and intimacy, as shown in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Relations</th>
<th>Social Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voluntary</strong></td>
<td>• Acquaintances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marriage</td>
<td>• Casual Friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Best Friends</td>
<td>• Relational Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cohabitating Couple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adoptive/foster family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exogenously Established</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parent / Child</td>
<td>• Distant Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Siblings</td>
<td>• Working Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grandparents / Child</td>
<td>• Monopoly provider – client</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1) Types of relationships based on volition and intimacy

Considering this typology theory the relationships explored in the context of this study are social relations which form in a professional environment, not the types of relationships which would be considered personal. Although, there are examples of relationships which have developed into more intimate ones which presents a particularly fascinating ethical issue, this study is unable to devote a great deal of space to exploring this aspect other than to acknowledge that it exists. Returning to the volition / intimacy typology as detailed above, the relationships examined as part of this study do not neatly fit into any of these boxes because they can be both voluntary and forced, as well as have some elements of intimacy whilst being formal. Lewis (2016, p.1) defines all relationships between offenders and criminal justice practitioners as ‘correctional relationships’, which recognises the unique context in which the relationships are formed. Furthermore, Lewis found in her study of relationships between offenders and probation officers that some relationships move beyond correctional relationships into therapeutic correctional relationships, whereby probation officers nurture growth and positive change in a collaborative relationship which is based on mutual respect, genuineness, empathy, acceptance and positive regard.

A seemingly more useful set of relationship types and their characteristics are presented by Guerro, Anderson and Afifi (2013, p.6) in their book on relationships. In this text the authors distinguish between three types of relationships which are defined as follows.

**Role Relationships:** Two people who share some degree of behavioural interdependence. People in such relationships are usually interchangeable and are
not psychologically or behaviourally unique. One person in a role relationship can easily replace another. These relationships are functional and casual.

**Interpersonal Relationships**: Two people who share repeated interactions over time, can influence one another and have unique interaction patterns. These relationships have emotional / social connections and because they often develop over time they have a shared experience, inside jokes and knowledge of private information which shape how they communicate with each other.

**Close Relationships**: Two people in an interpersonal relationship characterised by enduring bonds, emotional attachment, personal need fulfilment and irreplaceability.

Whilst, these theories are useful to begin to explain what might be happening in these relationships, they must also be understood in a criminological and offender supervision context which will be considered now.

**3.4 Criminological relationships: Case Work versus Offender Supervision**

In criminological terms the notion of a relationship has played a significant role in numerous theories as well as case management strategies. This section will therefore take a journey into probation practice, recognising that it has significant relevance for this study for two main reasons. Firstly, there are ideological similarities between the probation role and the police role, especially in a multi-agency setting where probation officers frequently have to navigate ‘care’ and ‘control’ (Willis, 1983, p.340). Secondly, there are significant correlations between the relationships being explored in this study and probation case management approaches.

Fundamentally probation practice has always focused on the relationship developed between probation officer and probationer as a means of influencing change in the offender. However, this approach has undergone dramatic change in more recent years coming in and out of favour at various times. Initially probation supervision was based on a missionary style approach where the probation officer built a relationship with the offender as a means of supporting change through befriending, which was known as the ‘case work’ model. This style continued for much of the twentieth century until the ‘what works’ movement begun to advocate a treatment style approach which resulted in a shift towards ‘social case work’ (Hardiker, 1977, p.146). Authors such as Bottoms and McWilliams rejected this model arguing that it objectified the offender as
a person who needed to be treated, cured and managed through social policy and professional practice (McNeill, 2006, p42). By concentrating on a treatment model the relationship altered to take into account the needs of offenders, as well as the human capital needed to change. Generally considered effective, both the ‘case work’ and ‘social case work’ style of supervision survived much of what Burnett and McNeill (2005, p.222) call the ‘gloomy message’ of the ‘what works’ movement, or more specifically the ‘nothing works’ era. However, the most significant changes in attitude towards probation officer and offender relationships occurred in the 1990’s which Robinson (2005, p.307) argues stemmed from an approach to offender supervision which became fragmented in favour of an ‘offender management’ approach. In this context supervision concerned itself more with the management of risk and the surveillance and control of offenders and less about the ‘relational’ aspects of offender supervision. In a study of Irish probation officers operating under a social / welfare case work model, Healy (2012, p.389) found that where probation officers adopted a social welfare model, offenders were more positive about their experiences. In particular they valued the practical assistance and friendship they received within the supervisory relationship. On the other hand, offenders who stated their supervising officers employed a surveillance approach were less positive about their relationships. From these findings the authors argue that a social welfare model may be better placed to encourage genuine engagement with supervision and ultimately promote desistance. In sum, this study along with others indicate the importance of listening to the needs of offenders who advocate for positive working relationships with their probation officers which are respectful, honest and meaningful (Lewis, 2014b, p.342). A failure to listen to this plea lessens the likelihood of supervision completion, compliance with programmes and reduces staff satisfaction (Robinson, 2005, p.315).

More recently, desistance theory has helped to invigorate a revival in the importance of the relational approach with the development of the probation Skills for Effective Development (SEED) pilot. This learning and development programme delivered to probation staff between 2011 and 2012 included motivational interviewing, cognitive-behavioural approaches, risk, need and responsivity, pro-social modelling and relationship building techniques. Generally well received by probation staff, (Sorsby, Shapland, Farrall, McNeill, Priede & Robinson, 2013, p.1) this programme built on McNeill’s (2006, p.45) point that offender supervision needs to be structured by first
thinking about how offender change should be understood. In this context, desistance theory stresses the importance of interventions which develop both human capital which focuses on internal capabilities as well as attitudes and social capital which places value on the relationships built with others. In studies which consider the latter, positive social relationships such as marriage and close family bonds have frequently been shown to increase an offender’s likelihood of desisting from criminal activity (Farra, 2004 p.72, Soothill et al. 2013, p.91, Laub, Nagin & Sampson, 1998, p.255). Likewise, supportive family relationships have been shown to transform criminal perspectives, identities and behaviours (Martinez, 2013, p.57) and arguably act as an informal social control (Farra & Calveley, 2005, p.11). In regards to human capital, desistance theory recognises that internal changes need to occur in order for an offender to ‘go straight’ (Laub & Sampson, 2001, p.50). This change includes the alteration of internal narratives which Canter and Youngs argue drives offending (Canter & Youngs, 2015, p.219). What research into desistance theory and practitioner practice indicates is that positive relationships with probation officers can encourage desistance by increasing offender confidence and altering self perceptions by using good rapport and non-judgemental communication (Barry, 2000, p.584, Burnett & McNeill, 2005, p.233, Barry, 2007, p.416). In addition research also shows that offender motivation to go straight is highly related to personal relationships with staff (Rowe & Soppitt, 2014, p.399). In sum, a positive relationship is therefore likely to have a positive effect on the offender’s desistance journey.

Whilst there has been research into the effect that pro-social probation relationships have on supporting offender desistance, especially in the probation service (King, 2013, Barry, 2000, 2007, Burnett & McNeill, 2005), there have been no known studies which consider whether or not the relationship developed between police officers and offenders within IOM could be considered pro-social or supportive of desistance. It is therefore important to understand both similarities and differences between the police and probation offender supervision role to progress theoretically in this area. Arguably, both police officers and probation officers share some of the same ideological areas of conflict in that probation officers often have to wear ‘two hats’; that of a ‘cop’ enforcing court orders and prison licenses and that of a social worker concentrating on offender rehabilitation (Murphy & Luntz, 2009, p.329). Farrant notes (2006, p.329) that this results in probation officers having to create a ‘new self’ in order to function
within this framework. Additionally research has found that multi-agency work greatly influences the attitudes and behaviours of both police and probation officers which can result in both partners alternating their approach (Mawby & Worrall, 2011, p.89). Ultimately, what appears to be the case especially in the IOM environment is that probation officers can become police officers and police officers can become probation officers. As an aside, some sense ought to be made of this way of working especially where strategic statements present as particularly ambiguous about the practicality of this approach (Home Office, n.d, p.16). Moving on, one author who studied this observation was Nash (1999). Nash recognised that in the preceding decades the police service and the probation service were moving closer together eventually to become bed fellows in the public protection arena. New Public Management, an overburdened and expensive criminal justice system, political rhetoric seeking to be ‘tough on crime’, increased accountability and broader changes in the working ethos of both services slowly cemented a collaborative approach to reducing the risk of harm to the public between the police and probation service (Nash, 1999, p.366). In his article, Nash introduces the metaphysical hybrid ‘polibration officer’ as a conceptual figure in the public protection conferencing arena formed through recognition that police officers and probation officers were performing each other’s traditional tasks. What is pivotal about this article is the recognition that this practice was occurring in the earliest phase of partnership working and fairly soon after the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 was implemented. What Nash started was the beginning of a debate about the complexities of multi-agency arrangements, in particular what happens when two professionals morph into one or roles reverse. Given the applicability of the concept, Mawby and Worrall (2004) used the ‘polibration’ officer as a way of exploring the role that police officers undertake within the PPO landscape. In their study of the Stoke on Trent PPO scheme the authors found that the case for the ‘polibration’ officer was unproven, but concluded that this may not always be the case (Mawby & Worrall, 2004, p.71). This particular article therefore contributes one of the most pivotal questions for this study: In developing these relationships with offenders are police officers in IOM becoming ‘polibration officers’? This will be revisited in relation to the findings of this study.

One area which has yet to be discussed in the context of these relationships is around ‘therapeutic alliance’ and the use of the relationship to encourage improvements in
self-efficacy. Therapeutic alliance is described as the interpersonal relationship between the therapist / practitioner and the client and how it effects change (Henry & Strupp, 1994, p.68). In essence, a therapeutic relationship is a rewarding relationship based on the modelling of pro-social attitudes and the reciprocation of values. A good therapeutic alliance will see the therapist, or police officer in this case, communicate to the offender that they are trustworthy and that their attitudes and values are particularly sensitive to their situation (Potter, 2002, in Ward & Brown, 2004, p.254). Where appropriate, this approach encourages breaches of trust to be restored so to renew an offender’s confidence and trust in those they are working with (Ward & Brown, 2004, p.254). Much of the literature and indeed this study has ‘trust’ at the heart of these relationships so therapeutic alliance seems likely to feature. Arguably, where therapeutic alliance will become problematic however is around issues of confidentiality and the breaking down of trust due to the demands of the police role which will be considered next.

3.5 Police Culture and IOM: Square Peg in a Round Hole?

Culture too, plays a significant role in understanding these relationships. From the perspective of police culture the organised, standardised and regulated police service that we see today was formed in response to the County and Borough Police Act passed in 1856 (Emsley, 2008, p.77). Although there was some trepidation about the creation of a ‘new police’ system to replace the parish system of community constables and night watchmen who were locally elected to oversee private prosecutions (Jones, 1997, p.16), the passing of this legislation along with increased centralised control, the desire to maintain social order and the reformation and modernisation of public authorities heralded the beginning of the modern day police model. Ideologically, this ‘new police’ force was charged with the role of preventing crime, as opposed to detecting it (Rawlings, 2001, p.118). Despite this initial modest intent the modernisation of society, increased industrialization and rising criminality saw the police service evolve to focus on peace keeping, crime investigation, risk management and the promotion of community justice (Wright, 2001, p.xiii). Within criminological discourse, numerous debates centre on the ‘real’ function of the police. Whilst there is inadequate space to debate this here, it is important to make the distinction between ‘the police’ and ‘policing’. Whilst ‘the police’ are defined as the institution itself, ‘policing’ in contrast considered the activities undertaken by the police. Policing may
also include private as well as public policing. This demarcation is important. Whilst the notion of the police can be steeped in rigid ideological principles, the act of policing allows for a more flexible and diverse set of activities which as Pakes (2010, p.42) points out ranges from social work to torture and murder.

Grounding the police role in Integrated Offender Management within this discourse is problematic. Crowther (2004, p.56) points to two main perspectives on the role of the police. The first is the Neo-Marxist and Neo-Weberian perspective which concentrates more on the police as a specialist, formal state apparatus endowed with the legitimate use of force that is charged with regulating a structurally excluded underclass. The police become the 'thin blue line' responsible for crime reduction, order maintenance and quasi-social service tasks. Foucauldians in contrast tend to concentrate more on general forms of administration and regulation. Instead of focusing on the clearly delimited and specialised task of crime reduction, policing is seen to focus on the issue of general social order, including the provision of security, welfare in its widest sense, general social stability and economic prosperity. The former is often considered more in keeping with ‘hard’ policing and the latter with ‘soft’ policing.

Whilst, the practice of police officers developing relationships with offenders might sit comfortably within the wide scope of ‘policing’ as a way of mollifying policy makers, attitudes which result from ‘cop culture’ affect police behaviour, which subsequently has a bearing on police relationships, decision making and discretion to use diversionary activities with offenders (Parker, Mohr & Wilson, 2004, p.10). Since the 1960’s there has been a fascination, especially within the field of criminology with understanding exactly what ‘cop culture’ is. Research shows that police culture is often divisible into three subcultures, that of secrecy, solidarity and social isolation, which often exists in an environment that operates with a sense of mission, suspicion, conservatism, machismo, pragmatism and racial prejudice (Thibault, Lynch & McBride, 2011, p.18, Reiner, 2000, in Westmorland, 2008, p.264). Although leading authors in this area state that these characteristics are not monolithic, they are recognised as being dominant enough to affect the culture overall. In addition the police world view is often simplistic, which includes a de-contextualised understanding of criminality and intolerant attitudes towards those who do not conform or challenge the status quo (Loftus, 2010, p.2). ‘Villains’ and even the general public are divisible
by the police into a range of categories and stereotypes in accordance with police ‘macho’ culture which predictably includes racist and sexist values. As Jones (2001, p.21) points out, many police officers find it hard to come to terms with anyone who is ‘different’ for whatever reason.

In relation to the criminal justice system, the police often view it as being about ‘incapacitation’ and less about rehabilitation (Ellis & Boden, 2005, p.8). In their study of YOT officers Ellis and Boden (2005, p.18) conclude that the police working in YOT had a predominately ‘caring’ profile which they noted was not typical of the police force in which they came from. Despite this there was an ‘elected affinity’ rather than simply a change of job which produced this change. This study shows it is more about getting the right police officer, with the right mind-set, into the right job. Role theory therefore offers us some explanations as to how police officers drawn from the general police population can work in an environment which could be considered vastly different to that of the wider policing network. In a socially constructed world individuals are expected to fulfil a number of roles, the behaviours of which are shaped by cultural norms and expectations. From a functionalist perspective these roles define how you are supposed to act, how others are supposed to act and how you are supposed to interact with each other (O’Leary, 2007, p.236). Since inception the police role has been moulded and influenced by a complex array of norms and expectations. On the one hand popular culture has created representations of the quintessential iconic British ‘Bobby’ as defined and influenced by endearing characters such as PC George Dixon of Dock Green who portrayed the faithful, incorruptible public servant, unwavering in his commitment to the community (McLaughlin, 2006, p.2). PC George Dixon represents the thin blue line; the line between the good and the bad and the line between a subversive criminal underworld and the rest of a law abiding society. But in contrast to this research into ‘cop culture’ tells us that there are certain, mainly unwavering police characteristics which when compared to the notion of the quintessential police ‘Bobby’ produce divergence. How then do some police officers break this mould and work in an environment which is the antithesis of the general police culture? In role theory, an interactionist view point argues that roles are not fixed and are changed through interaction and negotiation (O’Leary, 2007, p.236). Where this negotiation is less successful, police officers have to consider how far out of their comfort zone they are willing to go. Too far out is likely to result in conflict for the police
officer, the offender or both. Questions therefore need to be asked about how effective a ‘square peg, in a round hole’ can be and whether or not an ability to adapt into a new role should be a requirement of working in IOM. As Shaw (2004, p.180) points out, traditionally the police would be the organisation to be ‘tough on crime’ where as other agencies, the probation service included would be the organisation to be ‘tough on the causes of crime’. Whilst, the vast majority of general police officers would not consider drug using offenders to be ‘clients’, the IOM scheme offers us an alternative context where police officers are recruited into roles where the emphasis is on building relationships that are reliant on trust and rapport (Morgan, 2007, p.14). It can be argued therefore that some type of identity shift has to occur in cases were ‘cop culture’ has created an incompatible cultural identity for the IOM police role.

3.6 ‘What Works with Relationships

What is perhaps one of the most fascinating aspects in relation to this study is whether or not the relationship developed between police officer and offender has any impact on reducing reoffending. Whilst the research which deals directly with this question is sparse, there are some studies which are beginning to question whether or not the relationship built between offenders and police officers within IOM has any effect on reducing reoffending or encouraging desistance. Williams and Ariel (2012, p.133) found that their IOM participants had more than twice the likelihood of desisting from crime which they argue could be as a result of the way in which police officers build relationships with their offenders. However, Hopkins & Wickson (2012, p.13) warn that results of this nature can only ever be indicative of primary desistance (short term), due to the lack of longitudinal studies in this field. Whilst the Diamond Initiative, which focused purely on non-statutory offenders managed predominately by police officers, found no change in reoffending rates when compared with a control group (Dawson et al, 2011, p.11), there were several positive results which related to the practical and motivational support provided by the programme (Dawson et al, 2011, p.35). In addition, it is interesting to consider what the police relationship offers to short term offenders, especially as the relationship presents as a constant factor irrespective of whether the offender becomes non-statutory or statutory. Recognising the importance of offenders building warm and empathetic relationships with their probation officers as well as other key professionals in order to achieve change (Burnett & McNeill, 2005, p.237, Healy, 2012, p.386, McNeill & Weaver, 2010, p.6) and coupled with our
understanding that desistance from offending is shaped by lapse and re-lapse (Maguire & Raynor, 2006, p.26), it is right to question whether the constant break in probation supervision is therefore effective for supporting desistance within the IOM environment. Moreover, Weaver (2012, p.409) calls for a ‘relational revolution’, which recognises that the revolving door of prison devastates social networks, intimate relationships and harms the community. Weaver advocates instead for a shift in penal policy which redirects economic resources into the community so that co-productive relationships and collaborative responses to problems between the offender and services set up to support them are developed. In so doing, this would mean that reciprocal relationships would need to be re-configured and renegotiated in order to harness the unique contribution and strengths of each other. With an approach such as this relationships could be chosen and service users would have a more significant voice in the running of schemes. Whilst this approach requires a momentous change in current practice, it would support an increase in both social and human capital. Further research in this area in relation to IOM would therefore be beneficial.

3.7 Practical, Moral and Ethical Implications

Since the launch of prolific offender scheme there has been a fairly consistent flow of research, however much of it has concentrated on the more practical aspects of co-location (Lane & Kangulec, 2012), information sharing (Stevenson, McDonnell, Lennox, Shaw & Senior, 2011), partnership working (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006), policy implementation (Adams, 2007, Flynn, 2011), workforce development (Lane & Kangulec, 2012) and effectiveness (Wong, 2013, Fox, 2011, Worrall, 2002) rather than the more ideological aspects of the practice. What is sorely lacking therefore, is a discussion about the moral and ethical implications of IOM as there seems little doubt within academic literature that schemes of this nature amount to a substantial restriction of offender liberty (Merrington, 2006, p.335). Furthermore, in the context of this study the relationships that police officers develop with their offenders must also be considered ethically as a failure to grapple with these considerations places both individuals and organisations at risk. It is difficult to say why this lack of discussion has occurred. It may be that the practice is not recognised or is considered beyond reproach. Additionally, where it is recognised it may be contextualized in a different way, but ultimately there are numerous questions which need further exploration. The first being, does the development of a relationship between police officer and offender
affect civil liberties? In this respect authors have questioned whether it is proportionate for offenders to be constantly monitored on these schemes (Townsley & Pease, 2002, p.330), or subjected to increased monitoring and surveillance through the auspices of their professional relationships (McCahill & Finn, 2013, p.37). Furthermore, this practice could be said to impact on an offender’s right to a private life, (Article 8, Human Rights Act 1998) especially where home visits are increased. In addition, it could be argued that the relationship itself could affect a fair trial (Article 6 Human Rights Act 1998). In an article written by Harris (1966), it was common place in the state of New York USA for police officers to accompany their defendants to court. During this time of ‘enforced togetherness’, Harris reports that there was the potential for a relationship to form and whilst there were occasions when the police officers acted in a caring fashion by sharing food and cigarettes and offering sound advice, it was also an environment which bred corruption as police officers induced offenders to plead guilty or alter their evidence (Harris, 1966, p.21). Whilst this practice ceased in the USA, in the IOM context there are similar ethical questions which need to be considered especially where IOM police officers conduct court cell visits prior to court appearances. Furthermore, from a practice perspective and not widely known within the academic literature on IOM is the practice of police officers delivering reports to court, most notably on the progress of non-statutory offenders. As research indicates that prolific offenders are much more likely to receive a custodial sentence than non-prolific offenders (Simpson, 2012, p.22, Green, 2003, p. 229, Home Office, 2006, p.21), it is questionable whether the act of non-engagement with the police officer or a poorly functioning relationship with that individual could influence a police officer’s report to court which might advocate for custody. Whilst, this might be a consideration within probation practice where an offender is ordered to engage with the scheme as part of the conditions of their community order or their prison licence, no such legal requirement exists in relation to engagement with the police. This therefore raises a significant ethical question which needs further attention.

Moving on to consider the integrity of the police in this role, consideration should also be given to whether or not the practice of developing relationships with offenders is inherently dishonest or an act of coercion. Could this practice be considered an abuse of power? In one multi-agency study a senior police leader supported police officers to develop relationships with their offenders in order that it could be ‘exploited to full
effect for the police’ in perhaps a similar way as informants are used (Worrall et al., 2003, p.21). Likewise, in the Dordrecht project Shaw (2004) reflected that on occasions the relationship was used to encourage the admission of offences which could have a direct result of returning the offender to prison (DOMU, 2014, p.1). There are also significant implications for police officers and their careers too in questioning whether there are times when police officers collude with offenders or turn a blind eye to offending in order to keep the relationship functioning. In their study, Farrall, Mawby and Worrall, (2007, p.363) recognised the potential dilemmas that exist for police officers who build relationships with their offenders. They share an example where it became apparent that an offender was defrauding the benefit system or working for cash in hand. Turning a blind eye in these circumstances was deemed to be problematic because if an offender lost their job before benefits were secured they ran the risk of needing to go out and commit offences to survive. In addition, the police officer could be compromised further if they did not declare convictions or medications. Like probation officers, it is challenging for police officers to balance the needs of developing and maintaining a relationship with their offenders whilst acting upon information in relation to offending. In relation to this, if a police officer is overly authoritarian they risk the offender having nothing to do with them. If this results they will lose intelligence and the monitoring will become less efficient. In contrast, a sloppy or ‘shady’ police officer can equally lose the trust of an offender too. Managing this delicate balance means maintaining a relationship which is equally built on care and control.

Lastly, further questions should also be raised in respect of these relationships and multi-agency partnership working. In their evaluation of a partnership scheme between the police and drug services which sought to support drug using offenders to move away from offending, one of the ethical issues raised related to coerced drug treatment, whereby police officers were proactive, persuasive and assertive with the offender in order to ensure they accessed treatment (Best, Walker, Aston, Pegram & O’Donnell, 2010, p.367). McNeill (2012, p.7), recognises that ‘coerced correction’ which deals with the toughening up of corrections whereby offenders do not have to consent to rehabilitative treatment has come to pass without much critique, despite the compromise of ethical standards. Whilst working closely together with partners is seen as a distinct benefit of the scheme, mission distortion where partners take on
each other’s roles and influence each other’s attitudes and behaviours (Mawby & Worrall, 2011, p.89) also needs to be considered in relation to ethics. Whilst having knowledge of each other’s work could be seen as positive as professionals are able to reinforce each other’s positive messages, it can become problematic when professionals start to ‘do’ the work of their partners.

Contrasting this position, in their examination of the street crime initiative Mawby, Crawley and Wright (2007, p.132) furthered ‘polibation’ into ‘prisi-polibation’ (prison, probation and police) arguing that although there was no evidence of ‘prisi-polibation’ in their evaluation, they did present a brief argument for and against the establishment of a multi-disciplinary criminal justice practitioner. Whilst the authors argue that this might be fanciful, there is a precedent set within the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005 which legislates for the Chief Officer of the Serious Organisation Crime Agency designating members of staff to have certain powers in line with police constables, immigration officials and revenue and customs officers (Legislation.Gov.UK, 2005, section 43). Overall, what is lacking is clarity around the roles and responsibilities of the key partners within IOM (Home Office, 2011, p.5), without this roles may blur and practice could exceed acceptable ethical boundaries.

**3.8 Reflecting on that ‘Something Special’.**

Articulating what the ‘something special’ is about these relationships is incredibly challenging, but experience suggests that this centres on the nature of both police officer and offender developing a relationship with each other regardless of their traditional adversarial boundaries. It is unlikely therefore that these relationships would form without the structure of IOM or without an ethos which encourages schemes to rehabilitate and resettle offenders. Although there are parallels with neighbourhood policing and sex offender management, inherently these relationships differ on fundamental levels. Neighbourhood policing concerns itself with the needs of the neighbourhood predominantly, with accountability being at a local rather than national level (Paterson & Pollock, 2011, p.72). In contrast IOM is fundamentally focused on the needs of the offender with force-wide and national accountability (Wong, 2013, p.61). Sex offender management also concentrates on public protection and the dangerousness of individuals, whilst IOM categorises offenders on their risk of re offending rather than their level of dangerousness or risk of sexual harm (Rainey,
2013, p.30). Whilst both of these spheres of policing carry out many of the same fundamental tasks of offender management such as home visits, offender/target management and risk reduction, as well as the practice of developing relationships with other offenders (Nash, 2014), arguably the primary difference relates to the intensity of the relationships developed within IOM and an ethos which seeks to support offenders to make positive changes.

In addition, there is also something distinctive about the formation of an unlikely partnership and the messages which this generates for police officers and offenders alike. As a reflective aside, I remember thinking how incredible it was that I was hearing personal things about my offenders simply because I had taken off my uniform and offered to help. Whilst there are numerous questions about how ‘real’ these relationships are and whether or not both parties are simply social actors exploiting each other for their own gain, experience as both a practitioner and a researcher suggests that there is indeed something tangible and ‘real’ about these relationships, if only we could understand them and theorise their value. When I was actively working with my offenders I thought more deeply about my relationships with them, believing them to be real, meaningful and enriching for us both. However, the experience of ending my relationships when I left to go to a new job showed me that they were not as dependant or as attached to me as I had perhaps naively thought they might be. With those that I had developed a deeply trusting relationship with over time, there was clear disappointment in my departure but for others it was business as usual; just another professional who they had to tell their story too again! Whilst authors of ‘How to get a PhD’ would argue that it is detrimental to change jobs mid thesis (Phillips & Pugh, 2000, p.43), for me it was enlightening and helped me understand more about myself and these relationships. On reflection, I recognised that these relationships are actually ancillary when compared to the individual internal processes offenders must undergo in order to successfully desist from offending. Whilst there was mutual benefit for us both, the relationship itself was not the only element needed to influence offender change.

3.9 Conclusion

In sum, this chapter has unravelled the key theoretical aspects pertaining to the police officer and offender relationship within IOM, whilst exploring practical and ethical
issues. What this chapter aimed to convey was the complexity of these particular relationships, introducing interconnected yet diverse factors which clearly combine to influence both the relationships themselves as well as practice. Clearly articulating the nature of these relationships and providing a relevant framework in which to understand them is problematic. Challenges included a distinct lack of criminological research which details the ‘offender voice’ generally, as well as specifically within IOM. In addition, research into ‘cop culture’ is saturated with punitive attitudes towards offenders which advocate for the use of prison punishment over and above alternative approaches. Not surprisingly therefore, a survey of police officers found that 87% of the study participants did not think that their colleagues generally knew or understood what community penalties consist of (Allen, 2008, p.396). Against this backdrop, this chapter has advocated for further exploration of these relationships within the broader context of police officer offender management roles, whilst allowing the relationship to maintain its unique and distinct identity.

Part Two: The research process

Chapter Four: Research Methodology.

4:1 Introduction

The research problem is clear; there is a considerable lack of research in this area and no specific studies which explore the relationships developed between police officers and offenders within IOM. This chapter will therefore expand on the research problem, explaining how the study should be viewed in the world of scholarship. It will also describe the research setting and the inspiration for the research, as well as assure the reader of the originality of the study by clearly explaining how this study contributes new knowledge. In order to demonstrate how the research was designed, the methodology section is further broken down into four parts as detailed by Trafford and Leshem (2008, p.94). The first part concerns itself with the choice of research paradigm, the second with research approaches, the third with methodology and the fourth with the methods. What is useful about this particular approach is that the
research design for this study began with an exploration of research paradigms and how they are influenced by our view of the world and followed this sequence. In other words, choosing this model neatly fits with the research journey undertaken for this thesis.

4.2 Research Setting

The organisational context in which this research took place was in a large geographical police force which covers two counties in England. At the time of conducting the research the police in this area were partnered with a large probation trust, along with several drug and alcohol providers across the two counties to create Integrated Offender Management. IOM in this area had six well established IOM offices located across the two counties. Whilst these teams had been established for some time through the Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme (PPO), each team operated with its own degree of relative autonomy and showed some significant differences in operational practice. For example in one office the police officers predominantly managed non-statutory offenders leaving the statutory offenders to their probation colleagues, whilst in a different office the police officers managed statutory and non-statutory offenders equally building relationships with both. In order to account for these differences there were no demarcations on whether the offender chosen for this study was either statutory or non-statutory. What mattered most was whether they had regular contact with their police offender manager or not. In addition, there were also differences regarding the police role. In one area police officers were more likely to arrest and interview their offenders, whereas in other areas they were not. Quite clearly these operational differences across the peninsular could account for differences in the data presented and therefore the study aimed to recruit equally across the two counties, with at least one offender and police officer pairing recruited from each office.

Table 2) Participant status and location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Police Officer</th>
<th>Offender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North of the county</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Graham (Statutory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal town</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Charlie (Non-statutory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>Claire (Non-statutory)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study, IOM manages both statutory and non-statutory offenders with the probation service identified as the lead agency for statutory offenders and the police service identified as the lead agency for non-statutory offenders. No local funding was made available for probation officers to work with non-statutory offenders during the course of this study. In 2009 when IOM was launched, the Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme (PPO) was subsumed into its design and in doing so this IOM scheme increased its offender cohort size and employed more police officers into post as a consequence. The incorporation of the PPO scheme into IOM had the effect of replicating the philosophical strands of the PPO scheme, namely catch and convict, rehabilitate and resettle and prevent and deter into the working practices of this IOM. By design police officers working in this scheme do so under auspices of the rehabilitate and resettle strand of the scheme, leaving catch and convict to uniformed colleagues. This philosophical decision, along with the practice of including non-statutory offenders into the scheme has arguably paved the way for police officers to work with offenders and develop relationships as a matter of course.

In regards to demographics, in March 2013 when this study commenced there were 533 offenders within the cohort with 42 of these being female. Of the 533 offenders in the cohort 287 were labelled as PPO’s. In regards to age distribution, IOM in this area manages offenders from the age of eighteen onwards with no upper age limit. In 2013 the largest age group was in the 31 to 35 year old category, with similar numbers in the 26 – 30 year old category. In regards to ethnicity 94.7% offenders were recorded as White British, with the remainder describing themselves as Irish, White Other, Black or Black British/Caribbean, Asian, Asian British, Bangladeshi/ Indian, Mixed Race or Mixed Other. In regards to disabilities, 13.2% of the offenders were recorded as having a disability with the most common being mental health. Unfortunately learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large urban city</th>
<th>James</th>
<th>Sam (Non-statutory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Simon (No longer on the scheme)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural and geographically isolated</th>
<th>Mandy</th>
<th>Steve (Non-statutory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small city</th>
<th>Janet</th>
<th>Carl (Statutory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

difficulties, health related issues, accommodation and the percentages of those in either drug or alcohol treatment were not recorded (TurnAround, 2013, p.14). In relation to staff, there were forty four professionals from both the police and probation service specifically employed to work within IOM. Thirteen of these were police officers.

The overall primary focus of this IOM is on acquisitive offenders; namely those who commit theft, burglary, robbery and theft of motor vehicle. The scheme also includes offenders whose offending has a considerable impact on the local community. In order for an offender to be included on the scheme a referral is made from any of the partner agencies. Offenders have also been known to self-refer. When a referral is received the police researcher uses a scoring matrix which considers the individual based on their convictions, the number of arrests they have had, the number of offences where no action has been taken and police intelligence. A score is generated and a threshold agreed. All offenders are then discussed at a multi-agency IOM forum where a decision is made about whether or not this particular offender is suitable for inclusion in the scheme. In addition, low scoring partners or spouses are also considered for inclusion with the ethos being that managing one without the other would be less efficient.

Finally, this study was conducted with the full support of the police service in question having received permission from a senior leader within the organisation (Appendix 2). Overall there seems a reasonable appetite for the findings of this study to be released, with findings from the pilot study influencing policy and practice locally and contributing towards an equality impact assessment and risk register. Furthermore, findings of the pilot study were presented at the IOM staff conference in 2013 which although well received, created vigorous debate. Considering that this IOM has no formal mechanisms in place for evaluating practice or monitoring outcomes and performance, the findings of this study are seen as an important opportunity for highlighting areas of practice which need to be considered, adapted or amended.

Of note there have been two academic studies specifically relating to this IOM. The first was research undertaken by Louise Geddes (2010 & 2012) as part of her PhD thesis which identified the enabling factors and barriers to partnership management in the PPO scheme. Through qualitative interviews, observations and attendance at
strategic meetings, Geddes found that the management style was consistent with the more favoured management style of collaborative public management. Although this study was certainly informative, there were no discussions about police practice or their relationships with offenders, nor interviews with practitioners or service users. Perhaps the only enlightening exception was made by a Detective Inspector who was concerned that some non-statutory cases had gone unsupervised by police and probation (Geddes, 2010, p.23). The second study was a commissioned evaluation of the scheme by Serio (Serio, 2011). This evaluation concentrated on the effectiveness of the scheme, collecting data on one hundred offenders based on ninety different indicators relating to their profile, catch and convict and rehabilitate and resettle status. As the majority of this data was quantitative and reflects challenges in measuring recidivism for both offenders and the scheme, there was very little in this evaluation which would assist this study. With that said, it does show evidence that the scheme works on a multi-dimensional level to reduce offending (Serio, 2011, p.7), but without a control group it is difficult to attribute this impact to the scheme alone. Finally, there was no qualitative interviews with service users or police officers in this evaluation and no reference was made to how police officers work in the scheme or the relationships they build with offenders.

4.3 Research Inspiration

I first became aware that police officers were developing relationships with offenders within Integrated Offender Management when I became one of those police officers. Taking my lead from an experienced police officer who had worked in the team for ten years, I began to feel my way through my allocation of cases by observing his practice and picking up tips along the way. I remember being in awe to begin with, not only by what could be accomplished by working with offenders in this way, but by what they would freely discuss with me even though they knew I was a police officer. It is fair to say that I felt truly privileged; to me these relationships were immensely special. I remember thinking: police officers and offenders working together, who’d have thought it? After this initial reflection I was determined to find out what was going on and why these relationships existed. This coincided perhaps not by chance, with the start of my professional doctorate. Almost immediately I started a reflective journey into my own practice whereby many of the theoretical implications of this work, as well as a list of
conceptual questions began to unravel. Reflection told me that the arrangements of these relationships were complex. Early on I formed a list of questions in my mind:

- Why are offenders willing to work with police officers?
- Is the prevailing police culture mature enough to work with offenders in what could be considered a progressive way?
- What is the public perception of police officers developing relationships with offenders?
- What are the theoretical implications of police officers forming relationships with offenders?
- Does political rhetoric support this practice?
- Do other police officers find what is asked of them a comfortable fit with their perception of self and their role?
- What are the implications of this practice to partnership working?
- Are there ethical dilemmas?
- What do the offenders think of their relationships with their police officer offender managers?
- Does it work?

From that day on my desire to get to the bottom of what was going on in these relationships became inextricably linked with my position as a practitioner. As my relationships developed with my offenders, so did my reflections about what was going on. When Van Maanen (1988, p.xv) commented that ‘any effort to fully detach one’s self from one’s own work is bound to be quixotic’, for me he wasn’t wrong. Instead of feeling at odds with the practitioner/researcher tension which often exists in research between those at the applied end of the research spectrum and more academic colleagues (Hough, 2010, p.12), I decided to let my experience of these relationships influence not only the topic of this thesis, but also the research questions I asked. In addition, I felt that to disallow an ethnographical writing style and reflection within this thesis would be to lose some of the richness of the research. As a result I made sure that a small ethnographical element was included in the objectives of this research. Lastly, the inspiration for the research also includes a commitment to highlighting the work of police officers in this unexplored arena, as well as bringing to prominence these valuable relationships.
4.4 Research Paradigm

In order to illustrate how the research paradigm influenced this study, it is important to share an understanding of what is meant by this term. In research there are predominantly two main world views, that of positivism and constructionism (sometimes called interpretivism). In order to understand what each approach entails, it is essential to break these down even further into ontological and epistemological theories. Ontology is the theory of what exists, or in philosophical terminology the study of being (Harwood, 2010, p.139). Ontologically there are two basic distinctions. The first standpoint is that there is a real world independent of our observation and interpretation of it and known to us through objectivity: this is called realism (Rohmann, 2002, p.336, Petty, Thomson & Stew, 2012, p.270). The opposite view is called phenomenology, this is an idealist and subjective approach which suggests that it is not meaningful to talk of a ‘real world’ and that it is our interpretations of it that are all that matter (Kalof, Dan & Dietz, 2008, p.20).

Epistemology in contrast is the theory of what we can know, or the rules for knowing (O’Leary, 2007, p.76) and likewise this is broken down into a realist notion which suggests that we can conduct objective, unbiased observations and through them come to understand the world accurately, (Jackson, 1996, p.141) whereas the phenomenological notion contends that all observations of the world are our own social constructions rather than images of an objective, external world and that understanding is therefore achieved through a human centred approach (Moseley, 2008, p.162, Lal, 2006, p.24). Positivism draws on ontological and epistemological realism and presents the scientific aspect of research (Jupp, 1989, p.2) proposing that it is possible to produce an understanding of the world free from social, political and cultural influences without penetrating too deeply into its hidden nature (Kolakowski, 2004, p.8). This data is predominately gathered through observation synonymous with the natural sciences (Routledge, 2000, p.696). In contrast constructionism draws on the phenomenological approach to ontology and epistemology, stipulating that what is important is the social construction of that knowledge and the thoughts, feelings, attitudes and beliefs of people (Denscombe, 2007, p.75).

Whilst positivist researchers believe there is only one reality understood through measurable exploration of causal relationships which exist between humans and their
environment (Petty et al, 2012, p.270), constructionists on the other hand believe there are multiple realities which shift and become shaped simultaneously by the knower and the known (Ely, 1991, p.2). With such clear deviation it is easy to see how the assumptions we make about the world around us influence the research questions we ask and the research methods we choose (Brown & Baker, 2007, p.2). Therefore, in order to place this study into context it is important to state that this is a phenomenological study. Choosing this paradigm is directly related to my interest in how we construct our social world and the interpretations we gather from our relationships with each other.

4.5 Research approaches

Having chosen a phenomenological paradigm initially, the research approach followed quite naturally from the findings of two literature reviews. The first one was a literature review of Integrated Offender Management and the second a literature review concerning research approaches. The first review on IOM influenced the approach when it became clear that there were few studies which considered police offender management within IOM (Senior et al, 2011, p.32) and notably none which specifically explored police and offender relationships within IOM. Having recognised this significant gap in research it became apparent that an exploratory approach was needed to attend to this omission. Therefore a qualitative research design was chosen to uncover new avenues of exploration before any quantitative research would became appropriate (Latimer, Ginis & Perrier, 2011, p. 281). In addition, the literature review into research designs made it apparent that a harmonious way of researching any subject, irrespective of the paradigm wars (Haer & Becher, 2011, Petty et al, 2012), is to let the research question drive the method (Harden & Thomas, 2005, p.266, Copes, 2010, p. 388, Newman & Hitchcock, 2011, p.381, Westerman, 2006, p.273). Therefore the general approach adopted for this study was to attend to the gap in research with an exploratory study, thus allowing the research question to drive the method.

4.6 Methodology

Having chosen the research paradigm to complement my epistemological and ontological beliefs to reduce researcher tension (Rolfe, 2004, Bryman, Becker & Sempik, 2008, p.262, Pluye, Gagnon, Griffiths & Johnson-Lafleur, 2009, p.530) and
by recognising the importance of attending to the research question through a suitable approach, what is left to explain now is how both of these aspects are methodologically grounded. It is incredibly useful to think of method and methodology as two distinct but interwoven aspects within research, with methodology dealing with the philosophy of research (epistemology, ontology as well as the method combined) and the method being the practical application or the way in which the research is conducted (Boden, Kenway & Epstein, 2007, p.43). In regards to methodology there are three main approaches; qualitative, quantitative or mixed methods research.

Beyond the basic universal agreement that qualitative research deals with words and quantitative research deals with numbers (Kalof et al, 2008, p.14) a battle rages over ontological and epistemological perspectives, application, as well as complex notions such as validity, reliability, generalisability and ethical considerations (Shipman, 1988, p.xi). In the same way that I am clearly influenced by my epistemological views and the research method most congruent with my thinking, so are other researchers. As a result this manifests itself in a division of research paradigms and research approaches. In these terms a positivist approach is often aligned with a quantitative methodology, whereas a constructionalist approach is often aligned with a qualitative methodology (Kalof et al, 2008, p.20). This division causes great debate and controversy in the research world. On the one hand critics argue this strict labelling and affiliation with one particular philosophical view has created a ‘paradigm war’ (Burke-Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.14) which authors go on to argue is unhelpful (Miller, Poole & Seibold, 2011, p.5), inconsequential (Harden & Thomas, 2005, p.265) and fruitless (Copes, 2010), others argue that this debate is crucial to enhancing our understanding of the world and essential for validating our research (Trafford & Lesham, 2008, p.97, Lee, 2009, p.72). A seemingly more congruent distinction between qualitative and quantitative enquiry exists in the differences between inductive and deductive reasoning. Inductive reasoning starts with empirical data or an experience and generates theories or theoretical insights about what is happening (Baggini, 2002, p.7). Characteristics of an inductive enquiry include discovery, exploration, theory/hypothesis generation and the researcher as the primary instrument of data collection (Burke-Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.18). Inductive enquiry is aligned with qualitative research, whereas deductive reasoning starts with a theory or a theoretical statement about a phenomenon which is
transposed into a hypothesis that allows the theory to be tested (O’Leary, 2007, p.56). The characteristics of a deductive enquiry include confirmation, theory/hypothesis testing, explanation, prediction, standardised data and statistical analysis (Burke-Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.18). Deduction is aligned with quantitative research. For the sake of clarity it is important to state that this research is an inductive study, having adopted an exploratory approach which allows for theories to be generated.

Regardless of the paradigm wars, what is clear is the importance of researchers being explicit in their research choices to show how their epistemological views affected their choice of research design. This allows the reader to make value laden judgements about validity (Pogrebin, 2010, p.541). A failure to explain this sufficiently is to do a disservice to the study as a whole (Bridges, 2003, p.14). Quite clearly I choose a phenomenological approach to complement my epistemological view, but there were other considerations which finalised my decision to undertake a qualitative study. From the beginning I was acutely aware that I had a particular strength in interviewing people which coupled with ‘statistical anxiety’ (Law & Guo, 2011, p.388) became a significant predictor in my choice of methodology. I also chose a qualitative approach because I felt a social responsibility to my police colleagues to give them a voice in an organisation which is so often reluctant to measure or use ‘soft’ data (Beckett, 2009, p.21, Shilston, 2008).

4.7 Method

For this study I designed a semi structured interview which was able to elicit sufficient information from the participants to explore perspectives, gather context and provide meanings (Testa, Livingston & VanZile-Tamsen, 2011, p.244, Bachman & Schutt, 2003, p.17). Being aware of the current literature I was able to adapt an interview schedule which had been compiled for the most current and comprehensive study of IOM which proved a useful foundation (Senior et al, 2011). Going beyond these initial set of questions I used my professional practice, along with the specific aims of this study to write exploratory questions about the relationships studied. I produced two drafts of the interview schedule during the period of study, adapting the questions from a pilot and participant feedback (Appendix 3 / 4).
4.8 Research Alternatives

Although there are a plethora of well-established criminological theories suitable for deductive investigation in this area such as the Desistance Theory, Rational Choice Theory (Clarke & Felson, 1993, p.4), Deterrence Theory (McCulloch, 2006, p.26) and Procedural Justice Theory (Bachman & Schutt, 2003, p.36) all of which have a potential to impact upon the relationships under exploration, I remained unwavering in my methodological pursuit because an exploratory study was needed. In recognising this position it was important not to be swayed by the popularity of quantitative research (DiCristina, 1997, p.181, Copes, Brown & Tewksbury, 2010, p.341, Tewksbury, Dabney & Copes, 2010, p.391, Buckler, 2008, p.401) or overly influenced by a doctoral teaching schedule which frequently favours quantitative methodologies (Copes et al, 2010, p.344). Whilst I can clearly see the merits in undertaking quantitative research to increase scope and volume (Haer, Becher, 2012), create significant time savings for researchers (Schonlau, Fricker & Eliott, 2002, p.12) and to assist researchers by providing clear rules and boundaries to reduce bias and increase validity (Miller et al, 2011, p.6), as an approach it was my assessment that quantitative research would not be suitable. Without being disparaging, my view was that a quantitative research design would not have allowed for detailed exploration nor was it able to represent the complexity of human agency, (Byman in Williams & May, 1996, p.xiv) human consciousness or freewill (Travers, 2008, p.389) that are present in the relationships under examination.

Although I let the research question drive the method there have been a series of similar studies into prolific offender units (Dawson, 2005, Mawby & Worrall, 2004, Marlow, 2007, Culshaw, 2008) which could have been utilised to produce a questionnaire. However, these studies are now dated and the findings might not be applicable today. With regards to designing a more scientific experiment it is difficult to see how the research question could have been examined with this approach. Although one particular finding which relates to the warm and empathetic relationships that develop between police officer and offender could have subsequently been explored through a randomised control trial (Ibe, 2005, p.2) to consider how positive and negative variables affect offender desistance (McNeill & Weaver, 2010), this approach comes with considerable ethical dilemmas about subjecting one person to a more positive and rewarding relationship over another.
In designing the study I also considered using mixed methods (Burke-Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.15, Mason, 2006, p.9) as literature in this area suggests that by combining inductive and deductive enquiry together, a better understanding of what the data is trying to tell us can be achieved (Kalof et al, 2008, p.18). Furthermore, current literature is beginning to indicate that authors are a lot less obsessed with the ‘paradigm wars’ (Haer, Becher, 2012, Petty, Thomson & Stew, 2012), with traditional research methods being alternated (Westerman & Yanchar, 2011, Westerman, 2011, Polit & Beck, 2010, Holt, 2010, p.467), quantitative practitioners exalting qualitative methodologies (Latimer et al, 2011, Tenenbaum, Gershgoren & Schinke, 2011, p.349, Shaw, 2012, p.130) and qualitative researchers conducting quantitative studies (Peterson & Sondergaard, 2011, p.1551). Therefore, instead of seeing qualitative and quantitative research on two different spectrums it is perhaps more harmonious and inclusive (Brent & Kraska, 2010, p.413) to see them as equal partners by finding ways in which they can be mixed (Mengshoel, 2012, p.373). When combined, this method is more likely to answer complex research questions successfully, discover findings that were not anticipated and increase the quantity of valid inferences and conclusions that can be made (Lund, 2012, p.157, Bryman, 2006, p.110). Although I was able to locate a suitable methodological perspective called the ‘practice perspective’ in Cresswell and Tashakkori (2007, p.303) which is a mixed method model that allows the research question to drive the method and permits researcher experience and views in the context of the study, ultimately the time scales and other research parameters proved to be less concordant with this model.

In addition, another research consideration that I had to decide upon was whether or not to use action research. During the pilot stage I became concerned that the findings of this study would not be used or applied in any practical way within the police service, which is not only frustrating but also in direct contradiction to the aims of a professional doctorate. The ultimate aim of action research is to solve problems (Beal & Kerlikowske, 2010, p.117) and provide practical solutions for an organisation (Hagan, 1993, p.10). Considering this method, I hoped to counteract the inertia I had experienced during the pilot stage by creating a sense of agency which might result in real practical action (Somekh, 2005, p.1). I was also drawn to action research to complement my reflexive desire to position my practitioner experience as an intrinsic part of the social enquiry in order to deconstruct thinking and action in order to help
others do the same (Etherington, 2004, p.19, McNiff & Whitehead, 2009, p.14). Ultimately, as action research is ‘enquiry with people, rather than research on people’, (Altrichter, Kemmis, McTaggart & Zuber-Skerritt, 2002, p.130) this approach seemed to suit the police service which can be distrustful of outsiders and in particular researchers (Punch, 2004, p.184). However, at the design phase I became acutely aware of the changing and unpredictable landscape of IOM. At the time it had just been announced that the probation service would be privatised and that the future of IOM was uncertain. As a result it became apparent that this research would need to stand alone because any potential changes brought about by action research may prove insignificant or incompatible in the face of change. I was also unsure as to how receptive the organisation would be to action research amidst all of this uncertainty. For these reasons it was discounted as an approach.

4.9 Research Parameters

In considering the scope of the research, it was important to place some parameters on the research in order to make it well defined. In the same way there are prolific adult offenders there are also prolific juvenile offenders, more commonly labelled as prolific young offenders (PYO). PYOs fit into the PPO scheme under the prevent and deter strand which is predominantly managed by the youth offending team (YOT). The YOT in the geographical area where this study was undertaken is a completely separate entity from IOM which made excluding young offenders from the study a natural choice. Clearly some literature around PYO’s has transferable learning for the PPO scheme (Ellis & Boden, 2005), but overwhelmingly both groups appear in the literature as distinct groups of offenders. What is problematic about this demarcation is that adult offenders have to pass through adolescence in order to arrive in their adult offending career. Additionally, people do not suddenly change overnight on their eighteenth birthdays. There is a need therefore, for more longitudinal studies to capture life courses in this area (Laub & Sampson, 2001, p.48) which may show more conclusively the relationship between prolific juvenile offending and prolific adult offending and in particular, their changing relationship with the police. But for the purpose of this research young offenders are excluded.
4.10 Reflection on Research Methodology

Undertaking a literature review on research methodologies as part of the planning stage of this thesis gave me the confidence I needed to start my career as a qualitative researcher, allowing me to undertake an exploratory study with an open mind whilst avoiding influence from the plethora of quantitative literature which is available. In particular two authors helped me to understand that qualitative research is a journey and that although planning is essential, this methodology is all about letting go (Berry, 2011) and recognising that you might not know what you want from the project until you are well into it (Pogrebin, 2010, p542). This freedom opened up a vast research potential allowing me to be loud and proud about qualitative research, whilst being honest about its promises and its pitfalls (Copes et al, 2010, p.358). In the words of Travers (2005, p.51), once I became aware of the different methods and epistemological debates in social science it became difficult to retain a naïve commitment to positivism, so I decided early on to let the qualitative researcher in me free.

I also learnt that social science enquiry does not produce certainty (Henson, Hull & Williams, 2010, p.233), nor does it offer definitive solutions (Westeman, 2011, p.158). This helped me to rationalise the purpose of research, as well as place realistic expectations on the change that may or may not come about as a result of the findings generated during the research. As part of this understanding I also found it helpful to approach the research with a commitment to open communication (Shipman, 1988, p.xi) and an honest awareness about how my personal philosophies affected the research (Scott, Brown & Lunt, 2004, p.57). This allowed for a harmonious methodological experience.

4.11 Conclusions on Research Methodology

Qualitative enquiry is often considered a catch all term for any type of research aligned with the constructionist school of thought and therefore many researchers are content to adopt a set of methodological statements rather than accept the label as absolute (Ely, 1991, p.3). Although qualitative research is more difficult to categorise, Keegan (2009, p.11) defines it as a research approach that explores the ‘what, why and how’ of social situations which made this method ideally suited to an exploratory study. In line with the literature on qualitative research, this study successfully generated data
which provided a rich and valuable context regarding the relationships under examination (Berry, 2011, p.328). The approach was also successful in allowing a ‘close examination of the feelings, beliefs, preferences, norms and languages’ of this particular group (DiCristina, 2000, p.365). Whilst all methodologies have limitations, such as experiment verification (Rohmann, 2002, p.356), repeated testing and confirmation (Alchin, 2006, p.17, Glenn, 2010, p.3) and reduced scientific reasoning (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p.7), it is fair to say that these elements are quite clearly attributed towards a positivist approach to undertaking research and as qualitative research is not positivist they have little influence on what could be considered a research limitation in this type of research (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2011). To further ensure clarity this study was not written in the language of empiricism which could reduce its credibility (Bochner & Ellis 1999, in Pogrebin, 2010, p.541). In concluding this section it is important to reinforce just how substantial the gap is in relation to research in this area. Whilst the gap in research exists from an academic perspective, so does research which can be used to inform policy and practice within the police. Waddington, (2010) notes that ‘what is needed is a burgeoning of research for policing, not about policing’. This thesis therefore recognises this position and attends to both.

**Chapter 5: Research Design and Experience**

**5.1 Introduction**

Moving on to the practical arrangements of this study, this chapter has two distinct aims. The first is to explain how the study was planned and the second is to report on the research experience itself. By designing this chapter in this way the reader will be able to make value judgements and comparisons on whether what was designed, was achieved in practice. This chapter will therefore cover pertinent research aspects such as the literature review, sample selection, recruitment strategy, ethics, interviewing and finally data analysis. In addition, taking into account the reflexive nature of the qualification applied for this chapter will also include a section on the practitioner / researcher dichotomy and the reality of conducting research in the police. This chapter will conclude with a section which considers whether the researcher could be considered a ‘friend’ or a ‘foe’ within the research arrangement.
5.2 Conducting the Literature Review

In order to attend to the literature review for this thesis, I started by assembling all of the literature together which I had compiled on the subject over the first two years of the course cataloguing each source into a spreadsheet. To expand the corpus further, I re-searched all available electronic databases and library catalogues using a key word strategy. The key words chosen were: Integrated Offender Management, Prolific Offender Scheme / Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme and Police/Offender Relationships. I created a table which recorded where each of the articles had come from and a list of outstanding articles to locate. As I read, I categorised each article as either a primary, secondary or a supporting document under the useful guidance of Trafford and Leshem (2008, p.73) in order to evaluate the literature. I re-searched the databases and catalogues again at the midway point and prior to submission. In order to ensure the corpus was current, I set up an alert through Zetok which is a research publication tool (Zetok, 2016). This proved incredibly useful as several new articles were published during the course of this study (Dyer & Biddle, 2016, Wong, 2013, Annison, Bradford & Grant, 2015, Senior, 2014, Evans, 2015). Once this initial search was complete, I began the process of cross referencing to ensure that the review was a thorough representation of the literature available. To achieve this, I read each article by critically reflecting on the content, considering the validity of the findings, the methodology adopted, the epistemological / ontological position of the author, the purpose of the article, the intended audience and the suitability of the article for inclusion in the study. I also exploited the reference section of each article to validate the collection and to introduce new documents to it.

It was fairly clear from earlier reading that there were no documents which specifically considered the relationship developed between police officers and offenders within IOM. However, there were several articles which described practice which indicated that relationships were being developed and maintained. In order to draw out this knowledge, I read through the literature available with a very specific lens which focused purely on the police / offender relationship.

In order to give parameters to the literature review I decided to include information and articles pertaining to Intensive Supervision Projects (ISP) after the launch of IMPACT in the 1970’s. As IMPACT is widely considered to be the first renowned ISP project
(Worrall & Mawby, 2004) it was a suitable place to begin. I was however, unable to locate a great deal about IMPACT or similar schemes at the time and therefore choose to include information on these earlier ISP projects for historical context only. In addition, at the time of writing Integrated Offender Management was still in its infancy with very few articles that covered it in any real depth. Consequently it became essential to draw on literature from other more developed and recent ISP projects such as the Persistent Offender Scheme and the Prolific and Priority Offender Scheme.

In regards to other parameters, it is widely acknowledged that there are many more studies which concern themselves with persistent offender projects in the USA and Canada than there are that originate from the United Kingdom (Easton, 2007, p.17, Perry et al, 2009, p.iv, Warchol, 2000). Although similar parallels can be drawn between these countries and the United Kingdom, a note of caution is needed when generalising studies which relate to a different country or context. With this in mind, overseas studies have been used for context only without direct comparison or conclusions being drawn.

Once all of the literature was amassed, read and synthesised into the thesis it became important to know where and when to stop. In order to achieve a rounded literature review, I decided that the critical test of saturation would be simple. If a particular theory or further reading in a new area was likely to advance the contribution to knowledge or assist in the understanding and explanation of the relationships being explored, further reading was conducted. If on reflection no significant advances were likely to be made, no further literature was explored. In practice this was fairly difficult to achieve as there are other areas that could have been explored through a psychology or sociology lens for example which although fascinating, created the risk that the specific focus of this thesis would be depleted.

When considering the literature review overall there were some interesting findings. Firstly, there is a very clear distinction between those authors who recognised the complexity of the relationships developed between police officers and offenders within intensive monitoring schemes (Morgan, 2007, Williams & Ariel, 2012, McCahill & Finn, 2013, Senior, 2014, Annison et al, 2015, Wong, 2013) and those who seemed not to recognise it (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006, Culshaw, 2008, Dawson, 2005). Where authors recognised this practice a fair amount of discussion was generated which
develops our understanding of this practice further. On the whole however, recognition about this practice was more prevalent in more recent studies which either shows that the role of the police has changed over the years or the practice is now becoming more widely recognised. Secondly, the literature can be easily divided between primary, secondary and supporting documents. Overwhelmingly there are few primary articles with the majority of the corpus containing secondary and supporting documents. Whilst there are numerous local evaluations, very few were published in academic journals. This lack of publication is perhaps indicative of a lack of theoretical expansion in this particular area of research, possibly leading editors to question the value of publishing yet another local evaluation. Methodologically, more theoretical understanding is needed in order to progress this avenue of exploration further.

Thirdly, in regards to style the majority of the articles lacked criminological discourse with many of the articles being written more like a report than an academic article (Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006, Easton, 2007, Culshaw, 2008). Whilst this is intended for a very specific audience, it does little to inspire future academic enquiry.

Without doubt the literature review for this thesis advanced the study in a number of areas. Primarily, it validated the originality of the research but it also helped substantiate the importance of this study by making links between these relationships and other important criminological areas such as desistance and procedural justice theory (Hopkins & Wickson, 2012, Williams & Ariel, 2012, Farrall et al, 2007). Furthermore by adopting a thorough review of the literature new theoretical insights and ways of thinking about these relationships were introduced. For example, Shaw (2004, p.176) introduced a new link between these relationships and restorative justice which resulted in a ‘eureka’ moment. Without such a thorough literature review this article would not have been located especially as it is infrequently referenced. Likewise Sherman and Neyroud (2012) introduced some new theoretical concepts around what a rehabilitative police officer might look like.

What was particularly frustrating about the literature available overall however, was the narrowness of the conceptual parameters contained in the corpus. There were few articles within the IOM/PPO collection which pushed boundaries, opened up new lines of thinking, generated debate or created new understandings. For the main part the majority of the literature was fairly bland. With that said, thankfully the corpus does contain the lively and informative debate which centres on Nash’s (1999) conceptual
‘polibation officer’ (Mawby & Worrall, 2004, Nash, 2004, Mawby et al, 2007, Nash, 2008). This article alongside, Mawby and Worrall’s (2004) re-working of the ‘polibation’ officer are seminal articles in this collection because of their unique theoretical and discerning scrutiny of practice and the brilliant and lively debate generated as a result of the practical application of the ‘polibation officer’ in Mawby and Worrall’s evaluation of PPO projects. What is generally endearing about this set of documents is the everyday application of the concept which was intuitive in my professional practice too.

In regards to the methodological values contained within the corpus, there is a fair division of qualitative and quantitative research. What is questionable however, is the validity of the methods chosen to gather data overall. In 2009 the Ministry of Justice completed a rapid evidence assessment into the effectiveness of interventions with prolific and priority offenders (Perry et al, 2009). Interestingly not a single study from this literature review appears in their review. Although this review used meta-analysis as part of a systematic review which is considered a rigorous gold standard methodology, it does generate an interesting observation. Furthermore, in keeping with other areas of the social sciences I located numerous studies which were methodologically problematic because authors choose not to be explicit about their research design (Frost, 2011). Lastly, I also found great deviation in the quality of the articles produced. On the one hand there were many well written articles (Williams & Ariel, 2012, Wood, et al, 2009), but comparatively there were poor articles with fundamental methodological errors, poor referencing and a disorderly structure (Easton, 2007, Geddes, 2010, Vennard & Pearce, 2004, Dawson & Cuppleditch, 2007).

Reflecting on the literature review experience, it was particularly reassuring that I could not locate a single study which looked generally at the police role in IOM or specifically the relationships developed between police officers and offenders. Although this felt somewhat liberating, it also felt daunting. I questioned why there were so few studies about such a major Government initiative. It would be easy to suggest that this is because there is little or no interest in the subject and easy to surmise that the lack of research is indicative of a school of thought which may suggest that there is little or no merit in studying it. But again, as discussed elsewhere within this thesis there are a substantial number of valid reasons why studying this topic is important; by far the
most pertinent being ethics, effectiveness and value. What is left therefore is a query about how widely known this practice is within both the criminal justice system and the academic community. A more controversial argument would be to suggest that by recognising this practice the Government would have to acknowledge that the practice not only exists (Homes, Walmsley & Debidin, 2005), but that it is incompatible with other law and order approaches and a rhetoric which promises to be tough on offenders.

5.3 Interviewing as a research technique

A semi-structured interview method was chosen as the main research method in keeping with the inductive design of the study. Whilst on the one hand interviewing is a practical way of successfully eliciting detailed responses from participants and adaptable for use in many environments, it also helps the researcher to ensure the participant understands the question, provides a full answer and allows for a judgement on the quality of the response (Walliman, 2005, p.284). However, interview techniques do have their limitations. Language can be problematic, thus making it challenging to understand the true meaning of the response given and the intention (Briggs, 1986, p.3). Likewise, variations between interviews and interviewers makes comparisons challenging in research (Mishler, 1991, p.19).

Practically, I have learnt a great deal about the mechanics of undertaking qualitative research. Whilst conducting the interviews I found it difficult to rigidly adhere to the semi structured interview schedule as I became engrossed in the subject matter under discussion. However, I found that by checking back over the schedule before concluding the interview, most of the topic areas had been covered during the free flow of speech. In regards to securing interview space, it was challenging to find spaces free from distraction. In one interview a colleague knocked on the door and started talking about one of my offenders and in another interview a different colleague interrupted one of the offenders I was interviewing to discuss an issue with them. These incidents placed a strain on the interview, but didn’t seem to impinge too significantly. To remedy this I placed a do not disturb sign on the door for subsequent interviews.

Of the fourteen interviews I conducted, two were at home (one offender’s home and one police officer’s home), two were in an interview room in a homeless hostel, one
was at the work place of an offender and the remaining interviews were conducted at either IOM offices or police stations. Although the majority of these locations were suitable, there was at least one occasion when the location of the interview room proved problematic for the study. On this occasion, I was conducting an interview with one of the offenders in an IOM office interview room. When I had reached a suitable place to stop for a break, my participant left the building to have a cigarette. However, during this time he met his drug worker who was also outside smoking. They both began discussing some element of his drug treatment, which resulted in my participant being given some bad news which had the effect of him leaving the area and going home. I spoke to him on the phone but he stated he was too angry and did not wish to finish the interview. This incident was particularly frustrating because it could have been avoided if an alternative location was available for interview. I was also critical of the drug worker who knew that this interview had been arranged. In addition this was all the more frustrating from a research perspective because this participant was one of the more astute participants and a joy to interview.

A further challenge during the research experience was the general lack of insight and reflexivity offered by the police participants with regards to their relationships. From my experience, conflicting emotions, overfriendly physical gestures and risky behaviour are all part of these relationships. Yet colleagues did not disclose such sensitive or controversial experiences which I can only surmise is due to the problematic nature of this behaviour. What resulted therefore, was often a safe and sterile account. This is perhaps not surprising considering there can often be a difference between our private and public self-consciousness which can affect what an individual is likely to reflect upon (Fenigstein, Scheier & Buss in Silvia & Phillips, 2011, p.234). Interestingly this lack of deep reflection may also be as a result of the occupational police culture which does not encourage reflective practice like the teaching and healthcare professions do, (Bubb, 2004, Tummons, 2011, p.471, Day, 2000, p.115). Further, there is also a significant lack of literature on reflective practice within the police service (Wingrave, 2011) and a gap in the professional education of police officers regarding their ability to undertake self-critical reflection, (Waddington, 2010, p.17). By recognising the differences in reflective practice, I was able to resist coaching the respondents towards the observations and reflections I believed were evident in our roles. This understanding helped me to recognise that reflective practice
is not performed by everyone and that sometimes the activities under investigation are so routine that they often go unnoticed (Becker & Geer, in Travers, 2005, p.46). Recognising this likely position in advance, I used my ‘insider’ knowledge to tailor make the research questions to tease out these themes. On occasion this was successful, resulting in some interesting insights being shared. Whilst there remains an ethnographical avenue for exploration from my experience alone which would allow sensitive stories to be told (Murray, Pusher & Renihan, 2012, p.44), the scope of this thesis precludes such an undertaking at this time.

Generally, I found qualitative enquiry to be incredibly time consuming with most interviews lasting between one and a half to two hours. Similarly interview transcription was also a laborious undertaking, taking well over 120 hours to complete. Although I felt competent conducting the interviews, I found the experience both mentally and physically intensive (Morris & Marquart, 2010, p.526). Overall, I was fortunate that all the offenders kept their appointments. This indicates that it was important for them to have a voice and be given an opportunity to talk about their experiences.

5.4 Sample Selection

Initially, I wanted to simply recruit a group of police officers and a group of offenders from IOM, planning to ask them about their experiences in general. However, during a discussion with my supervisor Professor Mike Nash and David Carpenter from the ethics committee at the University, it was suggested that an interesting sampling strategy might be to recruit pairs of police officers and offenders who had a relationship with each other. This instantly ignited my interest. On reflection, what appealed most about this sampling strategy was not the uniqueness of the approach, but the interest that it sparked in my phenomenological self; how fascinating would it be to see how each pair interprets their relationship with each other? In regards to the number of participants sampled, the decisions I took reflected both the cost and time taken to travel across the two counties and the small number of police offender managers available for interview. Whereas the small number of police offender managers presented some challenge to the sampling strategy, the larger proportion of offenders available by contrast proved particularly helpful in allowing a degree of flexibility should the original offender interview not go ahead.
Reflecting on the sample selection achieved, Newman and Hitchcock, (2011, p.389) warn that qualitative researchers ought to be generally concerned about the degree to which a sample is representative of some phenomenon of interest. Being aware that the sample size is modest, it would be exceptionally remiss therefore to make generalisations. This is also important because the study was conducted in one geographical area and practice differs throughout the country. However, Polit and Beck (2010, p.1452) advocate that deep in-depth qualitative research can reveal a great deal about concepts and theories which are not likely to be totally unique. Therefore, with this in mind and the recognition that this approach is a serious contributor to real world research and evidence based practice (Robson, 2002, p.10), I felt a huge responsibility to ensure I conducted a quality study despite the small sample chosen.

5.5 Recruitment Strategy

In the same way that the sampling approach paid due consideration to the chaotic nature of the offenders recruited for the study, the recruitment strategy was built on the same consideration. It was clear that in order to be able to explore these relationships as a pair, the offender would need to be recruited first. This approach would therefore ensure participation before the police officer began to talk specifically about any one offender. In addition, it was also important to acknowledge sampling bias relating to the offenders recruited. Offenders in a more positive place may be more likely to agree to being interviewed and be more positive about their relationships than those who are not. In order to try to reduce this bias, the recruiting strategy consisted of primary attempts to recruit offender participants by setting up a stand in the waiting room of each office with clear information about the study. By design I produced a poster and information sheets which made it clear that this was a study for the University of Portsmouth, which I hoped would allow the offenders to approach the desk to discuss participation. After an initial discussion, the potential participant would be given a copy of the study information sheet and asked for their contact details (Appendix 7). If they showed a clear interest, a provisional date for interview could be agreed, with a follow up phone call made beforehand to check on continuing consent. Once the offender had been interviewed, the design was to furnish them with a letter (Appendix 8) and a copy of the police participant information sheet (Appendix 6) to give to their police offender manager to request their participation. The police offender
manager would then make contact in order to discuss their potential participation in the study. The aim therefore was to recruit a random sample of offenders and a purposive sample of police officers. I accepted fairly early on that this recruitment strategy was unlikely to produce a representative sample, especially as it relied on the random nature of offenders who presented to the study. It was also likely that there would be very few women and ethnic minority participants recruited as they were a minority in the IOM cohort. In recognising this limitation, consideration was given to how the recruitment strategy could be altered, but there were no realistic efforts that could be made to counteract this. The overall strategy therefore remains to be explicit about this limitation.

In practice the strategy worked, but it had to be altered on several occasions. One approach which was particularly successful was the recruitment of two participants who approached a stand erected in the reception area of a homeless hostel. Both participants had a genuine desire to take part in the study and interviews were arranged for the following week. However, the later part of the recruitment strategy had to be altered as neither were in contact with their IOM police officer and could therefore not pass on the recruitment letter. I therefore had to send emails to the police offender managers to ask if they would be willing to be involved in the study. Likewise, where the offenders were in touch with their police officers even on a daily basis they frequently asked if I would give them the introduction letter as they felt they were likely to lose it. Rather than miss the opportunity to interview the police officer paired with the offender, I agreed to do this. Another way in which I recruited two participants was through a two day drama workshop with Geese Theatre, the aim of which was to bring offenders and their police officers together through the arts. This was one of my practice initiatives which was clearly influenced by this research. During the event I found a quiet moment and spoke to the offenders on a one to one basis and asked them if they would be willing to give me their contact details for the purpose of the study.

Reflecting on both the sampling and recruitment strategy, I feel as though both ethical considerations and research standards were adhered to, but the reality is that when conducting research in the real world some compromise and deviation from what was planned is needed in order to achieve the research outcomes. Furthermore the process of seeking favourable ethical review also proved invaluable. Initially, I had
planned to recruit offender participants by requesting access to police data systems to identify a random sample of offenders who would be written to and asked if they were willing to participate in the study. This approach was deemed unethical, as it could be said that I was using my position as a police officer to influence the data controller to access private data held about offenders. This approach was therefore discounted. As an alternative I also considered approaching each offender through their offender manager, but recognised that choice to participate in the study might be impeded if they felt an obligation to participate. The approach as detailed above was therefore both evolutionary and responsive to the needs of conducting safe ethical research.

5.6 Research planning

In the early part of studying for a professional doctorate, I had to purposely halt my immediate desire to start the practical aspects of research, in order to learn about research itself. This was not an easy task as I believed learning about research itself was bound to be incredibly arduous. However, the early words of wisdom from Sieber (1973, p.1344) which detailed the significant advantages that would be afforded by becoming knowledgeable about research instruments and their administration influenced this view. Even Hibberd (1990) writing in a manual for police officers undertaking research advocated the importance of planning research and thinking deeply about the research question. On reflection, this was an excellent strategy because it became clear that it would be impossible to start anywhere other than with the philosophy of research and without this input it would have been difficult to explain the research decisions. In addition, planning and considering all of the aspects of research especially ethical considerations, reduced researcher stress (Gross, 2012, p.117). One of the first research decisions which had to be planned was whether or not to be explicit about my role as a police officer in IOM. Quite clearly one of the limitations of this research centres on the impossible task of eliminating researcher bias (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2004, p.777) and remaining objective (Tenenbaum et al, 2011, p.354) in a practitioner/researcher role. By undertaking this study as a practitioner as well as a researcher, I accepted early on that it would be impossible to totally eliminate bias from the study (Anderson, Jones & Reinsmith-Mangels, 2011, p.88) but for this study to be considered valid I also recognised that I would need to take great care to keep a critical distance from it (Drake & Heath, 2010, p.19). In order
to achieve this balance I was explicit with all participants that I was a police officer working in IOM in order to be honest about the strengths and weakness of the research situation (Smeyers, 2008, p.696). Initially, I was concerned that this may deter participation, but I realised that if the offender found out that I was also a police officer they might lose trust in me as a researcher and refuse to participate anyway.

Overall, I recognised the importance of being explicit with all parties in order for value judgements to be made about the research. On this note, it was interesting to see these types of methodological decisions in action within the literature. In their study Millie and Erol, (2006, p.694) undertook qualitative interviews with offender participants with their police offender manager also present. Whilst it is questionable the sort of responses the researchers were likely to receive, especially in relation to discussions about their relationships with their police offender managers, by being so explicit it did help evaluate their research.

Finally, reflection also played a pivotal role in research planning especially in relation to the labels used in the research design. In assimilating what I had read about labelling theory, combined with my own feelings about the term ‘offender’ and the theoretical inclusion of desistance theory in this study, I decided to incorporate the slightly more favourable term of ‘ex-offender’ wherever possible. Throughout the study however, I choose to use the term ‘offender’ as it is a more widely recognised and understood label within criminological literature.

5.7 Piloting the Study

As a pilot for this thesis, I undertook a small scale exploratory study in the spring of 2012 to explore the relationships that police officers developed with their non-statutory offenders using a series of semi-structured interviews with police colleagues (N=8). Using a purposive sample, I collected data and analysed it using grounded theory. In the study I found that although police officers were developing warm, empathetic and caring relationships with their offenders, their status as a police officer could become detrimental to this relationship if their operating locus was more akin to a catch and convict style; finding that they could become either a ‘caring copper’ or a ‘two faced tiger’. Conducting this small scale study proved useful to practice research techniques. It also influenced the overall research question and confirmed the importance of representing the offender in this study as the pilot study felt deficient without this.
In addition, I re-interviewed four participants from the pilot. This was beneficial on two counts. The first was that they had a background about what the research was about already. Secondly, they all consented to use their original interview data as part of this study. Much of what was covered in the pilot dealt with practical aspects such as co-location, partnership working and their general experience of working in IOM, but there were still interesting insights about their relationships with the offenders. Interestingly in two police interviews for the pilot, the police officers talked about the offender who featured in the second round of interviews for this study.

### 5.8 Data Analysis

During this study I used grounded theory to analyse the data. Grounded theory is an inductive method suitable for qualitative research, purposefully generating theories which are particularly useful in applied areas of research (Robson, 2002, p.192). In practice grounded theory involves data comparison and deep continuing engagement with the data which allows theories to evolve by keeping the researcher close and engaged with the data (Smith, 2007, p.82). In contrast, some authors are critical of grounded theory methods arguing that the process is longwinded, too rigid and overly structured which is often at odds with the more holistic and evolutionary aim that grounded theory offers (Tarozzi, in Charmaz, 2014, p.334). Further, authors are also weary of researchers who say they have used grounded theory, yet fail to develop its use conceptually within their study (Strauss & Corbin, 1994, p.277). With this in mind, this method was primarily chosen because it had been successfully used during the pilot and was harmonious with the data generated. It was also chosen to attend to the comparative nature of the relationships studied.

Although I was wholly comfortable with letting the research question drive the method, when it came to analysing and presenting the data I was acutely aware of just how difficult it was to avoid a positivist interpretation (Copes et al, 2010, p.341, Tewksbury et al, 2010, p.391, Buckler, 2008, p.401). This was particularly difficult considering the influence impressed on my study by the police organisation where it was carried out. Quite clearly there was a huge appetite for facts and figures which this study did not provide. In addition, I was also concerned about the value judgements others would place on my study (Pogrebin, 2010, p.541) and pre-occupied with the level of bias that could be construed when it was revealed that I was an ‘insider’ (Bachman & Schutt,
To counter this, I was explicit about the inductive nature of the study and continued to let the research question drive the method at every stage. In regards to the methodological limitations which exist within this type of study, it was also incredibly important to remain cognisant of the ways in which we ‘interpret and translate every interaction in order to enhance and validate our own personal narratives, experience and truths’ (Freshwater in Lees, Freshwater, 2008, p.210). In other words, it is important when pursuing external truths that we do not let our own personal interpretations of the truth overtly influence our analysis. In order to reduce this bias, grounded theory works as a method of data analysis that allows the themes to emerge from the data rather than the research themes being pre-determined and potentially overtly influenced by the researcher (Phelps, Fisher & Ellis, 2007, p.209).

In relation to the design of the coding framework, in this context it was used by the researcher to organise, process and analyse the data by hand (Cohen et al, 2007, p.86). The framework was designed to mirror the questions asked in the semi-structured interviews, but also open enough and not too descriptive to reduce the inductive nature of the study. Including a code labelled ‘THEME’ allowed emerging themes to be identified, rather than forcing data into an incorrect code or missing the emerging findings. This approach allowed for specific comparison and exploration about what works and what doesn’t work in this sphere of professional practice.

To be explicit; the interviews were coded in three parts, which is also how they are presented in the forthcoming findings chapter. The first part explored participant responses in general; analysing their overall experience of IOM as well as their relationships with police officers and other professionals. This part also explored generalised thoughts and feelings towards IOM and the police role, as well as the barriers and facilitators there are to the relationships under examination. Analysis in this area also explored what the respondents thought about the term ‘relationship’ and whether they thought it could reduce reoffending. The second part of the coding framework explored participant’s thoughts, feelings and experiences specifically about their relationships with each other. This section also allowed comment on what benefit was gained from their relationship with each other, who held the power and whether or not there were any unmet needs. The third part of the coding framework provided a space to analyse differences and similarities between what was said generally about the relationships and what was said specifically about the person who they worked
with. It also allowed examination about what they thought the other person would say about them and what they actually did say. This allowed analysis on how reflective and honest the relationships were, as well as comparison on how they rate their relationship with each other.

**Table 3) Codes used throughout the analysis.**

Part One – General Experience of IOM / Relationships with Police in IOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TERM</td>
<td>Thoughts about the term relationship and what it means to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEEL-REL-GEN</td>
<td>Feelings towards the relationship in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOU-REL-GEN</td>
<td>Thoughts towards the relationship in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP-REL-GEN</td>
<td>Experience of relationships in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL-ROL</td>
<td>Thoughts about the police role specifically in IOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Comments on operation / structure of IOM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INI-BAR</td>
<td>Barriers to the initial relationship connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INI-FAC</td>
<td>Facilitators to the initial relationship connection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON-BAR</td>
<td>On-going barriers to the relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON-FAC</td>
<td>On-going facilitators to the relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREV-OFF</td>
<td>Does the relationship prevent offending?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEME</td>
<td>A new theme emerges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part Two – Data about specific relationships / Relationship pairings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEEL-REL-SPEC</td>
<td>Feelings towards their relationship specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOU-REL-SPEC</td>
<td>Thoughts towards their relationship specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP-REL-SPEC</td>
<td>Experience about their relationship specifically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN-REL</td>
<td>Benefit of the relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-MET NEED</td>
<td>Un-met need is identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Three - Comparable Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THOU-SAID</td>
<td>What they thought the other would say about them / what they did say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>How they rate their relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The method by which the interviews were added to the coding framework was identical for each interview and followed this format. Firstly, all interviews were transcribed before coding began. Then coding was completed in pairs with the interview being read first, then coded and then re-read to check that the coding was correct. Then the second interview paired with the first was read, coded and then checked as above. At this stage both interviews were re-read back to back and a summary generated in a separate table for each particular pairing. These relationship summaries were detailed enough to include the general comments each participant made about IOM and the specific comments they made about their relationships with each other. Organising the data in this way supported comparison between each pairing and lead to the development of relationship typologies.

The main findings were then added to a master framework using a ‘cut and paste’ method. This framework separated each code and included all participants. Every time the code appeared in an interview, it was added to that particular part of the framework under the participant’s name. For each code an overall picture emerged and specific themes could be further identified allowing for analysis on a macro and micro level. For example in relation to the participants feelings towards each other, findings on a macro level showed that participants infrequently talked about their feelings towards each other in their interviews. Whereas analysing this code on a micro level revealed that whilst they did not frequently talk about their feelings in their interviews or talk about it with each other, it was not the case that they did not have an emotional involvement in their relationship. This code for example showed that there were high levels of regard and emotional investment in the relationships regardless of the overall picture.

On reflection, whilst the coding framework seemed quite vast at times, with analysis being time consuming, this approach was needed to move the data analysis beyond
a purely phenomenological examination, ensuring that the data was synthesised to support theory generation (Goulding, 2002, p.45).

5.9 Ethical Considerations

This section will now explore the ethical considerations specific to this study to show what was challenging about conducting the research (University of Portsmouth, 2011). The principle ethical consideration revolved around the participants themselves and especially the offenders. In many regards offenders are considered vulnerable. They often have complex social needs (Grover in Peelo, Soothill, 2005, p.57), with many offenders having limited understanding or capacity as a result of poor mental health, physical health or learning difficulties (Rennie, Senior, Shaw, 2009). Offenders may also be dependent on illicit drugs and alcohol (Stewart, Gossop, Marden & Rolfe, 2000) or simply vulnerable due to circumstances such as homelessness, poverty and social exclusion (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002, p.21). The foremost ethical consideration for this group was to consider how informed consent should be obtained. The British Society of Criminology (2006) advocates that this should receive special attention especially if the group is considered vulnerable. It was clear that it would not be sufficient to give each participant a study information sheet and expect them to understand what they were consenting to. Therefore at every stage, I explained the nature and purpose of the study, as well as the implications of participating with a communication style suitable for each individual. I also checked understanding by asking participants to outline what they had agreed to. For extra clarification I developed a consent sheet which was read to each participant before the interviews began (Appendix 5).

Another area of major ethical consideration revolved around role conflict and compromising situations being both a practitioner and a researcher. In recognising that it was not feasible to hire an independent interviewer to conduct the interviews, it became important to develop a strategy for dealing with potential issues which may prove problematic. I therefore chose to be explicit about what it meant for each participant to participate in the study, as well explaining the extent to which I was a police officer within the research process. To attend to this consideration, I detailed my involvement in the study information sheet and again verbally with each participant, reassuring them that I was conducting the study as a student researcher not as a
police officer. I explained that I had a duty to deal expeditiously with issues relating to serious harm, safeguarding and admissions of offending as any researcher would, but that I would not be passing on any other information to the police or other agency which fell outside of this remit. By making this explicit at the outset it protected the study participants and protected my integrity.

A further ethical consideration revolves around the potential loss of role, or changes which may come about as a result of the research being completed. Whilst I assessed that it was extremely unlikely that any participant in this study would either directly or indirectly lose their job or suffer economic loss as a result of this study, it is important to state that this is a risk in all research. I was therefore aware of the delicate balancing act between my responsibility to the University to pursue research that is designed to contribute to knowledge and protect the truth, whilst being aware of the risk this research posed organisationally. To protect my integrity as a practitioner, I developed a strong communication strategy with the Constabulary aiming to manage their expectations and anxiety, whilst being honest that the findings may have an impact on their decision to use police officers in this capacity going forward. A further dilemma in this area also revolved around the controversial choice of study. I was unable to get away from asking the fundamental question of whether police officers should be working with offenders in this capacity and simply posing this question caused conflict, disagreement, and concern within the police organisation. I was asked by several individuals of a higher rank to be ‘careful’ about what I reported so as not to jeopardise police jobs within IOM. In order to deal with these difficult conversations, I explained that the nature and scope of the study was to create new knowledge, not to comment vehemently either way on the effectiveness of this arrangement. Furthermore Maier and Monahan (2009, p.3) usefully drew my attention to the challenge of balancing closeness and detachment during qualitative research. On their advice I pre-determined where to draw the line between my role as researcher and the study participants. Therefore my ethical strategy was not to talk about my research findings with any participant, or individuals from the organisation to protect confidentiality and eliminate the likelihood of tension arising between the different teams involved. On more than one occasion I was questioned about my findings but found it easy to stick to the boundaries I had already set.
The last ethical consideration dealt with interviewer and participant safety. Being a practitioner who routinely worked with offenders, I was acutely aware of the potentially dangerous situation that interviewing prolific offenders presented (Lee-Treweek & Linkogle, 2000, p.9). Although prolific offenders predominantly commit acquisitive offences, they also have a propensity for violence (Dawson, 2005, p.2), can be manipulative and may also be a chaotic drug user (Bennett 2000 in Vennard, 2007, p.245). The first safeguard I made was to ensure that the environment I conducted the interviews in was neutral and safe. Where interviews were conducted at home, one was with a police officer and the other a female offender whom I had risk assessed beforehand. The second safeguard was to be confident about cancelling interviews where offenders were intoxicated or aggressive. No issues of this nature arose. The third safeguard was to ensure I considered whether or not the process itself, or any of the questions asked was likely to cause harm or aggravate the participant (Lee, 2009, p.143). By recognising that prolific offenders may struggle with feelings of low self-esteem, social isolation or depression (Dawson, 2005, p.3), I took great care not to conflate or create potential issues.

Reflecting on the research experience it was interesting to note how many ethical and moral dilemmas arose. One of the most significant incidents resulted from an interview with one of the offender participants. Despite clearly explaining that I was not a police officer in that context and what this meant, he still offered a substantial amount of intelligence during the study interview. I kept stopping him and reiterating that I didn't need to know that information, but he seemed unable to see me in a different light and intelligence seemed to leak out of him. Unlike many of the other interviews, this interview posed a significant issue. I explained to this participant that I would not be recording the intelligence on the police system and made sure that the security on my home computer was heightened whilst I transcribed the interview. As I transcribed I precluded the intelligence from the written account and then made a conscious decision to delete the verbal recording from my computer to ensure that no harm would result if my computer was stolen (Gillan & Pickerill, 2012, p.133). Whilst I judged the risks posed to this participant to be moderate as the intelligence offered related predominately to other offenders, I assessed each disclosure separately against the risk of harm that might be caused should this remain undisclosed to the police. My assessment supported the action of not disclosing the information as the threat of
harm did not necessitate it. This assessment also attended to my duty as a police officer.

During the pilot stage of this research, I naively thought that because I was interviewing police officers I was unlikely to be placed in a position of harm. However one particular police participant challenged this assumption. Not only did this participant have openly discriminatory views, which although beneficial for data comparison and one of the findings I hoped I would achieve for juxtaposition, he also made veiled threats about my own professional practice. This presented an open challenge to my position as a practitioner, but more specifically to that of a researcher. In response, I remained stalwart in my metamorphosis into a researcher-practitioner and remained true to the confidential ethos of research by letting the prejudicial remarks go unchallenged by the external organisation. I also eliminated the kind of disparaging remarks I would have liked to have made about his responses (De Laine, 2000, p.146), remaining truthful to the nature of the data collected by representing it in the manner it was intended (Denscombe, 2009, p.62). This experience constantly reminded me to be ready for all eventualities as the interviews for this study were conducted.

Lastly, being an ‘insider’ was a beneficial experience in that I knew exactly what was being discussed and could tailor the questions to suit. It also helped to have a shared understanding, which allowed for more truthful accounts. For example I got an entirely unguarded account from one supervisor who was frustrated with the performance of their staff, which is something that might not have been disclosed had I been an entirely independent researcher. However the ‘insider’ perspective also presented other ethical challenges. Despite being given permission from almost all participants to use their names in the study, I decided to anonymise them in response to the agreed organisational consent but also because several participants made comments about their practice which might be construed as either unlawful or negligent and may become problematic. This decision was therefore based on the balance of truthful reporting, versus the need to protect the participants by placing their interests ahead of my own (Hugman, Pittaway & Bartolomei, 2011, p.1275).

5.10 The Researcher / Practitioner Dichotomy

Undertaking a professional doctorate requires skill in balancing the dual role of researcher and practitioner. Whilst other qualifications require researcher dexterity in
practice settings, managing the researcher role whilst working in an organisation creates different considerations. Firstly there are a plethora of practical implications, the most notable of which centre around managing organisational expectations and avoiding take over. From the beginning I recognised the potential for conflict having previously completed a Masters degree in Police Science and Management whilst working in the same organisation. For that study, I applied to the senior officer group to conduct a series of semi-structured interviews with sexual offence liaison officers with the aim of identifying attitudes towards victims of rape. I was not supported in conducting this research with the organisation justifying their decision making by stating that research of this nature was planned in the future. At the time I disbelieved the justification and was suspicious of the reasoning, yet being so inexperienced I decided not to challenge it. Reflecting on this experience early on in the professional doctorate journey made me realise that although Chief Officers can be defensive about research and may prohibit it on the grounds of suspicion (Boda, 2010, p.122), apprehension or uncertainty (Scott, 2010, p.97), ultimately the outcome of this Masters degree research proposal could have been different if I had acted with greater proactivity and leadership. Determined to avoid this mistake twice, my strategy for preventing derailment was to engage with senior leaders within the organisation by using Lee’s (2009, p.122) adaption of Binney, Wilke and William’s (2009. p.113) ‘zone of choice model’ to build relationships, create loyalties and act with authority regarding the research proposal. This strategy was successful as I secured consent from two senior leaders in the police and probation service. During these conversations, I found it useful to explain the ‘practitioner - researcher’ (Fox, Green & Martin, 2007, p.76) dichotomy by making it clear that I had certain obligations as a researcher around confidentiality, ethics and truthful accounting. At the same time I also clarified that it was the University who owned the research, which helped to establish a critical distance between the research and the organisation.

With that said, although there was general support to undertake research within IOM, the actual aim of the research was not immune from ‘political hijacking’ (Hough, 2010). Like Mair (2004) who also recognised that it is not easy to eradicate politics from research, I had to adopt a forthright and determined approach with those authorising the research as it was clear that they wanted to steer my research in the direction of best value, cost savings and performance measures. What was obvious from this
experience was that there was a widespread misunderstanding about what research can ‘prove’. There was a clear expectation that the research would be of a positivist nature and give the organisation guidance on whether or not these relationships reduced reoffending. Being methodologically knowledgeable helped to explain what the purpose of the research was in order to manage their expectations. Around the same time as these conversations were occurring, an evaluation into IOM was commissioned by the Constabulary (University of Plymouth, 2011) which was wholly quantitative and clearly politically driven by the organisation’s desire to prove IOM worked (Travers, 2005, p.39). As the evaluation excluded qualitative research, I was able to avoid the pressure to conform to positivism by identifying the research gap in relation to this evaluation. By being so resolute in resisting both methodological and research objective pressure, I was able to thwart attempts by the Constabulary to use this study to advance their own ‘knowledge economy’ (Mills & Ratcliffe, 2012, p.151). However, by recognising the importance of maintaining the delicate balance between researcher and practitioner, I also found it essential to retain organisational support. To achieve this in a suspicious and often research wary organisation such as the police (Scott, 2010, p.97, Boba, 2010, p.122, Rosenbaum, 2010, p.144, Buerger, 2010, p.137) I used my position as an ‘insider’ to help sell the benefits of the research. On a related note it is important to be transparent and state that the organisation did provide some financial support for course fees, but these were without stipulation.

In conducting this research it also became clear that the researcher and organisational position also offered a unique contribution to the aims of this study. Acknowledging the challenges that the research question posed for the police therefore required a way of expressing the experience of conducting research on the police from within the police. In keeping with the theme of the research, the title of the study and as a comparable way of illustrating the challenges that could be posed to the relationship between the researcher and the organisation the same notion of ‘friend or foe?’ was chosen. Posing the question in this way contributed to the exploratory style of the study, allowing the researcher to deeply reflect on the research experience and also made a small contribution to knowledge about conducting research on the police.
5.11 Research in the police.

In précis it is fair to say that the pedagogical approach towards professional knowledge in the police service is rudimentary and relies heavily on the practical application of the policing experience, rather than research or academia (Holgersson & Gottschalk, 2008, p.375). Eraut (1994, p.8) recognises that a complex relationship exists between professional and academic knowledge, suggesting that because professional knowledge is significantly developed through practice the status afforded to this method in comparison to academic knowledge is much lower and therefore does not receive equal attention. Furthermore there is also a complete absence of ‘pure and applied research’ in the police (Kennedy, 2010, p.168). With this in mind I was concerned about whether or not the police organisation would use the research collated for this thesis in any meaningful way. In order to manage this expectation, I remained aware of the tensions that exist between researchers at the ‘applied’ end of the spectrum and their more ‘traditionally academic colleagues’ (Hough, 2010, p.12) and have therefore written this thesis for a dual audience using both ‘contingent knowledge’ which results from professional practice, as well as more formal academic ‘disciplinary-based’ knowledge (Creaton & Clements, 2010, p.2).

5.12 Reflection on the Research Experience

There are several significant reflections that I would like to make about the research experience as a whole. The first relates to the scope of the study. In hindsight it is clear that this was probably two studies combined. The first, a general exploration of the police role and these relationships and the second a more in-depth exploration about the specific relationships formed. Although including the police role and general information about IOM did provide context for the study, it proved to be an enormous undertaking. On reflection, it is clear that it was my phenomenological interest that extended the scope of this study as well as a desire to report new knowledge in an under published area of research. Furthermore, the immersion in the research itself was particularly rewarding and reduced the ‘solidified assumptions and blunt critical facilities’ which Pakes (2010, p.14) argues can be problematic in research which is less absorbing. Overall I experienced great joy conducting ‘real life research’ in a real life setting (Yin, 2010, p.7) and clearly recognise the practical difference that could be made if this research were to be applied.
5.13 Conclusion: Researcher Friend or Foe?

Managing the practitioner and research dichotomy within the research experience was without major disruption. Whilst I was most worried about the value judgements and expectations others would make about my study when it was revealed I was an ‘insider’ from within the organisation (Pogrebin, 2010, p.541, Bachman & Schutt, 2003, p.251), in reality it was more difficult to free the research from the positivist expectations that are evident in social science research than it was about continually managing organisational expectations and demands (Copes et al, 2010, p.341, Tewksbury et al, 2010, p.391, Buckler, 2008, p.401). Retaining autonomous control of the research, rigidly adhering to research guidelines, becoming knowledgeable about research instruments (Sieber,1973, p.1344) and thoroughly planning the research (Hibberd, 1990) prevented conflict with the police organisation which would not only have soured the research experience for both researcher and the organisation, but might also have negatively influenced other researchers gaining access in the future. Whilst I have since left the organisation and have fewer hurdles to overcome in relation to publication and dissemination which might have been linked to my employment, I certainly hope that the research experience has been as positive for the organisation as it has for me and that I could be considered a research ‘friend’ rather than ‘foe’.

Part Three: Findings and Conclusion

Chapter 6 - Findings

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will share the findings of fourteen semi-structured interviews with police officers and offenders who maintain a relationship with each other in IOM. The chapter will begin by presenting the demographics of the study participants, before moving on to display the findings of the interviews in shorter thematic subsections which relate to the relevant findings. The chapter will then conclude by bringing the chapter to a close with a succinct statement of findings.
6.2 Demographics

Fourteen participants were interviewed for this study, seven police officers and seven offenders. All participants described themselves as white British. There were nine male participants, three of whom were police officers and six were offenders. There were five female participants, four police officers and one offender. Two offenders were statutory offenders on prison licence, four were non-statutory offenders working with the scheme voluntarily and one offender had left the scheme. The following tables show, the age of participants, the length of time police officers had been in the service and length of time offenders had been on the IOM scheme. An interesting finding notes the significant age distribution, especially amongst older police officers in this study. This finding could be said to be an indicator of this type of work being more attractive to those more senior in both age and service, not only because work is conducted within office hours Monday to Friday but because it also utilises a different set of skills and abilities from general policing.

Table 4) Participant age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Offender Number</th>
<th>Police Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 – 35 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 40 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 45 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 50 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5) Length of police service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Experience</th>
<th>Number of police officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 – 10 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 15 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 25 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 6) Length of time offender on the IOM scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time offender on the scheme</th>
<th>Number of offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.3 General observations**

Overall, the general nature of the relationships explored in this study were both amenable and positive with none that could be described as truculent. This is in keeping with the way in which participants were recruited for the study and recognises that those with a negative relationship are much less likely to engage. One participant tried to recruit his friend who ‘hated’ his police officer, but I could not secure this interview as his friend commented:

‘*What would be the point, nothing will change*’.

Having said that, participants in this study did share less positive experiences which offer a comparative way of understanding these relationships. Helpfully, all participants were both obliging and co-operative seemingly valuing the opportunity to share their experiences. Likewise all appointments were kept and encouragingly all participants were keen to talk about each other, with most starting to talk about their particular pairing before being asked.

What was also apparent was that both the police officers and the offenders in this study did not talk to each other about their relationship, or reflect on what worked or didn’t work for them. Graham acknowledges this by saying:

‘*You know it’s like, maybe a man thing that, you know, we don’t talk about that sort of thing*’.  *Graham – Offender*

Having observed other working relationships in the IOM environment, this is in stark contrast to the probation officer / offender relationship where conversations about how relationships were seen to be functioning were frequent. Where these conversations were generated however, fundamental improvements were made to the relationship.
For example, both Lucy and Simon talked about a conversation they had with each other about Simon’s constant desire to please Lucy by agreeing to everything she said for an ‘easy life’. They both talk about the conversation as a turning point in their relationship, after which real progress was made:

‘But a lot of the stuff before would be ‘yeh ok Lucy I’ll do that’, just to keep her quiet, but I didn’t want to do it, do you know what I mean. At the time I thought yeh I’m up for that, but I wasn’t really ….I said that as soon as I used to walk out I would get to the stairs and I would think, why didn’t I say what I was actually feeling. You know and now once I started doing that, it was better because…..after the last couple of times that relationship got stronger and stronger’. Simon – Offender

Further, many of the participants in the study commented that they had never thought about their relationships in this level of detail before, or spent any time reflecting on how it worked. Answering questions from an alternative and a perspective taking view point, such as ‘what do you think the police / colleagues / offenders think about these relationships’ frequently elicited responses that demonstrated that it was challenging to consider what other people either thought of them or their relationship.

Not surprisingly and in keeping with this observation, all participants had less to say about their feelings towards each other or their emotional investment in the relationship. That is not to say that it was absent, but more guarded or less articulated. One observation which might indicate that there is a deeper bond beyond the superficial connection was the amount of times participants mirrored each other. On numerous occasions they talked about the same incidents, used the same language and even shared the same ‘in jokes’ during their interviews. Of course the most substantial indicator about how participants really felt about their relationships and indeed each other is demonstrated in their opinions about whether or not these relationships should exist at all and whether or not they work for them. This study finds that all participants saw value in their relationships. From the offender perspective they clearly benefited in practical ways, but also from the emotional support they received. Likewise the police gained benefit predominately from an operational perspective, through intelligence or attendance at court, but they did also comment that they got good job satisfaction at times when their offenders were doing well. Overwhelmingly all participants felt that a positive relationship was key to the success of the scheme and their work with each other. As Thomas clarified:
‘It is as simple as that; if you don’t have a good relationship.....you don’t work properly with them do you’. Thomas – Police Officer

6.4 Language and terminology

All participants were asked what they thought about the word ‘relationship’ to describe the way in which they worked together with all accepting that it was the right terminology to use. Interestingly, police officers in particular wanted to alter the terminology to make it clear that it was a ‘working’ or ‘professional’ relationship, with Katie clarifying:

‘I don’t think we befriend people, I think we have a professional relationship with them’. Katie – Police Officer

This clarification is very much in keeping with findings from the study overall that indicate how strict the professional boundaries of these relationships are. In contrast, the offenders were quick to quantify what the relationship looked like, with early themes such as trust, respect and communication arising.

One of the most interesting aspects of this study that arose was around the nature of the relationship itself. Whilst most participants articulated that they had a fairly sincere relationship with each other based on trust and mutual respect, Mandy a police officer in this study offers us a completely alternative, but exceptionally valid viewpoint. Whilst she acknowledged that a professional relationship does indeed develop, it is the nature of this relationship which differs from other explanations in the study. Mandy suggests that what it really going on is a subversive, manipulative and deceitful relationship:

‘You’re there to do a job, you build a relationship but the relationship is to achieve the objective and it is not a genuine relationship. It is based on deceit and the deceit is ours and that is what we are paid to do…. the whole thing falls down if people think their relationships are genuine with offenders’. Mandy – Police Officer

Whilst this viewpoint is not replicated by other participants in the study, other interesting findings support a perhaps less straightforward explanation of the nature of these relationships and support Mandy’s alternative viewpoint. For example Carl, one of the offenders points out:
‘Well you have to have a relationship with everybody, good or bad and especially if you are on prolifics and if you don’t have a relationship you get breached for non-compliance you know’. Carl - Offender

In another example, a police officer in the study recounts a time when she used her relationship with an offender who was wanted by the police to enter his house to gather evidence of stolen goods. Whilst she felt it was slightly dishonest and manipulative, she justified her actions by saying that if he said no she would not have entered the house.

6.5 Trust me, I’m a police officer

By far the most recurrent theme throughout this study was around trust. All participants indicated that trust was an important attribute within the relationship, but that working towards trust was challenging. The barrier it seemed was less pertinent to the status of the police / offender dichotomy and more in keeping with the time it takes in any relationship to build trust and rapport.

‘Some of them on that first time round they were a bit wary, but by the time you had known an offender, maybe when they had been in and out a couple of times, the trust is much more and you find they are opening up to you’. Janet – Police Officer

Given the suspicious nature of both parties, building trust was a challenge which was overcome through open and honest communication and a desire to help / be helped. What was also evident throughout the study was that the offenders themselves recognised the police as a source of help and that if they were going to change and be successful, trust was a necessary condition.

‘You know that what I’ve done in my past was wrong, do you know what I mean, I should never have done it and you know, all I can think about is moving forward, do you know what I mean. So, if that means accepting support from the police, then, that’s the way forward for me’. Sam – Offender

When reflecting on this theme it was surprising to most of the participants in this study that trust existed. So too was the fact that the relationship existed at all. The police officers said they were humbled by the fact that the offenders trusted them and opened up freely. Notably, these disclosures were often about their innermost feelings or life changing experiences such as childhood sexual abuse which they had never told others about before. Likewise the offenders were also surprised that they learnt to trust
the ‘enemy’, recognising that trusting the police was an important step towards reintegrating back into the wider community.

‘You don’t want to be mistrusting the police any more you want to be trying to build up a relationship with them so that if ever in the future you need them you are not going to be worrying about ringing them up and asking them for help because you don’t trust them’. Claire – Offender

Trust, however within these relationships was fairly unstable. For example police officers needed to maintain trust by balancing the need of their role with the maintenance of the relationship. On occasions, this was clearly not achieved. For example both Graham and Carl share experiences about relationships with previous police officers working in IOM where trust had broken down. Carl talks about a police officer on IOM with the wrong attitude who frequently ‘stitched him up’ and whom he caught looking through his cupboards on a home visit.

‘He is opening the cupboard and he is looking at it and I have caught him at it and I’m like fucking what the fuck is going on here? You know you are meant to be coming here to see how I am and all…. I heard a probation officer say that he didn’t have the correct attitude for working on prolifics. And he didn’t, he treated all criminals like scum basically. I really don’t give a fuck about him to be honest’. Carl - Offender

Graham also shares a similar sentiment about a police officer that he previously worked with, who he felt used IOM as a way of improving his promotion prospects.

‘……..was a prick you know he was out to make a name for himself, you know he used probation to do that. IOM to do that, and he used the fact that he worked with probation and I think to get into people’s heads and under their skin and then he left and used that to his advantage to progress through the police force. Now to me that’s a naughty way of doing it’. Graham - Offender

What these two examples demonstrate are relationships that soured because there was a lack of trust, transparency and the fact that the police officer was seen to be using subterfuge to get what they wanted. In these examples the lack of trust affected not only the functionality of the relationship, but its effectiveness. What was also an interesting finding was that trust could be rebuilt. On occasions where it had diminished due to enforcement activity or the giving of evidence, it could be regained through communication and a willingness from the offender to rationalise and accept the police officers’ actions were not vindictive or personal. As long as they were acting
within their role, or most pertinently ‘fairly’ within their role, enforcement was seen as a small hurdle which could be over-come.

What was also an unexpected finding was that a trusting relationship with a police officer in IOM, improved attitudes and relationships between the offenders and the general police overall:

‘Instead of like me walking through the street thinking there’s police, there’s police, you know and avoiding them, it’s actually given me the ability to think well, wait a minute not all police officers are like that you know. And now I can look at some police and think ok they are police, but they are there to protect the community. They are doing their job, you know, but they may actually be ok, you know. There may be more to them than meets the eye’. Graham – Offender

Whilst only one offender disagreed with this, all of the other offenders stated their IOM police relationships had a direct impact that changed the way they thought about the general police and most significantly how they interacted with them.

From the police perspective the benefit of building a trusting relationship was that they gained a greater and deeper understanding of where the offenders had come from, the challenges in their lives and most importantly what needed to happen to support positive change. However, the notion of trust didn’t always sit comfortably with all of the participants in this study especially in relation to how equal the division of trust was. As one police officer explains:

‘Yeh you get them to trust you, but you don’t ever trust them’. Mandy – Police Officer

In this regards all of the police officers in the study were wary of trusting the offenders, which given the risks of manipulation associated with offending behaviour is arguably a wise decision. Therefore trust was quite clearly one-sided, with the aim of the relationship from both perspectives being that the offender should trust the police officer and not the other way around. Because of this, police officers exemplified a desire to remain personally anonymous within their role. They were very cautious about their offenders overstepping the mark and invading their personal space. Even when the relationship was finished and ‘unofficial’ the same boundaries remained. For example at the time of the interview Simon, an ex-offender had not been on the PPO scheme for some years and was working for a charity which Lucy, his past IOM police officer, frequently used to support other offenders into work and education. When it
came to the Christmas party Lucy declined an invitation to join Simon and others working in the charity because she did not want to socialise with him.

Having said this, there were at least two occasions in the interviews where the offenders talked about a time they had been trusted to do something by their police officer in IOM. On these occasions the comments were shared with pride and pleasure that this had been the case. Whilst it is clearly difficult to broker this level of trust, from another angle the positive benefits might outweigh the risk of exposure or manipulation of the police officer. Either way, trust on both sides of the relationship had to be earned and was not freely acquired.

6.6 Care or Control? Boundaries, Conflicts and Dilemmas.

Another very evident finding of this study was how structured these relationships were, with all participants in this study understanding where they stood with each other. In order to achieve this the boundaries of the relationship were clearly articulated with the police officers in this study delivering ‘the talk’ with every new offender:

‘If they overstep the mark and they take the mickey out of my good nature and efforts, then they realise that there’s another side to my role’. James – Police Officer

Likewise it was clear what would happen if they transgressed:

‘Well I know we can’t commit offences in front of you’z like, we can’t talk about committing offences because that is conspiracy. Er that’s about it. And you can’t score weed in front of em either’. Charlie - Offender

As a result the offenders clearly knew that the police were there to reduce their offending through partnership working and that a swift return to prison would be utilised if needed. They also clearly understood that at the end of the day they were still police officers who would arrest them if offences became apparent.

One distinct area where the boundaries were less understood was around confidentiality. Whilst the interviews with the police officers made it clear that they told their offenders anything said to them was not privileged and formed part of the overarching strategy to increase intelligence and monitor offending, the offenders didn’t always seem aware that this was happening:

‘People say yeh you’ve got to be careful what you say because yeh they think that you’re fucking kinda stitching yourself up – but I’m not and I say
yeh, George keeps it to himself and confidentiality like isn’t it’. Charlie – Offender

Police officers too recognised that this happened:

‘They sometimes forget that you are a copper and they forget that you are police and they forget that if they tell you information it will go on the system’. Lucy – Police Officer

This is an area which will need more consideration, questioning if this particular aspect of the scheme is so explicit in offender agreement forms that it is totally transparent.

Moving on, all participants in this study recognised the care versus control dilemma. Police officers clearly saw that continual enforcement and use of police powers would interfere with their relationships. Whilst they were all willing to use their powers if needed, it was not seen to be core business and should be used as a last resort, the methodology of this being that trust would diminish and the offender would be forever wary of engaging with the police in the scheme. The offenders also acknowledged this aspect reflecting that:

‘I don’t think that the prolific offender officers should be the ones who arrest you and take you back to jail because I have seen that happen to people who were on probation or where on license. The license has been breached and the prolific offender has come around for help and then they have (arrested them). I think that…..just makes them think fuck you, why should I have any trust in you or work with you in the future’. Carl – Offender

Likewise there were also significant boundaries around the emotional involvement in the relationship which recognised that it wasn’t productive for the offender to become too emotionally reliant. Whilst some police officers in the study made themselves available outside of office hours on their mobile phone, or via being a key holder for a particular offender, most offenders in this study recognised:

‘They are only there to do their job, they aren’t going to do anything outside of their job and don’t expect to phone them at the weekend when they are not at work or anything like that’. Simon – Offender

Charlie, one of the offenders in this study in contrast would have preferred George to be available at the weekend because he felt that would have reduced the stress of ‘suicidal Sunday’, but in the same sentence he understood that George had a family life that he needed to be a part of too. In the main though, all police participants alleviated the emotional constraints of the relationships by creating boundaries which
recognised where the relationship began and where it ended. One strategy was to remind themselves and indeed the offender that;

‘I go home every day, my life is completely different when I leave here’. Lucy – Police Officer

This helped to create a safe and sustainable distance.

Whilst emotional boundaries were clearly in place, both police officers and offenders in the study acknowledged that police officers could become emotionally affected due in part to the type of work they undertake, the relationships themselves and the frequent disappointment which occurred when offenders experienced setbacks.

‘You must get attached to people you know if you keep seeing them and seeing what they are going through or if people are having a hard time. If somebody is falling to bits it must affect you. You see one person one month and they are doing really well and you see them a few months later and they are sleeping rough and there are pin marks all over them from crack and gear it must be, fuck knows, I would as a person, I would be affected.’ Carl – Offender

Simon, one of the offenders also recognised the emotional frustration of this work also:

‘This is where they need the patience because then they can be working and someone can be doing really extremely well for a month and all of a sudden the weekend comes and wham, next minute they are in a police cell on Monday morning. Or they are bang at it just that quick’. Simon - Offender

This comment also mirrors frequent frustration demonstrated by police officers in this study who found that they could become quite despondent if they had invested quite substantially in the offender only for progress to be diminished by further offending or drug taking. Going forward, this frustration may be reduced or mitigated through training and development around managing expectations and understanding desistance from offending.

In regards to the emotional boundaries put in place by offenders within this study, little can be said with any degree of certainty due to the lack of disclosure about their feelings in particular. There are some clues that the offenders distanced themselves emotionally too, especially where disclosures would lead to further arrests or a recall to prison for example. There were however, more indicators to the contrary that the offenders actually had emotional needs in relation to these relationships. For example one offender signalled the importance of not shutting the door on him in his hour of
need and taking him off the scheme too early, whilst others talked about the importance of the police building an emotional link with them. Additionally, there were some indicators that negative regression or a return to offending resulted in the offenders expressing disappointment in themselves because they had in some way let their police officer or probation officer down:

‘They said they really, really felt awful. It was one of the worst things for them. (They said)…. “I really felt I had let A down and I didn’t think about that when I was offending but afterwards I felt really guilty because I had promised him this and promised him I would try and then I let him down”.

Katie – Police Officer

Equally, two offenders in the study articulated that they had unfulfilled needs in relation to the personal information they knew about their police officer. Whilst many of the police officers were at pains to make sure they didn’t give too much of themselves away, some participants articulated that they would have liked to have known more about them in order to increase the emotional connection. Where they did know things about the police officers on a personal level you could audibly tell from the interview that this was not a matter of them being smug about knowing the information or holding information over the other, it was more a quiet indicator of something deeper and personally enriching for the offender. Likewise, one police officer recognised that an emotional connection was important for them being able to relate to the police officer as a person, which would make the acceptance of advice more meaningful:

‘Because if you share nothing about yourself, how do they ever relate to you?’ Katie - Police Officer

Another very clear boundary articulated by police participants in this study was around collusion or turning a blind eye to misdemeanours. Without exception all police officers in the study articulated strongly that this would not happen, yet some comments and examples given in this study could be construed in this way. In addition practice tells me that this is not beyond the realms of possibility. Whilst I never witnessed any deviation from this path, or indeed personally overlooked offending or the need to intervene in a formal capacity, reflecting on practice for this study I acknowledge there were moments of ethical challenge and times where decisions were taken in order to safeguard the relationship over and above the need to use police powers. Likewise, one police participant articulated that not enough attention was paid to integrity in IOM or how the contact with offenders was managed. This was especially important where
reports had been generated about inappropriate relationships forming between offenders and staff within IOM historically. Whilst our sense of right and wrong and decision making is subjective, as well as our variable commitment to the proactive use of personal reflection, especially in the police (Rowson & Lindley, n.d), this finding seems too clinical and not in keeping with many of the challenging aspects that exist in the police officer and offender relationship. In addition, the offenders themselves also recognised many of the moral dilemmas and conflicts that could easily occur, yet their experience also showed that this aspect did not feature strongly within their particular relationships.

6.7 Friend or Foe?

When considering terms often associated with relationships in this context, interesting findings emerged. The notion of ‘friendship’ or example came up in half of all the interviews with participants, acknowledging that these relationships could be ‘friendly’ albeit within the boundaries already agreed. Similarly there was frequent discussion about whether or not the participants liked each other. On several occasions where this was discussed it seemed more important to the offender that they got on with their police officer than it did vice versa. The police frequently voiced that it didn’t matter whether or not the offenders liked them, irrespective of this they had a job to do. Other police officers were more concerned that to like an offender was over stepping the established boundaries:

‘To say I like so and so, that is a no no. Where as in IOM you hear that all the time you think …that would be a warning sign and you would then re-assign that person to a different police officer. Erm so if you are liking somebody are you being objective? You can't then see the risk that they pose to people’. Mandy – Police Officer

Continuing the ‘friend’ notion further, another interesting finding from this study considered how far the relationship extended. There were examples of police officers attending the weddings of their offenders, becoming their birthing partner and attending their funerals:

‘We got invited to one of our offender’s weddings…In fact the professionals…were the majority of the guests. We declined to go to the pub with him afterwards, but we did go to the wedding. We felt duty bound because at least he had made the effort’. Thomas – Police Officer
It would seem in this context that births, deaths and marriages didn’t constitute a step too far, but were in fact seen as an accepted and even privileged part of the relationship developed. Moreover a sense of loyalty was also fostered. All offenders in the study told others, including their peers, that they were working with the police. Risking taunts of ‘grass’, they frequently voiced how often they had stuck up for their relationships with their police officer when talking with their peers:

‘I have been stood there with George and they have said ‘what are you doing there, you grass’. I have said ‘he’s my IOM worker you know mate, just because he is a copper he’s a probation officer as well you know, so just shut your mouth’. Charlie – Offender.

This is perhaps indicative of the strength of their relationship with their police officer that they would risk being shunned, or even seriously hurt within their peer group in order to defend the relationship.

At the other end of the spectrum not all relationships the police officers had with their offenders were harmonious. A common finding was that the relationships started off fairly sceptical, with offenders saying they felt harassed and targeted. Whilst the offenders who participated in the study reflected that they understood the police were there not to cause them problems per se, but to prevent their offending, some relationships were simply unworkable. Police officers in this study all articulated that they had at least one relationship with an offender on their case load, who regardless of their attempts, would not allow them into their life. On these occasions the fact that it was a police officer offering the support was the barrier.

Another interesting and predominately excluded strategy for the police role, relates to the use of the relationship itself to encourage change. It was felt by many of the police participants that this was an uncomfortable strategy which should not be adopted. Lucy explains it like this:

‘Don’t do it for me, it’s for you at the end of the day you’re the one that makes that decision, you’re the one that has to be in the box if you are in court, it’s up to you. I will help you, but if you want to go out and offend then you can go out and offend’. Lucy – Police Officer

Whilst there was more support for the notion that the police officer themselves were modelling good behaviour and relationship boundaries, there was a universal
uncomfortable voice about the offender making changes to either please the police officer or make them proud for example.

In regards to power differentials, all participants were asked who held the power in their relationship. Interestingly this was analysed in various different ways with no obvious patterns emerging. For example two police officers said it was in their favour, one said it was the offender who held the power, three said both held it equally and one said power didn’t feature in their relationship at all. In regards to the offender responses to this question, four stated that the power was distributed equally, whilst two said it was in the favour of the police and one participant did not answer the question. Interestingly though, in the four responses from offenders that said they both held the power, they acknowledged that they had the power to make changes in their life. This is an interesting indicator of how many offenders interviewed within the study viewed themselves as an agent of change:

‘I certainly hold power in my life and nobody holds it over me’. Claire – Offender

6.8 Police Role: More than One Way to Skin a Cat? Or Pink and Fluffy?

One of the avenues that this study wanted to understand was whether or not police officers should be doing this work, or indeed developing relationships with offenders within the rehabilitation and resettle strand of the scheme. In analysing the interviews there was overwhelming support from all participants for police officers doing this type of role. Police officers saw it as a role consummate with the long game and bigger picture. They recognised that the revolving door of offending existed and that current enforcement practice which simply locked people up and expected change was unrealistic. They therefore saw that their role offered in effect another way to ‘skin a cat’ as Janet puts it. For police officers the benefit of them taking this role was to increase intelligence, encourage change and provide consistency. Having said that, there was almost universal acknowledgement that this was not the traditional way of policing:

‘We picked up a new one recently who could not believe the police were there offering to help as opposed to the authoritarian approach when the police were going to bang on your door. So this is turning it on its head from the traditional perspective of policing’. Katie – Police Officer
Likewise, the fact that it is a police officer offering support and encouragement through the scheme did not seem to be as big a barrier as you would expect. Carl, one of the offenders in the study even labelled police officers undertaking this work as ‘restorative figures’, explaining that they were there to restore law and order by getting things back to ‘normal’ for offenders. In fact the offenders saw numerous benefits. Although they recognised that the police were there to protect the public and reduce offending, from a self-centred perspective what they really liked was having a police officer work with them because of the influence they had with partner agencies:

‘Yeh cos they do have a bit of clout when they say that they can do something…It makes a hell of a difference to….the council or whoever if the police officer goes up and says ‘look this person has changed’ and vouches for you and then says don’t fucking let me down. You know then that shows that it does work both ways’. Steve – Offender.

Seemingly the police in the scheme got things done and didn’t seem to take no for an answer. This removed blockages and moved rehabilitation along. Likewise the offenders benefited from the relationship by having someone they could trust, communicate with and receive support and advice from. In addition the offenders also saw the benefit of police officers putting positive intelligence on the system which would prevent unnecessary stop checks:

‘I think it is good that they have police officers up here cos then they can put that info onto a computer’. Sam – Offender

Throughout the study it was evident that police officers within the study made continual assessments and value judgements which affected their decisions, or their chosen approach to working with the offender. Intelligence, partnership working and criminal justice involvement all indicated offending and therefore instigated action under the catch and convict strand. However, the relationship and associated aspects such as likeability, belief that the offender was telling the truth and perceived level of effort all contributed towards police decision making, especially in relation to how much support they would receive under the rehabilitate and resettle aspect of the scheme. This is best exemplified in the following quote:

‘I think that when I work with whoever I work with, if they’re showing me that they are keen to change, so I will up my effort towards them……If they are not, then I will demonstrate that I am not interested. If you can’t be bothered,
I can't be bothered. I won't be chasing you. But if you commit crime then you will be seeing more of me'. James – Police Officer.

In regards to features, the police role was characterised by several traits. The first was that it was important that police officers believed that offenders could change. Whilst this belief was important to both parties, with several participants acknowledging that that it wouldn’t work if this wasn’t the case, in reality belief in change was also a tool to encourage the offender to believe it for themselves too:

‘Ninety Nine times out of one hundred we believe that people can do something different and can desist from crime if they make the right choices. We have to show the offender that we believe in them and (then) they start believing in themselves too’. Katie – Police Officer

Secondly, participants also talked about how necessary it was to recognise the offenders’ problematic and emotionally unstable upbringing. Coupled with the importance of taking a non-judgemental approach, when compared to other roles in the police participants recognised this was a unique attribute of their role. It was articulated that nowhere else in the police force would police officers have the time to devote resources to emotionally supporting offenders to change, although at least one police officer in the study articulated that it was not their role to support offenders, instead they should signpost them to support.

Thirdly, the role spanned many aspects of the offender’s lives. Police officers worked holistically with partners, friends and family in order to support the offender.

‘I have built all of the trust back with my family now from heroin you know, and a lot of that was due to Mandy saying you know, well Steve has started to (change)….She would sit and talk to my mum and dad, and my mum and dad never liked the police either, before Mandy’. Steve – Offender

The police role also spanned many of the partnership roles, on occasion undertaking tasks more in keeping with probation practice or social work for example. When asked what professional role their work was most similar too, half of the police officers said roles which were not policing. The offenders also said similar:

‘I know George is a police officer still but he is like a probation officer as well, isn’t he’. Charlie - Offender

The morphing of roles seemed especially acute in cases where police officers acted as housing officers. This seemed less about a desire to do the work of housing officer’s
per se and more of an operational requirement in that not finding accommodation for an offender would be counter-intuitive to the aims of the scheme. One justification for this situation was that:

‘Everything is a police officer’s job’. Katie – Police Officer

Yet in the same sentence Katie goes on to question whether this is right and reiterates the importance of maintaining distinct partnership identities. Others too expressed that there was a blurring not only of roles, but also the distinct strands of the scheme:

‘When I first started it was, catch and convict and that was one strand and the other strand was the prison, rehabilitation bit. I do believe that it is necessary to have a combined role, it is not necessary to have separate roles – you can do both as a sort of offender manager’. Mandy – Police Officer

Interestingly, an experience is shared by one police officer in this study who conducted an investigation interview with a prolific offender as an IOM police officer. When it came to offering signposting and support to that offender after the interview, they refused to accept help and asked for another IOM officer to assist instead.

Fourthly, what was also apparent was that the police role had little guidance and was seen to be both ‘creative’ and ‘flexible’. This allowed for ‘cooking with cops’, badminton, ping pong and games of scrabble for example. In reality this manifested itself in practice which could on the one hand produce actions which arguably went the extra mile, versus occasions where the police officer simply did not know what else to do with the person they were working with:

‘What can I say to you different, I don’t know what else to do or say’. Lucy – Police Officer

Interestingly, the police officers seemed to like this autonomous way of working. Whilst they would have liked to have had more supervision and guidance it was not seen as a barrier to their work on a day to day basis. This area in particular saw the greatest rewards and benefits personally for all police officers in this study who stated that they either enjoyed the challenge of the work, or they felt genuine satisfaction regarding the positive strides and changes made by the offender.

Lastly, most participants had a view about what the police officer chosen for the role should be like. Police officers wanted to work with colleagues who were respectful of
the offenders, jovial, positive and creative. Likewise there was a commonality that ethics and a strong back bone were important, whereas offenders felt they should be patient, empathetic, supportive and especially not ‘gung ho’.

In regards to perceptions of the role from police colleagues, participant’s said their role was frequently viewed as ‘pink and fluffy’ policing. Examples where police officers were referred to as ‘scum cuddlers’ and taunted about hugging offenders during trips to visit them in police custody existed across the majority of police interviews.

‘Bloody do-gooders they go out swanning about in their bloody cars buying them a burger, asking for a few clothes back – how hard can that job be?’
James – Police Officer

Likewise there was also a sense that because this work was not taken seriously, tasking requests were not proactively progressed. Lucy talks about asking uniformed colleagues to conduct a home visit out of hours on a new offender, and for whatever reason it was not done, which resulted in the offender committing numerous fraud offences that night. This of course is counter-intuitive practice for reducing demand on the police in general, but also reducing offending in prolific offenders. Positively however, police colleagues did view police officers in the IOM role as a:

‘Useful conduit to get to probation’. Mandy – Police Officer

In relation to the ‘pink and fluffy’ perspective, one area which might affect this view is highlighted by a police officer in the study who fervently articulated that the practice of IOM police officer attending court with favourable information about an offender’s progress to influence sentencing, amounted to ‘career suicide’. Whilst others argued that this practice was a really positive aspect of the role and seen as a useful way to prevent offenders receiving a custodial sentence when progress had been good, this arguably presents an example of mission distortion.

6.9 What works in these relationships? Finding the spark!

The question of whether these relationships reduced offending was a really fascinating aspect of this study. Less than half of the respondents, both police officers and offenders said it did (N=5), whilst the rest said either ‘no’ (N=1) or were categorically unsure (N=8). Notwithstanding the fact that many of the participants didn’t really know whether it did or didn’t make a difference to reoffending rates, there were clear themes
that emerged which seemed to either support or negatively affect efforts to desist. Generally, in keeping with other research about desistance the majority of both police officers and offenders in the study articulated that irrespective of the intervention, the offender themselves had to be in a place of change, or indeed have a willingness to change and be ready to do so before they would:

‘I am not sure it has an impact if people are not really fussed about sorting their life out I think to be quite honest’. Claire – Offender

Having said that there were some aspects of both the relationship and the scheme itself which appeared to either push, or encourage change in the offenders which they articulated had an impact on the likelihood of them reoffending. The most prevalent was the notion of putting the pressure on. Although many of the offenders in the study were clearly uncomfortable with the intrusive aspect of the scheme, like the home visits and surveillance, they did recognise that it was part of signing the IOM agreement:

‘You know prolific offenders do need to know that they are being watched and that they are close to going to jail at the end of the day…. I feel that if I didn’t have that I would just carry on as I was you know’. Carl - Offender

Interestingly this particular aspect was not as intrinsically linked to their relationships as you would expect. This is perhaps because they did not see it as the IOM police officers themselves who were watching them, but the police and the scheme itself in general. This distorted perception allowed the offenders to separate the police officers they built relationships with under an ‘us and them’ category: with ‘them’ being the police officers at the police station. Demarking the police in this way allowed the offenders to switch allegiances and build genuine supportive relationships. Furthermore, there was no evidence that the relationship itself acted as a deterrent against offending.

The findings in this particular part of the study did recognise the complexity of the offender journey towards desistance however. When compared to some of the challenges which offenders need to overcome in order to desist, the relationship itself seemed superfluous as these quotes demonstrate;

‘I think their craving for drugs is going to be greater than the relationship they have built up’. Katie – Police Officer
‘I offended because I was a heroin addict at the end of the day…it didn’t matter what my mum done, what the queen done or what my partner done, if I didn’t have heroin I was going out to get it’. Carl - Offender

‘I don’t think it is one person in particular’. Lucy – Police Officer

‘It is down to the individual you know, they can only do so much the prolifics’. Simon – Offender

One particular aspect about reoffending which was raised several times was the converse influence that the relationship could have on desistance. Simply put, constant enforcement or a poor relationship with the offender might result in an increase in offending. This is best exemplified in this quote:

‘Any relationship can influence something else can’t it – negatively or positively. I mean it could make them go out and reoffend time and time again – that’s for you (James), ‘this one’s for you too, by the way this one’s for your mother’. James – Police Officer

In addition, negative attitudes displayed by police officers towards offenders could also detrimentally affect positive change.

‘I wouldn’t mind working in this. “You can’t fucking work there you thieving cunt”, you know stuff like that. That sort of puts people right off of even thinking, well yeah I am a thieving cunt so…I’ll do what they’re expecting of me you know’. Steve – Offender

Whilst there is uncertainty about whether or not the relationship itself reduces reoffending, there were other important aspects of the relationship which could be said to support desistance. The first is an acknowledgement through the relationship itself that offending is wrong, that it has reached an unacceptable level and that it causes harm. Several offenders acknowledged that things must have got out of hand in regards to their offending if they were on the IOM scheme and had a police officer working with them. The second is that the relationship works in contradiction of prevalent societal norms by sending a strong prosocial supportive message to the offender:

‘That’s what I was on about, the public wasn’t I. Saying that….some people don’t agree with people getting support and stuff like that. Because they’ve lived a life of crime all their lives yeah, and I understand that to an extent but everyone needs support in life’. Sam – Offender

The relationship also offered the opportunity for police officers to reinforce prosocial attitudes with their offenders, which the offenders also recognised was an important
aspect of their relationships with the police in IOM. Thirdly, some offenders recognised that when they were in a good place they really didn’t want to let their police offender manager down. In this study two offenders articulated that this tempered their desire to reoffend. Lastly, the practical help and support offered especially where police officers went the extra mile was seen not only as positive, but likely to reduce offending. There are numerous examples within the relationship where police officers helped to secure accommodation, arrange mental health/health/drug and alcohol treatment, assisted with benefit claims, helped offenders move house, applied for grant funding for driving lessons, furniture, clothes, computer equipment and a whole host of other activities which helped the offender to progress through the problematic criminogenic pathways:

‘But years ago, before (IOM) it was like us against the police you know what I mean, like cat and mouse or cops and robbers but now it’s just like you’re mixing together to try to come to a solution, yeh stopping all that. You know helping people get jobs and helping people get houses, helping people get off the drugs’. Graham - Offender

As an aside, it is important to recognise that one of the difficulties police officers in particular had about answering this question was in relation to measurement:

‘I always say that you can’t measure the amount of crime what hasn’t been committed from the result of the relationships which, if it makes the offenders think or changes their thought processes you just can’t measure how many victims (and crimes have been prevented)’. George – Police Officer

Exploring what works and doesn’t work in the relationship in general, there were more facilitators than barriers identified within the study. This finding is perhaps linked to the fact that all study participants were very supportive of the scheme and determined to make it work. Brokering the relationship at the beginning was seen as the first challenge in initiating a relationship which participants identified could be detrimentally affected if the police in IOM were too overtly ‘police-like’. In the study the police participants recognised that the wearing of a uniform and arresting offenders within IOM offices would be a barrier, especially at the beginning. This too would have affected the scepticism and suspicion already demonstrated by offenders when the relationship was initially offered. In regards to brokering the relationship it was important that the police officers sold the benefits of the scheme, promoted the value of a relationship to the offender and built rapport. The value of developing the
relationship was most significant around the offer of support which the offender could obtain:

‘You know they turned around and said that they could support me and help me with all of this sort of stuff and help me do stuff. I sort of thought, well all I can do is give it a go and see how it goes’. Simon – Offender

In relation to maintaining the relationship, one interesting theme touched on by both police officer and offenders was around honesty. For the police officers in the study, honesty was essential for the relationship and without it there would be an on-going barrier. Honesty was however more problematic for the offenders. On the one hand they recognised that the relationship would be more enriching if they were honest, but there were occasions for example during child protection procedures, where it would not be in their best interests to be honest with the police officer they worked with:

‘When my son was taken into care, we got him back and we were both clean and we started using drugs again and I wanted to come clean … to get help with drugs. I wanted to go back on a script because at one point we were the golden boy and girl in probation….I wanted to ask them for help but if I asked them for help, it would have got other people involved…but if I told you, social services would have come back in and my son would have been taken and when your child is involved… you would do anything for them’. Carl – Offender

Other recurrent barrier to the relationships identified by both police officers and offenders were personality clashes, chaotic lifestyles, offending, intoxication, enforcement, legal status (statutory and non-statutory) and whether or not the offender was in a place of change or wanted to engage. From an offender’s perspective, finances, police officer attitude and unwanted advice were all identified barriers. Police officers, also specifically identified the amount of time which could be spent in developing relationships, a reduction in the benefits which could be offered (‘carrots in the bag’), basic living necessities like accommodation and food, breaking down stereotypes built up by other police officers, aggression, poor behaviour and lack of adherence to rules and expectations as on-going barriers for them.

In relation to on-going facilitators that would make the relationship work, both offenders and police officers identified the importance of working together to achieve goals, the development of good rapport, respect, listening, non-judgemental communication, consistency and continuity of the relationship. Police officers also identified the importance of being available, avoiding assumptions, being enthusiastic, steering
them in the right direction, giving structure, choice, opportunities, not giving up on the offender and finding the good in them. Or as George calls it ‘finding the spark’.

‘You cannot treat everyone the same and have to look for that spark. If you see the little spark you have to jump for it, find out what it is and work towards it’. George – Police Officer

Offenders specifically identified the importance of an open door approach, commitment, persistence and straight talking to assist relationship building.

Notably, it was also a common theme throughout the study that the longer you worked with an offender the better the relationship was. In addition, it was frequent to hear experiences where the relationship itself had improved compliance, not just with community orders or offender supervision, but also compliance with the law and compliance with police activities:

‘One of them will ring me up and say ‘if I’m sought for something, just ring me up and I will go in with you’ and there has been a riot van and the boys are all kitted up, and he has just got in the car and that is only because of the relationship I have got with that particular person because I have known him for donkey’s years and he trusts me to some degree I think’. Lucy – Police Officer

There was also an example where the police offender relationship also improved compliance with the prison regime and improved relationships with prison officers.

Further, all participants were asked about why offenders worked with the scheme on a voluntary basis when they were a non-statutory offender. Many of the offenders in the study said they engaged on a voluntary basis because they saw it as a support mechanism to help them get back on their feet on release from prison:

‘Because I want to change my life and the only way around that is getting help from the police and not being against the police, know what I mean. Be with em and for em and not against em cos they are doing a good job really’. Charlie – Offender

There was however, also an indicator in the study that voluntary engagement was not constant and those who chose to engage did not do so for extended periods of time.

‘I suppose if I wanted to work with them then I probably would for a short time to help me get on my feet. I suppose it is good to have support and to ask for help at times [rather] than still having people invading your life – [but there] is a time when you have to say fuck it and I need to be able to look
after myself and I shouldn’t have to have people supporting me all the time to prop my life up – I should be able to do it myself’. Carl - Offender

In relation to this aspect, it was frequently questioned by both police officers, offenders and supervisors about the length of time offenders were either on or off the scheme. Many of the participants questioned expectations from senior managers about how quickly offenders, who had been offending for such a significant period of time could turn their life around:

‘People we work with have got to where they are through many years of damage and problems and to try and put that right in a six month stint is just not going to happen. You are looking at a long term piece of work that is ongoing, plus the support’. Janet – Police Officer

Others recognised that they needed to be back on the scheme quicker than they were:

‘I have had it before when I have come off prolifics and I have thought fucking brilliant, great but then the thing was I started relapsing…… I started saying look I’m messing up. I’m starting to commit and use again…and they said look you’re not a prolific offender so now you fall under the old category and….it felt like they were saying if you go out and commit crimes, two or three crimes we will register you as a prolific and then you can get your help’. Carl - Offender

These findings raise numerous questions about dependence on the relationships developed and indeed dependence on the scheme, versus the risk of an offender reoffending without either the support of the relationship or the input from the scheme. The time an offender remains on the scheme needs further examination, especially in relation to whether it impedes progress, sustains progress or indeed enhances it.

In relation to diversity, there were several identified aspects relevant to how effective these relationships are. The first is gender. Whilst there was only one female offender participant within the study, there were several female police officers who raised gender issues also. The findings indicate that gender does matter and that good practice in this area would be to give offenders the choice about the gender of the officer that they would like to work with:

‘I think it would be good to put that initial choice in their hands because then it would make them feel that they were having a choice in their offending management then and I think it would certainly help towards their relationship you know – getting to choose whether they want a male or a female’. Claire – Offender
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The second is personality disorders and mental health. It was highlighted several times in the study how challenging it was to build and maintain a relationship from a police perspective with those experiencing mental health problems. It was seen that the erratic nature of these conditions could prove difficult and on many occasions police officers articulated that they did not know how to work successfully in this area. It would seem that training or greater involvement of mental health services in IOM would be beneficial. Thirdly, the lack of recognition or discussion about ethnicity, or its influence on the effectiveness of these relationships was either indicative of the lack of ethnic diversity of residents in these two counties or a relevant omission in this study which needs further attention.

**Table 7 - Common themes across all relationships**

| Common themes across all relationships | • Relationships need to be built through open and honest communication, rapport building and respect to generate trust.  
• Police have positive outlook for the future of the offender / belief they can change.  
• Positive regard for the relationship – key to the success of the scheme. Overwhelming support for police undertaking work. Not a traditional role, but valuable to both police and offender alike.  
• Clear boundaries, everyone knows where they stand.  
• Relationship right terminology  
• Being a police officer is not a barrier / care versus control exists but can be managed. Too much enforcement would be detrimental.  
• Offenders loyal to police – disclosure to peers.  
• The relationship provides positive benefit and value for both the offender and police officer. |
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6.10 General observations about the specific relationships

In regards to how offenders and police officers rated their relationships with each other, in keeping with the rest of the findings within this study they were mainly ‘really good’. The study found that seventy eight percent of the respondents rated their relationship between seven and ten out of ten (one being exceptionally poor, ten being exceptionally good). One respondent didn’t answer the question because the interview ended prematurely and two respondents said that they would rate them as five out of ten. In both of these cases the rating was lower because they assessed their relationship against how important it was in their life, comparing it to other more important relationships such as friends and family. Several police participants said that their scores would have increased if the offender was closer to rehabilitation. Only one offender said that it was lower because the relationship was with a police officer, but they still rated their relationship as seven out of ten regardless.

Over and above the general findings, there was quite significant diversity between the different sets of police officer and offender relationships. These differences were clearly influenced by several factors such as the experience of the offender manager, their emotional commitment and their chosen style/approach. It was also influenced by the compatibility within the relationship and whether or not the police officer and the offender ‘got on with each other’. Analysing the relationship pairings showed commonly identified themes across particular relationships. The first set of relationships were very functional. Theoretically these fit in the ‘Role Relationships’ category (Guerrero et al, 2013, p.6). In these relationships the work was less aspirational, more practical and less emotionally rewarding especially for the offender. These relationships seemed more superficial. From a police officer’s perspective the relationship existed to get the job done and from the offender’s perspective they engaged to keep within the rules of the game: Janet and Carl and Steve and Mandy embody this relationship typology. This relationship was therefore more about the interaction between both individuals based on the roles they performed. Then there were relationships which had more warmth on both sides which could be described as interpersonal relationships. In these relationships there was a deeper level of emotional investment, with relationships of this type characterised by the police officer often ‘going the extra mile’. In addition it is within these relationships where attendance at births, funerals and weddings was more likely to occur. These were the relationships...
that seemed more personally and emotionally rewarding for both police officer and offender. They were also the types of relationship which had clear examples of aspirational work being conducted with the offender. In these relationships the offenders articulated that they would like more personal information from the police officer they worked with in order to feel more connected. Claire and Katie and Graham and Thomas fit this typology. Then there are unstable relationships which are either not fully established with rules being written and boundaries being tested, or newer relationships in transition towards a more settled, functional or interpersonal relationship. These unstable relationships were either in their infancy, where time and trust have yet to be fully established, or could unstable due to the ‘on / off’ nature of the offender engaging with their police officer. James and Sam fit this typology. Then there are familiar relationships. These familiar relationships are highly dependable, continuing and open, characterised by the fact that the offender has moved away from the relationship but could easily re-establish it at any time. In these relationships it would be easy to fit back into previous roles with very little relationship building needed. George and Charlie, Lucy and Simon fit this typology. Lastly there are also two further possible typologies, which although identified by study participants were not evident in the relationships examined in this study; that of ‘no relationship’ where there was no relationship developed and ‘close relationships’ which are characterised by enduring bonds, deep personal attachment and irreplaceability (Guerrero et al, 2013, p.6). These type of relationships would be considered as intimate.

An example of ‘no relationship’ is presented below.

‘There is another client I work with and he has always chosen to say stuff you, you’re a copper I’m never ever going to work with you, you’re scum, you’re shit, you’re filth that’s how I am brought up and we know our places. Doesn’t stop me putting effort into that person and digging around a little bit more, in fact it gives me a challenge to try and make them engage with me’.

James – Police Officer

Table 8: Relationship Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Type</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Relationships</td>
<td>• Exists to get the job done (police)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Role Relationships)</td>
<td>• Accept relationship to keep within the rules of the game (both)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Less warmth
- Less aspirational
- The role performed is paramount
- Offender less likely to engage on a voluntary basis
- Structured and goal orientated (practical)
- Emphasis on the scheme, the partnership working and less specifically about the relationship
- Relationship can be replaced by another (both)

### Interpersonal Relationships
- Deeper level of emotional investment (both)
- Higher level of dependability on police officer to be there. Police go ‘the extra mile’
- Sharing of personal information (both)
- Sharing of life events (weddings, birth, funerals)
- Relationship continues even when offender becomes non-statutory
- Aspirational
- More emphasis on the relationship itself being important

### Unstable Relationships
- Includes new relationships or relationships in transition
- Game playing or ‘testing’ occurring
- On / Off – offender not engaging / then engaging

### Familiar Relationships
- Relationship has ended, but would be easy to pick up from where it was left
- Relationship now in a different context / some transition or relationship blurring
- But assumed roles in previous relationship continuing in new context

### No Relationship
- Offender refuses to engage with police officer
- Trust broken down and cannot be repaired
- Power in the favour of the offender who chooses not to engage
Close Relationship

- Enduring bonds
- Strong emotional attachment / love / affection
- Personal need fulfilment
- Irreplaceable

Whilst these findings come from the exploratory nature of the study, it would be interesting to develop these typologies further with a larger sample to give an indicator of which approach is favoured, which is more effective and how prevalent each relationship typology is within the IOM cohort. Similarly, it would also be beneficial to consider how these relationships are influenced by either party and whether particular offender managers favour one particular typology, or whether they have a multitude of different relationship types depending on who the relationship is with. This would show what variables change the relationships. It would also be important to see how these relationships change over time, especially as the relationships are likely to start off in transition and then move into more functional or interpersonal relationships.

6.11 Case Studies

As part of this study both police officers and offenders were asked questions specifically about their police officer / offender pairing, as well as perspective taking questions about each other. For example participants were asked; ‘what would you want them to say about you, and what do you think they said about you?’ Research participants were also asked to give the other person in the relationship a message. This aspect of the research generated a rich amount of data that has been used to generate detailed case studies. In this section we will examine three relationships in greater detail. The first case study features Katie and Claire whose relationship is classified as interpersonal. The second case study features Janet and Carl whose relationship is functional. Finally, the third case study features James and Sam who have an unstable relationship. These have been chosen for comparison.

Katie and Claire: Case Study

This is a unique relationship within the study as it is the only purely female relationship. Katie, a white female aged 46, is a police sergeant with twenty six years’ experience having worked within IOM for three years as a supervisor. Claire, a white female is
aged 33 and is a non-statutory offender having been in the IOM scheme for three years. Katie and Claire have known each other for a long period of time with the relationship starting when Katie was a police officer in the neighbourhood policing team. Both Katie and Claire struggle to classify their relationship with each other and acknowledge that it is a fairly unique and challenging relationship. Furthermore they both recognise that this relationship is a particular challenge because of the amount of time they have known each other and the extent of the events they have experienced together. In this case most of the shared experiences relate to Claire’s children being taken into care, with Katie supporting her during this time.

‘But yeh going back to the relationship it is a strange relationship….. It’s almost like talking to a distant, dysfunctional relative you know’. Katie

‘It is difficult to describe it because it is a, you know Katie is very professional…she is always professional but she is, I don’t know it is easy to mistake it, not mistake it, but it is easy to be friends with Katie…but at the same time remembering who she is….so having respect for her job’. Claire

They both value an open and honest approach with each other, yet both recognise this is problematic for Claire who can be deceitful. Katie views her role within the relationship as a role model articulating that although she believes this is successful, what works with Claire is a ‘bit of a mystery’. Claire clearly respects Katie though and trusts her intent to help her.

‘I have never been so honest about my feelings inside as what I have when I have spoken to Katie’. Claire

In regards to how they rate their relationship with each other, both give similar scores with Katie giving it an eight out of ten and Claire a nine out of ten. Both reflect that they have an equal share of power in their relationship, but Claire holds more power in terms of her own recovery and destiny.

What makes this relationship interpersonal in particular are the number of warming comments made about each other and the breadth of the support Katie has offered Claire:

‘I genuinely care about Katie as a person’. Claire

‘I would give her a cuddle if she was sad and I would be there to talk to her about things, but I know how far to go’. Claire
‘Then there was all that trauma of going through that child protection stuff in terms of her child being fostered. I never really experienced that in any other relationship with any other offender. The birthing partner thing, being put down as her birthing partner being asked to be present at the last contact with her baby and her, knowing that could be the last time she would ever see that child again and then going through that court thing where we were supporting her… when the magistrates were saying you are going to lose your baby…we broke for lunch and she had the option of not having to come back and she wanted to come back in the afternoon to hear the conclusion and I thought that was very brave of her….Just a random fluctuation of emotions, that was a bit surreal really so I think the relationship is more intense for those reasons’. Katie

In regards to perceptions, Katie thought Claire would say that she expected too much, was hard to please, didn’t understand her addiction, found her challenging, found it strange that on the one hand she has told her that she loves her, but on the other hand she hates her, that she gives her a hard time and ‘does her head in’. She also thinks Claire values their relationship. Katie would like Claire to say that she was fair, approachable, helpful and kind. The findings reflect that this was a fairly accurate perception of their relationship from Katie’s perspective, with Claire saying all of these things apart that she didn’t understand addiction, that she gives her a hard time or does her head in. Claire consistently says that Katie was helpful and kind, but also recognised that expectations were high and that this was challenging for her.

‘But I said to her ‘you’ve got to give me a break – I have just got out of prison and you have got really high expectations which I understand, but you have got to give me a chance to get on’. Claire

Interestingly though, the level of expectations and the level of intervention from Katie did not seem to be excessive or intrusive enough for Claire to say that Katie ‘does her head in’. This is a fairly perceptive reflection of their relationship with few omissions that would probably surprise Katie, however Katie might not anticipate just how much Claire values their relationship or how much she seems to care for Katie as a person.

From Claire’s perspective, she thinks Katie would say that she is not very trustworthy, can be dishonest, frustrating for Katie, but that overall she does care about her. Claire would want Katie to say that she was likeable and that they had a good working relationship. In regards to whether these things were borne out in the analysis of Katie’s’ interview, many of these perceptions were also correct. Katie talks about how frustrating and challenging Claire is and how often she can be dishonest. It was clear
that Katie does care about Claire, but this is on a less deeply personal level as exemplified in the following quote.

‘But my biggest fear is that she will die and I am braced for the fact that I will come in one day and she will have died. I won’t feel responsible... because I know that we have done everything that we could have done – she has been given all the options so I will sadly and coldly feel that this is part of this job and you move on to the next job about how you tell that in the best possible way to her mum and how the hell do you stop her daughter being permanently damaged from that’. Katie.

One omission is that Katie doesn’t make any particular comment about whether or not she thinks Claire is likeable, but boundaries of the police role and comments from Katie that Claire is a ‘narcissist’ are perhaps reasons why this is not discussed.

**Katie’s message for Claire would be: ‘Put your words into action: Think of your children’**.

**Claire’s message for Katie would be: ‘Keep doing what you’re doing because I think you’re great’**.

**James and Sam: Case Study**

James is a white male police officer with seven years police experience, having worked in IOM for one year. Sam is a white male offender, aged 31 and is a non-statutory offender who has been on the IOM scheme for four years. James is Sam’s third police offender manager. Sam gives a detailed account of his offending history stating that he started offending at age thirteen when he was put in a children’s home. Having come from a small rural village, this experience unsettled him and he started stealing cars and using Valium. His offending escalated to include domestic burglary, assault and shop theft, as did his drug taking which eventually led to a heroin addiction. He was first sentenced to prison at age seventeen and has been in prison for ten years of his life.

Both Sam and James describe their relationship with each other as positive, with James rating it eight out of ten. Sam describes it as honest, trusting and supportive. Whilst James describes it as a ‘wholesome’ relationship that shows understanding, empathy and support, he does recognise that it can be ‘difficult and strained’ at times. This strain results from the unstable nature of their relationship which can be both testing and disruptive.
‘Most of my time is taken up with Sam at the moment because he is either choosing to engage or he is giving me the two fingers salute and saying that no he is not going to engage’. James

Analysing their responses it is unlikely that it is the relationship itself which is producing the instability, but several other internal and external influencing factors were disclosed. Firstly, Sam described himself as being unsettled at the time with James disclosing that he was a ‘red’ offender, likely to be offending and leading a chaotic lifestyle. Secondly, they were both in a period of non-engagement with each other when the interviews were conducted, yet they still gave positive responses about each other. Thirdly, Sam discloses a history of difficult relationships with professionals, being suspicious of working with them due to earlier life experiences. James, also acknowledges that Sam has been a ‘victim’ of both the CJS and the care system. Fourthly, James is Sam’s third police offender manager in four years and given that they have already worked together for a year perhaps inconsistency is producing discord and Sam is preparing himself to build another relationship with a new offender manager. Fifthly, in that year Sam had been a statutory offender and a non-statutory offender on several occasions. In practice this means that he has at one time been working more intensely with a probation officer, then as a result of either a breach of community order or a short custodial sentence he has changed to work more intensely with James. Lastly, Sam discloses being concerned that the support will one day cease and that the door will be closed to him for good.

‘But it's bad because, I feel like if they wanted to they could just shut that door. Do you know what I mean? And I thought the support was going to disappear’. Sam

This produces feelings of concern which might necessitate the creation of an emotional barrier between him and James in order to prevent future hurt. Sam acknowledges his propensity to do this:

‘I don't trust many people due to my childhood do you know what I mean. And I don't trust many people cos I've not had a trusting family…..so I don't understand what trust is massively about,…so I'll tend to like push people away….instead of like trying to work with them’. Sam

Lastly, it is likely that Sam’s learnt behaviour has over time shown him that he will be rewarded or get what he wants by being disruptive.
‘He is a survivor. Sam is a survivor really. He is very resourceful, he has found in his life that if he shouts, yells and screams he will get what he wants and I think that can often be quite detrimental to his working relationship with myself and my colleagues’. James

Although this is a fairly unstable relationship, there is also genuine regard between the pair and trust has been built up despite all the challenges. James describes Sam as a ‘success story waiting to happen’ and Sam says James has been ‘phenomenal’. What has clearly made a difference to Sam is how James has treated him. In one example he talks about how he was ‘blown away’ that James met him in the police cells after he had been arrested to see if he needed anything. He also appreciated the fact that James had invested considerable time in him and really sought to understand him. This positive regard has been clearly helped by James displaying pro-social attitudes towards Sam.

‘The way that he’s treated me, like a normal human being. He’s not treated me as a criminal, he’s not treated me as a druggie, d’you know what I mean? He’s treated me as someone who’s had problems that needs support. And I think that’s great. I think that’s something that I’ve always needed, something that I didn’t think I was ever going to get’. Sam

Interestingly, despite the turmoil in this relationship progress was made as the relationship itself started to alter Sam’s internal narratives about himself.

‘He seems to put a lot of time into me. He wants to help me. I asked him why he wanted to help me and he said to me that he sees potential, so he feels that why shouldn’t I have that help? Do you know what I mean and I don’t see that, but he does. Erm, but he’s starting to make me see it’. Sam

In regards to perception, because the interview was cut short due to Sam leaving after having a disagreement with his drug worker, it is more difficult to present his perception about his relationship with James. In James’ case however, he wanted Sam to respect and appreciate the support he had given him and recognise the mutual respect they had for each other. Sam, discloses all of these aspects in his brief interview.

Janet and Carl – Case Study

Janet and Carl have the longest relationship of all the pairings in this study having worked together for eight years. Janet, a white female in her fifties has been a police officer for twenty years having worked on the PPO scheme since inception in 2003. Carl, is a white male in this thirties who has been on the PPO scheme for ten years.
Carl and Janet have not worked together for the last 18 months as Carl moved areas but still remains on the scheme. Janet has returned to a detective role in the criminal investigation department (CID).

Both Janet and Carl rate their relationship with each other consistently, with Janet giving it seven or eight out of ten and Carl giving it seven out of ten. Janet and Carl describe their relationship as challenging, reflecting that it took a long while to break down barriers between them due to Carl’s mistrust of the police. Allowing the time to devote to this relationship was clearly beneficial for Carl, as was the constant and consistent nature of his relationship with Janet.

‘You know someone as time went on I got to know her better and I realised that we actually got on alright to start with. I suppose my back was always up with prolific officers, people I didn’t want involved in my life. I wanted nothing to do with them as much as possible. She stayed and was persistent for so long and I had other coppers coming and going, but she still stayed there all the time. So you have more of a relationship with her. So I just found myself able to talk to her better then. I just had a better relationship with her because we had known each other for many, many years’. Carl

Janet also reflects that being a woman also helped to break down barriers between her and Carl in particular.

‘I think possibly being a female had an advantage with Carl because certainly he seemed to come into conflict with the male colleagues, perhaps that is because the majority of the officers who were arresting him and dealing with him in the justice system before were male’. Janet

This relationship is one which would be categorised as a functional relationship. Both describe it as a ‘working relationship’, which from Janet’s perspective exists purely to ensure compliance, enforcement and supporting offenders to change. From Carl’s perspective it exists to prevent him being ‘breached for non-compliance’. In this type of relationship the choice about whether or not to develop a relationship with the police was influenced by what was expected of the offender, and what they think they should do to avoid further interference or enforcement. This is borne out by the fact that Carl would not engage with Janet on a voluntary basis when he was a non-statutory offender.

‘There were obviously periods when he wasn’t under supervision, so you know Carl being Carl if he didn’t have to engage he wouldn’t’. Janet
Interestingly, both recognised that the power differential in their relationship was in favour of Janet as the police officer in this relationship:

‘Because it is an enforceable process, you know I was always frank with him and told him how the land lied if we were sort of talking about offences in the past and things like that. No I think that I didn’t dictate to Carl but the power shift was obviously, as someone who represents the police and a supervision agency that the power was held on my side of the fence’. Janet

Carl was quite firm and reflected that if Janet had used her powers repetitively, they would not have had a relationship at all. In fact Carl talks about how important it was to their relationship that Janet did not enforce the serving of a shop banning notice on him:

‘The EBAC scheme they had to serve you with papers for you to abide by…Janet would say, I’m not going to do that because it would jeopardise my relationship with you as a your prolific offender officer even though my boss is asking me to give it to you. She said how can I carry on working with you when I am forcing papers on you which you are refusing to sign’. Carl

In regards to perceptions, Janet would want Carl to say that he valued the advice and support he received from her and that this helped him to think differently about his future. She also wanted him to say that he respected the way she worked and that she treated him as a person. Like many of the other relationships in this study, this too was an accurate perception. Carl stated that Janet ‘deserved respect’ because she had respected him, and that he also appreciated the help and support she had given him.

‘Janet always played the good cop it felt like to me. She was open minded… I always felt that she wanted to help me….even if something had happened and it had jeopardised my license or something’. Carl

He also stated that without Janet, the scheme and his previous probation officer he ‘would not be here today’.

Carl jokingly would have wanted Janet to say that he was ‘charming and perfect’, but actually he thought that she would say that he was challenging to work with, but when he did set himself to change he did this really well. Likewise Janet did recognise how challenging her relationship was with Carl, but she did see great potential in him and reflected times where he had done really well. A positive example she offered was when Carl became a father for the first time.
Whilst this relationship was not necessarily warm which is likely to be due to Carl’s substantial mistrust of the police and Janet’s ‘working relationship’ approach, it was still a highly functioning relationship which was not derailed by either an underlying threat of enforcement or unequal power differentials.

‘I wouldn’t say we had an amazing relationship – but out of all of the police officers that I have worked with she was the most, you know she got me…. I don’t feel she ever crossed the line and took the piss out of me you know’. Carl

‘Carl is who he is, warts and all and I felt that the relationship that I had with him was probably a marked improvement on what had ever been done before’. Janet

**Message to Carl:** Try and keep focused on the positive things that (you) can do and the things that (you) can achieve and have belief in (yourself) and…think before (you) act….Never be afraid to ask people who are close to (you) for help.

**Message to Janet** Good luck with you career, I’m sure that she will do fine. She looks good for her age (laughs) and that’s it you know.

### 6.12 Conclusion on findings

Overall, all of the participants in this study would describe their relationship with each other as more in keeping with ‘friend’ than ‘foe’. As described previously there were examples from both police officers and offenders where this was certainly not the case. On these occasions the relationship had not formed because the offender was neither willing, nor able to move beyond the fact that the support was coming from a police officer, or something had occurred within the relationship where trust had broken down. Whilst all of these relationships were situated within highly structured boundaries, they did differ in character in much the same way that relationships do in a wider societal context. To simply call these relationships ‘working relationships’ does not reflect the complexity or diversity that exists within them. Likewise applying the term ‘correctional relationship’ gives only an indicator of the environment and external constraints placed on the relationships themselves, not the rich relational experience or the type of interconnectedness which occurs.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This concluding chapter will draw together the main theoretical themes presented in previous chapters, along with the findings of the study in order to present theories which can be used to understand the police and offender relationship within IOM. In addition, this final chapter will bring this thesis to a close by summarising the main findings and implications of the study, before making suggestions for future research.

7.2 Discussion

In the introductory chapters, it was specified that this exploratory study would be theoretically grounded using Procedural Justice Theory and Desistance Theory. In addition, the ‘care versus control’ concept and ‘polibration’ were identified as valuable ways of conceptualising the nature of the police officer and offender relationship within IOM. In this discussion, the findings of this study will be focused on both the theoretical and conceptual framework in order to identify the most useful theories for understanding these relationships.

In considering the theoretical framework first, the findings of this study indicate that the relationships examined have resonance with both Desistance Theory and Procedural Justice Theory. Desistance Theory is perhaps best understood as part of the individual’s journey towards successful reintegration within the community (Uggen, Manza & Thompson in McNeill, 2012, p.13). Rehabilitation is therefore not just about ‘sorting out’ the individual’s readiness for or fitness for reintegration, it is as much about rebuilding social relationships without which reintegration is impossible. Therefore any would-be supporter of offender desistance has to do more than simply support offenders, they need to mediate relationships between people trying to change and the communities in which change is impeded or impelled (McNeill, 2012, p.13). Evidenced within this study are numerous occasions where police offender managers either mediated with family members on behalf of their offenders or included partners or family members on the scheme. In addition, the support offered by police officers in this study was wholly focused on an offenders’ criminogenic needs, which offenders noted supported their reintegration. Findings of this nature indicate that the police offender managers in IOM work proactively to build social capital which is desistance.
focused, rather than offending focused which Farrall (2004, p.72) notes will have a greater chance of increasing the likelihood of offenders desisting from crime. Furthermore, research into police history and culture often cites the unique role that the police play in serving the community (Nelkin, 2007, p.141). Often referred to as ‘policing with consent’ or ‘the thin blue line’, the relationship between the police and the community often situates the police officer as the conduit between those who break the law and the community in which the offender needs to reintegrate back into. In relation to this, the findings of this study indicate that offenders were surprised that the police were working in this capacity which had the effect of projecting a positive pro-social message onto the offender. Showing offenders that police officers believe they can change and that they are worthy of their investment in time, resources and support had the effect of building positive, supportive and trusting relationships. Having historically been a ‘foe’ rather than a ‘friend’, this non-traditional police relationship not only changed the offender’s attitudes towards their police offender manager, it also positively altered negative views they held about the police population as a whole.

Desistance theory also advocates the importance of building human capital in offenders which includes influencing internal narratives, building confidence, listening, supporting, increasing self-esteem and encouraging self-reflection that they are the agent of change (Fenton, 2013, p.77). In this study police officers noted the importance of not only believing an offender can change, but using this belief as a tool for encouraging the offender to believe it themselves. Whilst the police officers voiced uncertainty and even opposition that the relationship itself should be used to encourage change in the offender, voicing preference instead for the case-manager / intervention approach (Hough, 2010, p.17), what was apparent within the findings of this study was that the relationship did act to encourage personal change in the offender, which has more resonance with a therapeutic relationship model where the relationship is the intervention (Hough, 2010, p.17). Whilst strict boundaries and the way in which the relationship was contextualised by police officers contributed towards this perspective, examples where childhood sexual abuse were disclosed, privileged invitations to weddings and births were offered and offenders defended their relationships to offending peers demonstrates that conducive conditions had been created for more meaningful therapeutic relationships to form. Furthermore, the findings from this study also indicate that both police officers and offenders had
overwhelming positive regard for their relationships, both noting the significant emotional and practical benefits that their relationships offered for the offenders. Although not all of the relationships were the same in nature, with some being more interpersonal than others and emotional connectedness frequently guarded, overall all relationships explored in this study were authentic, genuine, trusting and respectful. In sum, participants noted that these were ‘good’ relationships. Like Wilkinson’s (2009, p.24) findings in the Doncaster Desistance study, which found that when offenders were in genuinely caring relationships with people looking out for their best interests where they were able to develop positive attitudes towards therapeutic support, so too did offenders in this study. In most cases the offenders saw the importance of using the relationship they had with the police to support their attempts to change. In sum, many of these relationships are therefore recognisable as a therapeutic correctional relationship (Lewis, 2016, p.2).

Considering human capital further, cognitive research with ex-prisoners suggests that long-term persistent offenders tend to lack feelings of agency and expect their lives to be largely determined for them in a fatalistic mind-set that Maruna (2001 in LeBel, Burnett, Maruna & Bushway, 2008, p.136) refers to as being ‘doomed to deviance’. Yet, other research shows that desisting offenders maintain a distinctly optimistic sense of control over their future and hold strong internal beliefs about their own self-worth and personal destinies (Maruna 2001, in LeBel, Burnett, Maruna & Bushway, 2008, p.136). Furthermore, LeBel and others (2008, p.155) found evidence for offenders believing that they were the agent of their own destiny, adopting a positive mind over matter approach. Interestingly, the findings of this study also support a distinctly optimistic outlook with numerous offenders in the study recognising the power they had to change their own lives, irrespective of their relationships with the police or their interactions with the IOM scheme. There were also few examples of a fatalistic or deviant offender narrative within this study which supports other research into IOM which finds that schemes of this nature support primary desistance (Farrall et al, 2007, p.352, Williams & Ariel, 2012).

In sum, as King (2012, p.318) notes the central challenge for would-be desisters is to develop the necessary personal and social strategies which will enable them to move away from crime and reintegrate into mainstream society. In recognising the complexity involved in an offender successfully desisting from crime, this study
presents a tentative conclusion that the police and offender relationship has many of
the characteristics needed to support desistance, especially in relation to building both
human and social capital in the offender. However, without a bespoke research study
which explores these relationships specifically in relation to desistance from offending,
framed within a methodologically superior research framework, this conclusion must
be considered indicative only.

Moving on, Procedural Justice Theory offers a social psychological perspective which
examines the perceived fairness of a process and the subsequent behaviour or
attitude which results from this assessment (Lind & Tyler, 1988, p.30). In a justice
setting, this theory can be used to explain compliance with institutional authorities
(Hough, Jackson, Bradford, Myhill & Quinton, 2010, p.2). Compliance therefore relies
on the relationships developed between the treatment individuals receive at the hands
of the police and their resulting perception of trust, legitimacy and authority which
consequently affect an individual’s preparedness to obey the police, comply with the
law or cooperate with justice (Hough et al, 2010, p.2). In relation to the findings of this
study, offenders shared several examples where police officers within IOM had used
illegitimate methods of gathering intelligence which had negatively affected trust and
resulted in feelings of anger and unfairness. As a result the legitimacy of policing in
general, but more crucially in IOM was challenged. This resulted in displays of
negative attitudes and examples of behaviours which had the opposite effect of
supporting compliance with the law. In these instances, the positive desistance
supporting effects that the relationships offered as outlined above were lost. Whilst a
small gain might be the intelligence gathered from such an act, a more considerable
loss will be the relationship itself.

Furthermore, Procedural Justice Theory also concerns itself with the perceived
fairness of a process which is judged by the quality of the decision made, the quality
of the treatment and the trustworthiness of the authority carrying it out (Tyler &
Waksilak, 2006, p. 255). In this regard, the findings of this study indicate that both
police officers and offenders acknowledged the importance of communicating in such
a way as to be open, honest and transparent so that the offender genuinely believed
they wanted to help and could be trusted. This was an effective approach as offenders
frequently noted these characteristics in their relationships, commenting that this was
a valuable way of achieving positive outcomes for them. Furthermore, honesty and
trustworthiness were also significant in supporting improved compliance, not just with community orders or offender supervision, but with the law and police requirements. For example, offenders frequently handed themselves in to their IOM officers when they were wanted on warrant.

To conclude this brief discussion on Procedural Justice Theory, it was argued in the opening chapters that the relationship itself could be used to increase compliance with the law. One suggestion was that the relationship could be used to undertake regular and routine enforcement relating to IOM offenders. Whilst this study shows that many of the activities and characteristics of the police and offender relationship fit procedural justice approaches, wide scale implementation of an enforcement approach would be harmful. Both police officers and particularly offenders in this study held fervent views that altering these relationships to concentrate more on enforcement would result in reduced intelligence, ineffective relationships and a lack of engagement. Whilst the offenders noted that monitoring and surveillance were factors which were likely to reduce their offending, they did not equate this activity with their police offender manager in IOM so to create a safe distance between 'us and them', (us being police offender manager in IOM / them being the general police). This safe distance allowed the offender to justify the creation of a relationship with a person who had historically been an adversarial opponent in their life. Whilst infrequent enforcement could be justified by both the police officer and the offender, with relationships being repaired on these occasions, routine enforcement would be detrimental. Furthermore, police offender managers within IOM are increasing procedural justice compliance for the general police population as all offenders noted that their positive relationships with the police in IOM had changed their negative view of the police population in general, as well as their willingness to engage with them. A full enforcement approach would therefore not only reduce desistance gains, it would also negatively reduce procedural justice compliance with the general police population.

Considering the concept of ‘care versus control’ next, the relationships examined in this thesis are used as a tool to ensure compliance with the law and used to support offender change. It could be said therefore, that this is a useful concept in which to explore these relationships. In support, this study found that both police officers and offenders raised no objections to this dual focus, recognising that it could be successfully navigated by them both. Furthermore, being a police officer did not
present a barrier. With that said, the ‘care versus control’ construct is too conceptually narrow to be used as a complete tool for understanding the dynamics which exist in these relationships. This study demonstrates that these living relationships are both ‘messy’ and complex, with both police officers and offenders negotiating their involvement with each other on a continual basis. Whilst characteristics such as trust, respect and regard seemed to remain relatively stable, they were not immune to continual challenge based on complex variables such as value judgements, risk assessments and operational demands for police officers, as well as the changing social and criminological context for the offenders. In practice, what worked in these relationships one day did not always work the next. Furthermore, ‘care versus control’ was not as problematic for practitioners as initially anticipated because it was not conceptualised by them in this way. Relationships were just that; interactions between two people who share a connection, not simply between roles which demark individuals as either ‘cops’ or ‘robbers’ or within a practice model which required either ‘care’ or ‘control’.

Returning again to McCulloch’s (2005, p.17) earlier comments, which recognise the tensions that can exist between welfare and offence-focused work for both academics and the political community, which she found to be less problematic for both workers and probationers, the same can be said about the findings of this study. Furthermore, in keeping with the auto-ethnographical aim of this study, the ‘care versus control’ concept can also be used to explore the challenges which can exist within the practitioner / researcher relationship also. To explain: Williams (2006, p.35) presents a compelling case about how the ‘us versus them’ problem, especially in criminology can be considered. Williams recognises the ordinary experiential self wants to connect with offenders as people, while the professional self with its well-crafted and solid rationale through many years of formal socialisation, continually wants to disconnect from them. It is interesting to reflect that on a personal, academic and professional level I wanted to connect with the offenders whom I had relationships with, however organisationally I often felt the professional need to disconnect from them, especially where role requirements, attitudes and operational practices ran counter to the aim of rehabilitating and resettling offenders. This ‘rub’ was first introduced to me theoretically in the ‘care versus control’ work of Moore and colleagues (Moore, et al, 2006). Whilst this had the effect of presenting a concept to work from academically and seemed to
explain the ‘rub’ sufficiently, on reflection it created tension between both the roles of researcher and practitioner. In practice, I felt able to successfully manage care and control in the relationships I had with my offenders, but once I was aware of the ‘care versus control’ concept academically I looked more deeply at my relationships expecting to be able to demark them as such. Where I was unable to do this, internal conflict emerged. ‘Care versus control’ was therefore more problematic within my role as a researcher than it was in my role as a practitioner. Returning again to Williams’ (2006, p.35) ‘us and them’ argument, he goes on to say that it is important within studies about offender rehabilitation that both voices are empowered, despite a widespread tendency to silence the personal voice or to dismiss it as being inferior, subjective and therefore a contaminant to social science research and practice. Therefore, reflecting on the findings of this study along with the experience of being both a practitioner and a researcher, it is important to conclude that research which shares both a researcher and practitioner role must be well designed and reflective enough to ensure that assumptions made in one role are neither dominant over the other or unfairly solidified within our research. In sum, although ‘care verses control’ is useful in this context, it should not predominate our conceptual parameters in understanding these relationships simply because the researcher presented this theme within the study.

Unlike ‘care versus control’, the concept of ‘Polibation’ (Nash, 1999) was useful in explaining and understanding elements of relational practice and theoretically valuable within the chosen framework. Furthermore, it offered congruence within the practitioner and researcher role, with findings from practice being reflected in the findings of this study. Quite clearly police officers adopted many of the same relational strategies as probation officers and they too had to manage many of the same challenges of welfare, enforcement and risk management. Likewise, the practice of police officers delivering reports to court offered a practical example of how both roles in this multi-agency setting have merged. However, in its truest sense it cannot be said that ‘polibation’ has fully occurred. Instead police officers within this study undertook roles consummate with various other professionals, notably housing officers, social workers and mental health practitioners as well as probation officers. In fact it was fascinating how much divergence there was between each participants understanding of the police role. In this study participants described the police offender manager role
as more multi-disciplinary in nature, working with offenders on their criminogenic needs and acting to plug the gap in multi-agency deficiencies. This practice, established perceptions that police officers in IOM were neither ‘traditional’ police officers or like ‘them’ (the wider police force). However, underneath this perception offenders recognised that they were always ‘real’ police officers, which in spite of these assumed roles were still able to use the powers bestowed upon them. From a partnership perspective therefore, the police role in IOM could be said to be reducing the demand on other services. However, to be fully effective police officers reflected that improvements needed to be made in relation to multi-agency commitments to IOM to reduce the time they were drawn away from their work. Paradoxically though it was this multi-disciplinary work which built the relationships and provided benefit for the offender. Whilst an increase in professional knowledge and involvement within IOM would benefit police officers, especially in areas such as mental health as demonstrated in other studies (McLean, Marshal, 2010, p.69), given the important desistance and compliance gains from the development of relationships between police officers and offenders within IOM, further consideration ought to be given to this point to ensure the relationship is maintained.

7.3 Research Implications.

Given the nature of the qualification applied for it is equally important to reflect on the implications of these findings for practice, policy and research. Considering practice first, this study details the important desistance gains which result when police officers develop supportive, trusting and positive relationships with their offenders. Conversely, police officers operating outside of these parameters in ways which are both illegitimate and unfairly perceived by the offender risk harming these positive gains as they challenge trust and legitimacy, as well as the authority of both the police officer and the IOM scheme. Care should therefore be taken to create conducive conditions so that positive relationships can flourish. Whilst in practice this might be difficult, the challenge is to avoid the recruitment of police officers into IOM who do not display pro-social attitudes or wish to use the role as a subversive way of ‘catching and convicting’ offenders. Furthermore, IOM and the police offender management role should be altered conceptually to include the relational approach to offender management. Clarifying this would reduce criminal justice strategies such as the use of electronic monitoring equipment (Nellis & Bengerfeldt, 2013, p.290), which may be
implemented counterintuitively and should also help to demystify the relationship and improve its acceptance within the policing context. Overall, the findings from this study should be used to assist police officers in their work by further developing these principles in practice, so that the best possible results are achieved from these relationships.

In relation to policy, the most recent joint inspection of IOM conducted in 2014 stated that ‘police officers working in this environment should have some knowledge of the theories and practices associated with assisting an offender to achieve desistance, but their principal role should be gathering and disseminating intelligence and enforcement’ (HMIP & HMIC, 2014, p.8). Whilst, the importance of gathering intelligence was clearly reflected by police officers within this study, all participants were adamant that repeated enforcement within the relationship would diminish desistance gains, reduce trust and damage pro-social relationships. This policy statement and the findings of this study are therefore conflicting. Arguably the emphasis on the ‘principal’ role of the police within IOM should be reviewed in light of this study. Whilst it might be politically challenging and seemingly at odds with the traditional aims of policing and crime control strategies, police officers within this study have shown that they can successfully navigate the difficult task of managing care and control and therefore policies need to accurately reflect this fine balance without dictating which should be predominant.

In relation to the implications for research, this inductive social science enquiry has uncovered important theoretical insights about the social world around us, whilst generating new knowledge (Maxfield & Babbie, 2006, p.61, Petty, Thomson & Stew, 2012, p.267). Firstly, this study has made a unique contribution to research by extending our understanding of ‘policing’ by situating the practice of police officers working within IOM within a relational and offender supervision context. The implications of this approach open up further avenues of exploration around the changing nature of policing not only in light of the transforming rehabilitation agenda, but within an alternative criminological landscape where police officers rehabilitate offenders. Secondly, this research builds on and expands more recent studies within IOM which note the important desistance gains that the police and offender relationship within IOM produces (Farrall et al, 2007, p.352, Williams & Ariel, 2012). Thirdly, the findings of this study offer a fresh perspective on multi-agency working.
Whilst ‘polibation’ was not borne out in this study, the conceptual idea of ‘polibation’ where professionals morph into other roles shared by their colleagues from other agencies was present. In this context the findings indicate that police officers operated a mixed economy of practice within the multi-agency setting. However, rather than this having a negative effect it was one of the contributing factors that built ‘good’ relationships. The research implications of this finding therefore need to be further considered with a ‘fresh’ look at multi-agency work. Lastly, research and the data it produces should be the life blood of social, political and procedural change (Denzin & Giardina, 2009, p.12), inspiring and enabling action (Murray, Pushor & Renihan, 2011, p.46). It is therefore a necessity to contextualise both the IOM police role and police offender supervision within a wider criminological context. Consequently considering the findings of this study as a whole, the relationships developed between police officers and offenders within IOM ought to become an intrinsic aspect of the scheme, with future research about IOM including the ‘additionality’ that the police / offender relationship contributes.

7.4 Future Research

In effect, the exploratory nature of this study has generated many more research questions than it has answered. Building on from the findings of this study, further research which examines specifically whether or not the relationship developed between police officer and offender within IOM supports or encourages desistance from offending would be beneficial. Whilst this study presents a tentative finding of this association, it was not designed as a desistance study and therefore a longitudinal study which would map the offender’s journey towards desistance in comparison to how their relationship with their police offender manager is functioning would be advantageous. Likewise, Lloyd and Serin (2012, p.556) make the point that our current understanding of crime and rehabilitation has primarily emerged from a risk-focused perspective, therefore by assessing offender desistance beliefs treatment can be more effectively designed, more easily anticipated and offenders particularly poised for desistance identified. In further supporting a desistance approach to future research, IOM would also benefit more generally from research which includes offender’s attitudes and beliefs about desistance so to encourage a more effective response. In addition research which deals with police offender manager beliefs about change and their attitudes to endorsing theories of change in offenders within a methodological
framework which supports the offender experience, would further expose the effect that negative attitudes and beliefs have on offender behaviour. Subsequently, a study of this nature would highlight the importance of recruiting police officers into post who display pro-social attitudes, so to avoid behaviours which would be counterintuitive to both the IOM role and an offender’s desistance journey. Whilst this study found that the relationships did show a degree of being ‘offender led’, in that on limited occasions the police officer encouraged the offender to negotiate actions within the relationship, research shows that supporting an offender as an agent of change greatly assists desistance from crime (Laub & Sampson, 2001, p.27). Given that this approach was both sporadic and informal specific research on this subject would explore the impact that this approach has on desistance.

In a parallel context, there is also a need to further explore other police roles which fit the offender management structure. Work in this area would broaden current research into police culture and represent the experience of ‘being’ a police officer more completely. Considering the police role further, one significant omission from this study relates to the police offender manager’s relationships with the victims of IOM offenders. This area of research should be further explored in order to grow this work more holistically. Whilst Atterbury (2007 p.45) would advocate for the importance of ensuring that offender managers do not have dual contact with the offender and the victim in case it presents a conflict of interest, little is known about the police offender managers interaction with the victims of their offenders. Questions about what interactions they have with victims, what is communicated about the victims to their offenders, how the details of the offence and the harm caused to the victim are framed and how prevalent access to restorative justice is through police offender managers in IOM are just a few further avenues of future exploration.

Lastly, due to sampling difficulties in this study gender did not feature as prominently as it should have. With the same being said for ethnicity and other demographic variables. Future research should therefore attend to this exclusion so that relationships between police officers and offenders can be more completely understood.
7.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study finds that the relationships developed between police officers and offenders within IOM reflects the complexity of all relationships within a sociological context. Like all social interactions, these relationships were clearly divisible into numerous different typologies characterised by how behaviourally interdependent they were. Within the study there were examples of functional, interpersonal and familiar relationships, as well as shared examples of relationships which did not form because of the adversarial barriers that exist between police officers and offenders. Appropriately, all relationships within the study exhibited strict boundaries which prevented close relationships forming. In contrast however, what is distinctive about these relationships is the correctional circumstance in which they form, specifically within the policing context. Whilst this study finds that the police officer and offender relationship within IOM shares similar conceptual parameters as other correctional relationships, notably the offender / probation officer relationship whereby professionals manage both ‘care and control’ and undertake multi-disciplinary roles, within policing these relationships and the offender supervision role are unique. Although offender management in its broadest sense within the policing context is not new, as demonstrated in sex offender management and the management of police targets within neighbourhood policing, arguably these relationships differ in their level of closeness and offer a new dimension to the varied role of ‘policing’. Furthermore, not only do these relationships indicate that police officers in IOM are working with offenders to support positive change, this study also finds that some relationships were in themselves offering a therapeutic intervention. It is important to note that these relationships have grown organically without formal training or a requirement within a role description, guided only by the ethos of rehabilitating and resettling offenders. Considering these findings within wider criminological discourse it is argued that police offender managers within IOM are rehabilitative, in that they are operating within an offender supervision role rather than an offender management role which focuses on desistance from offending not simply offending. Moreover, these relationships contribute towards what Robinson and Raynor (2006, p.336) describe as ‘relational rehabilitation’, where ‘treatment’ is not applied by ‘experts’ but negotiated through relationships with significant others. They argue that in this relational process successful rehabilitation occurs.
Controversially what seemed to be the most provocative aspect of this study, namely; police officers developing relationships with offenders should now be considered in contrast. Opponents have argued that these relationships threaten the organisational aims of both the police and IOM, whereas this study has found that positive, trusting and caring relationships have developed which support both compliance with the law and offenders efforts to desist from offending. Whilst work is needed to recognise this important contribution to practice, policy and research, irrespective of desistance gains and the association between these relationships and reductions in reoffending, the message from this study should be clear; Police officers and offenders value their relationships with each other. Not only this, they both benefit. Faced with the difficult challenge of turning their lives around and desisting from offending, persistent offenders supported by the IOM scheme would much rather do this with the trust, warmth and support of the police rather than without it. Care should therefore be taken to recognise, promote and protect these special relationships.

7.6 Summary of Key Findings

- The general nature of the relationships explored in this study were both amenable and positive. All participants saw the value in the relationships and stated that the success of the scheme relied on the development of good relationships.

- Police officer and offender relationships within the study had many of the characteristics needed to support desistance, especially in relation to building both human and social capital in the offender.

- The relationships developed between police officers and offenders within IOM reflect the complexity of all relationships within a sociological context and could be divided into numerous different typologies, characterised by how behaviourally interdependent they were.

- Despite police officers voicing how uncomfortable they were about using the relationship itself to encourage offender change, many of the relationships could be described as offering a therapeutic correctional relationship.

- Participants disclosed examples of less positive relationships which had failed to succeed due to the police / offender barrier, a lack of trust being developed and poor communication. In addition the use of illegitimate methods of
gathering intelligence and increased use of enforcement within the police offender relationship negatively challenged the legitimacy of policing. This had the opposite effect of supporting compliance with the law and jeopardised the positive desistance supporting effect of the relationship.

- The ‘care versus control’ construct was too conceptually narrow to be used as a complete tool for understanding the dynamics which exist in these relationships.
- The police offender manager role within this study was more multi-disciplinary in nature, whereby police officers worked with offenders on their criminogenic needs and acted to plug the gap in multi-agency deficiencies.
- Research which shares both a researcher and practitioner role must be well designed and reflective enough to ensure that assumptions made in one role are neither dominant over the other nor unfairly solidified within research.
- Association between reoffending and the police and offender relationship within IOM was unclear. Participants reflected that offenders had to be in a place of change and be willing to accept help before desistance could occur.
- Trust was the most reoccurring and important theme within the study. In addition a trusting relationship with the police in IOM, improved attitudes and relationships between the offenders and the general police population which has implications for procedural justice compliance.
- There was a significant acknowledgement that the police role in IOM was not a ‘traditional’ way of policing, with all participants conceptualising the police role in various different ways. Although all offenders knew the police in IOM were ultimately police officers.
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Interview Schedule – Police Officers

Study Title: Exploring police and ex-offender relationships on Integrated Offender Management.

General

- Role?
- How long IOM/PPO?
- Experience?
- How did you come into this role?
- What do you understand about the police role in IOM?

The Police Role

- Tell me about your experience working with offenders in IOM generally?
- What do you think about police officers working in this role?
- Should police officers work in this capacity?
- What are the positives?
- What are the negatives?
- What are the challenges?
- What are the rewards?
- What does it mean to working in this way?
- What messages do you receive from the organisation about working in this way?
- How do you feel about the term relationship to describe the way in which you work with your offenders?
- What does the term relationship in this capacity mean to you?
- What are your relationships like with your offenders generally?
- What words would you use to describe these relationships?
- What happens in these relationships?
- What is the aim of developing these relationships?
- What reactions do you get from your offenders about you working in this way?
- How do you manage these relationships?
- Are police officers the best profession to be fulfilling offender’s needs in this way?
- What is the most important thing about these relationships?
- What is the least important thing about these relationships?
- Does this relationship have any influence on offending?
- What do you say to your peers about your relationship with your offenders?
- Thinking about it from an offenders perspective, what do you think they think about working with you in this way?
• What labels do you give to your offenders?
• Are there any conflicts or dilemmas for police officers working in this role?
• In regards of your experience of police officers working in IOM, have you changed the way you think about offenders or about offending in general?
• What sort of person should be doing the police OM role?
• If you could give all offenders in IOM any message what would it be?
• What impact does the relationship you have with your offender have on your attitudes? Behaviours?
• When is the best time for a police officer in IOM to work with an offender?
• Do you prefer to work with statutory or non-statutory offenders?
• What boundaries are there in these relationships?
• What barriers are there?
• Who holds the power in these relationships? (stat/non-stat)
• What challenges are there to these relationships?

Please rate these statements (Linkert Scale)
(Strongly agree, agree, neither agree/disagree, disagree, strongly disagree)

• Police officers working in IOM are more lenient
• Police officers working in IOM are more tolerant
• Police officers working in IOM are less accountable
• Police officers working in IOM are more understanding
• Police officers working in IOM are trustworthy
• Police officers working in IOM are not like regular police officers
• Police officers working in IOM are less professional than other police officers

**Your Current Relationship**

• How many different offenders do you work with?
• Tell me about your relationship with……...(name of offender who recruited).
• What do you think about this offender?
• What do you think about the word relationship to describe the way in which you interact with him/her?
• What words would you use to describe this particular relationship?
• What messages do you receive from this particular offender about your relationship with them?
• How do you work with this particular offender?
• On a scale of 1 – 10 (One being Very Bad – 10 being Brilliant) How good would you say this relationship is?
- Who holds the power in this relationship?
- What works with this offender?
- What do you get out of working with them?
- What doesn’t work with this relationship?
- Would you change anything about this relationship?
- Thinking back over all of the relationships you have had with offenders on IOM, have there been differences?
- What would you want your offender to say about you?
- If you could give this offender a message what would it be? And why?
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Interview Schedule - Offenders

Study Title: Exploring police and ex-offender relationships on Integrated Offender Management.

General

- Stat/Non Stat?
- Age
- Gender
- How long on IOM/PPO?
- What do you understand about the police role in IOM?

The Police Role

- Tell me about your experience of police officers on IOM generally?
- What do you think about police officers working in this role?
- Should police officers work in this capacity?
- What does it mean to you to have a police officer working in this way?
- What messages do you receive from the fact that a police officer works with you in this way?
- How do you feel about the term relationship in regards to the way in which you work with your police offender manager?
- What does the term relationship in this capacity mean to you?
- What words would you use to describe these relationships?
- What should you get from your police offender manager?
- How should they give you what you need?
- Are they the best profession to fulfil your needs?
- What is the most important thing about these relationships?
- What is the least important thing about these relationships?
- Does this relationship have any influence on offending?
- What do you say to your peers about your relationship with a police officer?
- Thinking about it from a police officer’s perspective, what do you think they think about working with ex-offenders in this way?
- What label do you give to your Police OM?
- What would happen if others found out that you were working with a police officer?
- Are there any conflicts or dilemmas for police officers working in this role?
- In regards of your experience of police officers working in IOM, have you changed the way you think about police officers or the police service in general?
- What sort of person should be doing the police OM role?
If you could give all of the police officers working in this capacity any message what would it be?

What impact does the relationship you have with your Police OM have on your attitudes? Behaviours? Offending?

When is the best time for a police officer in IOM to work with you?

If stat/ would you ever work with a police officer when non-stat?

What boundaries are there?

What barriers are there?

Who holds the power in these relationships? (stat/non-stat)

Please rate these statements (Linkert Scale)

(Strongly agree, agree, neither agree/disagree, disagree, strongly disagree)

- Police officers working in IOM are more lenient
- Police officers working in IOM are more tolerant
- Police officers working in IOM are less accountable
- Police officers working in IOM are more understanding
- Police officers working in IOM are trustworthy
- Police officers working in IOM are not like regular police officers
- Police officers working in IOM are less professional that other police officers

Your Current Relationship

- How many different police offender managers have you had?
- Tell me about your relationship with your current police offender manager on IOM?
- What do you think about your current police OM?
- What do you think about the word relationship to describe the way in which you interact with each other?
- What words would you use to describe this particular relationship?
- What messages do you receive from your police OM?
- How does your police offender manager work with you?
- On a scale of 1 – 10 (One being Very Bad – 10 being Brilliant) How good would you say your relationship is?
- Who holds the power in this particular relationship?
- What works with your current police OM?
- What do you get out of it?
- What doesn’t work with your current police OM?
- Would you change anything about your current police offender manager?
• Thinking back over all of the police officers you have worked with on IOM, have there been differences?
• What would you want your police offender manager to say about you?
• If you could give your current police offender manager a message what would it be? And why?
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Participant Information Sheet – Police Officers

**Researcher:** Davina Cull  
**Supervisor:** Professor Mike Nash  
Institute of Criminal Justice Studies  
Ravelin House, Museum Road, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO1 2QQ – 02392 843933

**Study Title:** Exploring police and offender relationships within Integrated Offender Management.  
**REC Ref No:** 12/13:28

I would like to invite you to take part in my research study. Before you decide, I would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it involves. Talk to others about the study if you wish and please ask me if there is anything that is not clear.

This study aims to explore the relationships that offenders have with police officers within Integrated Offender Management. The study is exploratory which means that I am interested in finding out what is happening in these relationships.

Before you read on it is important that I introduce myself. My name is Davina Cull and I am currently studying for a Professional Doctorate in Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Portsmouth. This study forms part of my assessment and will be written up as a thesis. This particular type of qualification exists to support professional development and therefore it is also important that I tell you that I am also a police officer who works in Integrated Offender Management. However for the purpose of this study I am separating these roles and conducting this study as a
student researcher. What this means in practice is that like all other professionals, researchers included, I have a duty to deal with issues relating to serious harm, safeguarding and admissions of offending, meaning that I am duty bound to pass on this type of information to the police. I will not however be passing on any other information to the police or other parties which falls outside of this remit.

**What is the purpose of the study?**
The purpose of this study is to contribute towards existing research about Integrated Offender Management and to form part of my assessment for a Doctorate in Criminal Justice Studies.

**Why have I been invited?**
You have either been invited to take part in this study by one of the offenders who you work with, or you have been recruited following a conversation held at your place of work with me about taking part in this study. You have also been asked because you are currently a police officer working within Integrated Offender Management. I aim to recruit at least 12 participants, 6 offenders and 6 police officers, which will ideally be arranged into pairs of police officers and offenders who currently work together.

**Do I have to take part?**
Taking part in this research is entirely voluntary. It is up to you to decide if you want to join the study. I will describe the study and go through this information sheet with you. If you agree to take part, I will then ask you to sign a consent form.

**What will happen to me if I take part?**
You will be asked to take part in a digitally recorded interview which will last between one hour and one hour and a half. I will be the interviewer. The questions will ask you about what you think of police officers and offender relationships generally, as well as what you think about police officer and offender relationships within Integrated Offender Management. I will also ask you about your experiences working with offenders in this environment, about what works and what does not work. I will also ask you about your relationships with your offenders in IOM generally, as well as your current relationship with the offender who recruited you to this study specifically.
Expenses and payments
There are no expenses or payments associated with this study.

What will I have to do?
As a participant in this study you will be asked to sit with me in a quiet room, free from distractions and talk about your experience. I will use a script with the set questions that I wish to ask, but some discussion will also occur. Together we will choose a suitable venue. I may ask you if we can conduct this interview at your work place. If this is not possible we will together consider other options. If you need transport to a suitable place I will arrange this for you. It is important that we both feel comfortable and safe in the environment we choose and therefore we will discuss this together as we decide a suitable venue.

What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?
Taking part in this study may be inconvenient for you, as it requires you to be interviewed for at least an hour. In addition you could also be identified as having taken part in this study through direct quotes which may become a problem for you. I will however make these quotes as anonymous as possible to prevent this from happening.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?
There are no direct benefits for taking part in this study. However your participation may help to make things better or create a better understanding of the needs and experiences of police officers working in this capacity.

Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?
This is a confidential study which means that the data collected will be anonymous. This is achieved by assigning a random participant number to your interview transcript and ensuring that the comments you have made are anonymous where ever possible. The code with your participant number will be kept separately from the interview transcripts in a password protected home computer. However if you wish not to be anonymous then this is also possible. Sometimes it is important for people to have their say.
If you join the study, it is possible that some of the data collected will be looked at by authorised persons from the University of Portsmouth. Data may also be looked at by authorised people to check that the study is being carried out correctly. All will have a duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant and will do their best to meet this duty.

Your confidentiality will be safeguarded during and after the study in the following ways.

- Your interview will be digitally recorded and then downloaded from the digital recorder into a sound file which will be kept secure on the hard drive of my home computer. This computer is password protected. This sound file will be deleted from my computer once my thesis has been assessed which will be in approximately two years’ time. The sound file recorded on the digital recorder will be destroyed once it is stored safely on my computer.

- Each interview will be written up into a transcript. These will be analysed by myself and also kept secure on my home computer until the thesis has been assessed and then these will be destroyed.

- I will not use this data to inform any further study, but do intend to write various academic articles for publication, in addition to my thesis from the data collected.

- You will have the right to check the accuracy of the data held about you, with the opportunity to correct any errors. This will be achieved by asking you once the interview is over if you would like to have a copy of the interview transcript for you to check for accuracy once it is written up.

**What will happen if I don't want to carry on with the study?**

In regards to withdrawing from the study you will be able to withdraw during and after the interview but this must be done before the data is analysed. This is because it will be difficult to isolate your particular contribution from the analysis at this stage.

**What if there is a problem?**

If you have a concern about any aspect of this study you should ask to speak to me or to my supervisor Professor Mike Nash. We will do our best to answer your
questions. If you would like to speak to Professor Nash, his contact details can be found on the first page of this document. If you remain unhappy and wish to complain formally, you can do so by contacting the director of the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Portsmouth, Professor Stephen Savage with the same address as before.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The results of this study will be collated into a document forming my thesis. A copy of which will be held in the library at the University of Portsmouth. From this original document it is hoped that the findings will used to write smaller papers with the aim of publishing these in academic journals. In addition the findings of this study will also be given to interested parties, such as the police service to help them consider current practice. The police will have the same access to information as if it were being published. You will not be identified in any report or publication. Your participation remains anonymous unless you state otherwise.

Who is organising and funding the research?

This research is being sponsored by the University of Portsmouth. There is no financial gain attached to this research.

Who has reviewed the study?

Research in the University of Portsmouth is looked at by an independent group of people called a Research Ethics Committee. This is done to protect your interests. This study has been reviewed and given a favourable opinion by the Research Ethics Committee on 3rd of December 2013.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet. If you decide to take part in this study then you will be given a copy of this information sheet for you to keep. If you agree to take part in this study your signed consent will be sought.

Many thanks for your time in this matter.

Davina Cull
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Participant Information Sheet -
Ex-Offender

Researcher: Davina Cull

Supervisor: Professor Mike Nash

Institute of Criminal Justice Studies
Ravelin House, Museum Road, Portsmouth, Hampshire, PO1 2QQ – 02392 843933

Study Title: Exploring police and offender relationships within Integrated Offender Management.

REC Ref No: 12/13:28

I would like to invite you to take part in my research study. Before you decide, I would like you to understand why the research is being done and what it involves. Talk to others about the study if you wish and please ask me if there is anything that is not clear.

This study aims to explore the relationships that offenders have with police officers within Integrated Offender Management. The study is exploratory which means that I am interested in finding out what is happening in these relationships.

Although the title includes the word ‘offender’, it is important for you to know that this is not being used in such a way as to create any particular label, but chosen because it is the most commonly understood term for those managed by Integrated Offender Management. There is also a distinct lack of other descriptive words which could be used instead and therefore the term ‘offender’ will be used throughout this study. I
acknowledge that offending may be something in your past and wherever possible the term ex-offender will be used in favour.

Before you read on it is also important that I introduce myself. My name is Davina Cull and I am currently studying for a Professional Doctorate in Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Portsmouth. This study forms part of my assessment and will be written up as a thesis. This particular type of qualification exists to support professional development and therefore it is also important that I tell you that I am also a police officer who works in Integrated Offender Management. However for the purpose of this study I am separating these roles and conducting this study as a student researcher. What this means in practice is that like all other professionals, researchers included, I have a duty to deal with issues relating to serious harm, safeguarding and admissions of offending, meaning that I am duty bound to pass on this type of information to the police. I will not however be passing on any other information to the police or other parties which falls outside of this remit.

**What is the purpose of the study?**
The purpose of this study is to contribute towards existing research about Integrated Offender Management and to form part of my assessment for a Doctorate in Criminal Justice Studies.

**Why have I been invited?**
You were invited to be part of this study during a conversation we had when I visited local IOM offices to recruit participants. You have also been invited because you are currently included on the Integrated Offender Management cohort. I aim to recruit at least 12 participants, 6 offenders and 6 police officers, which will ideally be arranged as pairs of police officers and offenders who currently work together.

**Do I have to take part?**
Taking part in this research is entirely voluntary. It is up to you to decide if you want to join the study. I will describe the study and go through this information sheet with you. If you agree to take part, I will then ask you to sign a consent form.

**What will happen to me if I take part?**
You will be asked to take part in a digitally recorded interview which will last between one hour and one hour and a half. I will be the interviewer. The questions will ask
you about what you think of police officers and offender relationships generally, as well as what you think about police officer and offender relationships within Integrated Offender Management. I will also ask you about your experiences working with police officers in this environment, about what works and what does not work. I will also ask you about your relationship with your current police offender manager, as well as other police offender managers who you have worked with.

I will also ask you about whether or not you would be willing to approach your police offender manager to ask them if they would be willing to take part in this study as well. There is no obligation for you to do this. I will not tell them what you have said about them, or tell you what they have said about you. I am simply interested in representing these relationships in an interesting way. We will discuss this further.

**Expenses and payments**
There are no expenses or payments associated with this study.

**What will I have to do?**
As a participant in this study you will be asked to sit with me in a quiet room, free from distractions and talk about your experience. I will use a script with set questions that I wish to ask, but some discussion will also occur. Together we will choose a suitable venue. I may ask you if we can conduct the interview at your home address. If this is not possible we will together consider other options. If you need transport to a suitable place I will arrange this for you. It is important that we both feel comfortable and safe in the environment we choose and therefore we will discuss this together as we choose a suitable venue.

**What are the possible disadvantages and risks of taking part?**
Taking part in this study may be inconvenient for you, as it requires you to be interviewed for at least an hour. In addition you could also be identified as having taken part in this study through direct quotes which may become a problem for you. I will however make these quotes as anonymous as possible to prevent this from happening.
What are the possible benefits of taking part?
There are no direct benefits for taking part in this study. However your participation may help to make things better or create a better understanding of the needs and experiences of offenders.

Will my taking part in the study be kept confidential?
This is a confidential study which means that the data collected will be anonymous. This is achieved by assigning a random participant number to your interview transcript and ensuring that the comments you have made are anonymous wherever possible. The code with your participant number will be kept separately from the interview transcripts in a password protected home computer. However if you wish not to be anonymous then this is also possible.

If you join the study, it is possible that some of the data collected will be looked at by authorised persons from the University of Portsmouth. Data may also be looked at by authorised people to check that the study is being carried out correctly. All will have a duty of confidentiality to you as a research participant and will do their best to meet this duty.

Your confidentiality will be safeguarded during and after the study in the following ways.

- Your interview will be digitally recorded and then downloaded from the digital recorder into a sound file which will be kept secure on the hard drive of my home computer. This computer is password protected. This sound file will be deleted from my computer once my thesis has been assessed which will be in approximately two years’ time. The sound file recorded on the digital recorder will be destroyed once it is stored safely on my computer.
- Each interview will be written up into a transcript. These will be analysed by me and also kept secure on my home computer until the thesis has been assessed and then these will be destroyed.
- I will not use this data to inform any further study, but I do intend to write various academic articles for publication, in addition to my thesis, from the data collected.
• You will have the right to check the accuracy of the data held about you, with the opportunity to correct any errors. This will be achieved by asking you once the interview is over if you would like to have a copy of the interview transcript once it is written up.

**What will happen if I don’t want to carry on with the study?**
In regards to withdrawing from the study you will be able to withdraw during and after the interview but this must be done before the data is analysed. This is because it will be difficult to isolate your particular contribution from the analysis at this stage.

**What if there is a problem?**
If you have a concern about any aspect of this study you should ask to speak to me or to my supervisor Professor Mike Nash. We will do our best to answer your questions. If you would like to speak to Professor Nash, his contact details can be found on the first page of this document. If you remain unhappy and wish to complain formally, you can do so by contacting the director of the Institute of Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Portsmouth, Professor Stephen Savage with the same address as before.

**What will happen to the results of the research study?**
The results of this study will be collated into a document forming my thesis. A copy of which will be held in the library at the University of Portsmouth. From this original document it is hoped that the findings will used to write smaller papers with the aim of publishing these in academic journals. In addition the findings of this study will also be given to interested parties, such as the police service to help them to consider current practice. The police will have the same access to information as if it were being published. You will not be identified in any report or publication. Your participation remains anonymous unless you state otherwise.

**Who is organising and funding the research?**
This research is being sponsored by the University of Portsmouth. There is no financial gain attached to this research.

**Who has reviewed the study?**
Research in the University of Portsmouth is looked at by an independent group of people called a Research Ethics Committee. This is done to protect your interests. This study has been reviewed and given a favourable opinion by the Research Ethics Committee on 3rd of December 2013.

Thank you for taking the time to read this information sheet. If you decide to take part in this study then you will be given a copy of this information sheet for you to keep. If you agree to take part in this study your signed consent will be sought.

Many thanks for your time in this matter.

Davina Cull
Appendix 8

Researcher: Davina Cull
Supervisor: Professor Mike Nash

Institute of Criminal Justice Studies
Ravelin House, Museum Road, Portsmouth,
Hampshire, PO1 2QQ – 02392 843933

Study Title: Exploring police and offender relationships on Integrated Offender Management.

Dear Potential Participant

My name is Davina Cull and I am a student researcher at the University of Portsmouth. As part of my Professional Doctorate in Criminal Justice Studies I am conducting a study which seeks to explore the relationships that offenders have with police officers within Integrated Offender Management. I am interested to find out what is going on in these relationships. I therefore currently write to you in the capacity as a student researcher.

I would therefore like to invite you to participate in this research study. You have been given this letter by one of the study participants. They are also an offender that you currently manage. I am interested in recruiting pairs of police officers and offenders that work together for the purpose of this study.

You are under no obligation to participate. Your choice will have no impact, either positive or negative on any working relationship that we might have outside of my role as a researcher.

I enclose a copy of the study information sheet which will give you more information about this study. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and withdrawal is easily facilitated should you choose not to continue to be involved in the study once it has started.

If you would like to take part in this study then I enclose a stamp addressed envelope for return. Alternatively you can contact me via telephone on 07730 929731 or via email at 618658@port.ac.uk. You can also write to me at the above address if you have any questions.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter and I hope to hear back from you soon.

Regards Davina Cull