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Abstract

The Police Service has a strategic priority to improve approaches to progression for under-represented groups; however, it is facing continued challenges for this priority, as there is a lack of progression for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) officers. There are implicit suggestions in policy that increasing BME officers in the police would improve police culture in the form of attenuating the racism that may be creating barriers to recruitment and progression.

Reform efforts have taken place in the UK Police Services in the last decade to have a more diverse workforce, especially with regard to race, sex and sexual orientation. However, contemporary research has repeatedly demonstrated that there are inherent problems in assimilation of officers that are not white males (Holdaway and O’Neill, 2004; Bolton and Feagin, 2004; Cashmore, 2001). The common themes from previous research are that BME officers face barriers of stereotyping, police culture and racism that affects their working environment and prospects of progression.

This thesis examined BME senior officers perceptions of progression in the British Police Service. The research was conducted within a qualitative paradigm to examine barriers to career progression that affected BME officers so that professional knowledge is improved for police leaders to consider alternative employment practices. This thesis focused on BME and white Superintendents working in the United Kingdom.

BME Superintendents were excluded from the sub-culture of progression, which contained informal practices that were rooted to covert institutional racism. The predominant informal practice found was networks that operated covertly and were linked to chief officer sponsors who could provide mobility. Within the networks there was axiomatic knowledge providing vital dissemination of information for progression. BME Superintendents were negatively impacted by exclusion from these informal practices and exhibited physical and psychological behaviours such as working hard, anxiety and having a lack of confidence. A model describing the cause and effect of BME progression in the British Police Service was developed through this research and is presented as new professional knowledge.
Chapter One: Black Minority Ethnic Officers in the Police Service

Black Minority Ethnic [BME] police officers in the British Police have been historically under-represented and research has shown that they often face barriers to progression (Coaker, 2008; Home Office, 2010a; NPIA, 2011). The necessity to recruit police officers from diverse communities was introduced into social policy reform by the Scarman Report (1981) following the Brixton riots. Efforts to attract BME recruits remained a key challenge for the police for the next twelve years. Following the murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993, the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson, 1999) again reiterated that there was a greater imperative to increase recruitment of BME officers but added targets to monitor recruitment, retention and progression. The aim of both the Scarman and Macpherson Reports was to shift the nature and culture of the police in order to improve relationships and how the police dealt with minority communities. Some politicians (Travis, 2014) argue that positive discrimination, where people from under-represented groups are given preferential treatment to improve an organisation’s ethnic profile, should be made legal, with changes in employment law. Against this backdrop, this study aims to analyse the progression for BME senior officers in the Police Service.

The first chapter in this thesis reviews the origins of the imperative to recruit BME officers, the problems and issues identified and how these were to be addressed. An analysis of police reform of recruitment of BME officers follows, together with a discussion on why this became the focus for the research. The conclusion of this chapter outlines the aims and objectives of this thesis and how this research can bring original knowledge into the domain of policing.

The Imperative for Black and Minority Ethnic Officers to be in the Police Service

The first record of a black officer working in the police dates back to Carlisle over 170 years ago (Herbert, 2006). However, some academics state that the Police Service has advanced little to the present day in terms of attracting, retaining and, more importantly, progressing BME police officers (Taylor, 2004, p. 6; Bland, Mundy & Russell, 1999, p. 39). There is a divergence between the published Home Office Equality and Diversity vision for the Police Service (2009, p. 7), to have ‘A Police Service that has the trust and
confidence of all communities and a service that reflects the communities it serves,’ and any discernible improvements in BME officer progression. There is still a distinct lack of progression for BME officers, according to the Police Service’s own ‘watchdog’ organisations, the National Policing Improvement Agency [NPIA] (now the College of Policing, [COP]) (2010) and Butts (2010). The empirical and qualitative evidence strongly suggests that BME officers are under-represented in the top jobs. According to Chief Constable Peter Fahy, this has arisen because they have faced unfair discrimination (Davies, 2008). In 2014, Fahy commissioned an internal review of Greater Manchester Police, which reported that BME staff often lose out in promotion competition to less qualified candidates (Sommers, 2014).

High profile exposures, such as the television documentary ‘The Secret Policeman’, (Daley, 2003), which uncovered racist behaviour in Manchester’s training centre, suggest that one reason for the lack of progression is racism. However, under-representation in the workplace is not restricted to the Police Service, as a recent article reported that more than half of the Financial Times Stock Exchange 100 companies have non-white leaders at board level and that, between 2007 and 2012, the number of black British people in top management positions decreased by 42% (Chandauka, 2015). The Government has, over the last few decades, sought to address underlying problems of racial discrimination against people of BME backgrounds (Department for Communities and Local Government, 2008, p. 11) through targets such as Public Service Agreement 10, race equality and community cohesion. This target aimed to tackle inequalities in society. Despite attempts to promote diversity in the UK, through legislation and government interventions of performance management, there has been slow progress in the advancement of under-represented groups and women on public and private senior management boards (Government Equalities Office, 2015, p. 5). The issue of under-representation of BME staff is a key challenge that affects key public services and the wider labour market.

The issue of under-representation of BME officers in the Police Service leads to the question: why is it imperative to have BME officers? The imperative can either be attributed to an aim to achieve a fairer, more integrated society or, more pragmatically, to a desire to reduce civil unrest and disturbances between the police and BME, and to promote trust and confidence amongst those sections of the public which often have the
worst experiences with the police. Research across a wide range of British, American and European literature (Skolnick, 1975; Bolton & Feagin, 2004; Rowe, 2004; Reiner, 1985) suggests that policy on BME officer recruitment is based on the idea that a proportionally representative police body is better equipped to deliver an efficient and effective Police Service to the community and, thereby, perhaps even more importantly, to help maintain a philosophy of ‘policing by consent’. Reiner describes consent by the community as follows:

> to a maximum degree it is ever attainable – the whole-hearted approval of the majority of the population who do not experience the coercive exercise of police powers to any significant extent and the de-facto acceptance of the legitimacy of the institute by those that do.

(Reiner, 1985, p. 51)

The Brixton riots of 1981 marked a severe breakdown in the relationship of trust by the black community in obtaining fair treatment from the police. Running battles in the streets between the BME community and the police challenged the legitimacy of policing by consent. The backdrop to the riots was years of mistrust between predominantly young black people and police, and the implementation of stop and search tactics amongst this group. The indiscriminate use of a common law power known as the ‘sus’ law (Section 4 of the Vagrancy Act, 1824) led to the culmination of a large-scale operation called ‘Swamp’ in 1981. The operation, an attempt to cut street crime in Brixton, used the ‘sus’ law to stop more than one thousand people in six days and triggered violent riots. Lord Scarman, in his report on the Brixton Disorders (Scarman, 1981), recommended that chief officers, representatives of police authorities and minority ethnic communities should conduct an urgent study into ways of improving minority ethnic recruitment into the police and that minority ethnic communities should be involved in police-related activities (Scarman, 1981, para. 8.28). The imperative for the police to secure consent was reiterated again, with Scarman (1981, para 12) stating that ‘a police force which fails to reflect the ethnic diversity of our society will never succeed in securing the full support of all its sections'.

The integration of BME officers into an historically white police institution was at this time intended to reduce racial tensions where BME officers were seen as ‘reformers’ who
would be more sensitive to black communities and less likely to harass minority ethnic citizens, thereby reducing community tensions (Bolton & Feagin, 2004, p. 19). The theme of BME officer representation in the police was again explored by the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson, 1999) following BME community concerns about the investigation of the murder of Stephen Lawrence. The main strategy of the British government has been to tackle inequality through legislation. The Equality Act HC Bill (2010) made discrimination in the workplace illegal on a number of grounds including race, gender, nationality and ethnicity. This established two misperceptions; the first was the idea that racial discrimination is a thing of the past, and the second involved the view that if it still exists then those experiencing it have adequate protection in law.

However, research provides a different story in that minority ethnic employees have a more negative view of the workplace, particularly as regards their perceptions of unfair treatment by management (Great Place to Work Institute UK, 2013, p. 2). The Police Service still faces frequent cases of alleged racial discrimination, with officers claiming they are being denied equal opportunities because of race, and suing employers for alleged discriminatory practices (Churchill and Davenport, 2014, p. 1). More recently there has also been a call for a public enquiry to review the undercover policing operation on the family of Stephen Lawrence, one implication being that corrupt practices were used to smear the family’s reputation (Evans and Lewis, 2014, p. 1). The case for having a more representative proportion of BME officers continues to provoke a highly charged debate and one that needs further research and examination. It indicates that the progression of BME officers continues to represent a substantial challenge for the Police Service at large.

**Police Reform of the Recruitment of BME Officers**

The two most critical events that forced changes in policy for the recruitment of BME officers were the Brixton riots in 1981 (Scarman, 1981) and the death of the London teenager Stephen Lawrence (Macpherson, 1999). Both resulted in public inquiries that led to significant police time, money and effort being invested in improving levels of BME officer recruitment, retention and progression. Scarman (1981), examining police community relations, rejected institutional racism (IR) that operated in an unconscious state but advocated positive discrimination, which was a ‘price worth paying’ to increase
BME officer progression. In contrast, the Macpherson (1999) report accepted that there was IR and that a strategy of positive action rather than positive discrimination, through the setting of quotas, should become policy. Both reports advocated better representation of BME officers in order to help the Police Service engage with the community and build trust and confidence. The Macpherson Report (1991, p. 35) received evidence from senior police leaders that concluded that no substantial progress had been made in the Police Service and, by implication, that many of the recommendations made by Scarman (1981) a decade before had resulted in no real change. In reviewing both Scarman and Macpherson reports, key differences may account for why little change had occurred. The first, that social and political causes and consequences were not understood or examined; the second, the power relationships in British society in the operation of IR were not explored.

The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry recommended a self-analysis of the Police Service regarding police organisational culture, especially the notion of IR. Oakley (1998), cited in Macpherson (1999, para. 6.32), promoted a view developed earlier by Carmichael and Hamilton (1967), that the Police Service failed because of the institutionally racist nature of the organisation. This finding caused fierce debate within the Police Service, with polarized opinions. On one hand, to concede would be to admit all police are racist and, on the other, would be to accept that some officers were individually culpable of racist behaviour, as espoused in Scarman (1981). The methodological difficulties of linking the concept to behavioural outcomes are an issue that divides polemics and the wider police service. IR as a concept will be tested within this thesis and its components used to frame the findings. The concept of IR will be expounded in the next chapter.

The outcome of the Macpherson (1999) report was that a Home Secretary’s action plan (Home Office, 1999) was produced to implement the key recommendation to increase recruitment, retention and progression of minority ethnic police officers. The recommendations were a watershed in police reform in the area of equal opportunities for the Police Service. Various reports such as ‘Winning the Race’ (Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary [HMIC], 1997) and the subsequently ‘Winning the Race Re-visited’ (HMIC, 1999) found progress of BME recruitment in some forces was too slow, stating:
The effort and initiative to improve the recruitment profile is not matched by equivalent energy and creativity in addressing progression and retention.

(HMIC, 1999, p. 5)

Given that years earlier Scarman (1981) had made similar recommendations, there appeared to be either reluctance or other factors that impeded forces from improving BME senior officer progression. Rowe (2004, p. 21) comments that despite proposals made prior to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry by the Commission for Racial Equality (1996) and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (1996), to improve recruitment and progression of BME officers, there were clear shortcomings from police leadership in not advancing these recommendations.

Why Research BME Officer Progression?
As a former senior black officer in the Police Service, the intriguing point for the author was the apparent disconnect between policy and outcomes. The reports on BME progression seem to have had little impact on practical outcomes for BME officers. As a member of the National Black Police Association [NBPA], over a period of sixteen years the researcher collected anecdotal evidence from BME officers, who stated their belief that discrimination affected their progression. They categorised this as stemming from either direct or indirect race discrimination. Other research by Holdaway (2004) and Cashmore (2001) seemed to support these claims that black officers perceived different treatment and outcomes regarding career progression.

The following chapters will review in depth the literature covering this complex and multi-layered topic. However, four key points set the importance and urgency of this research for the Police Service:

1. National UK demographics; 14% of the UK population classed themselves as of Minority Ethnic origin at the last national census. BME officers represent 5.2% of the total population of the Police Service (Office of National Statistics, 2015).

2. European demographics; in 2015, 34.3 million foreign citizens lived in the 27 European Union member states, accounting for 6.8% of the European Union population (Eurostat, 2015). Twenty-point-five million of these people were third
country nationals (i.e. nationals of non-EU countries). Immigration into the EU will continue from across the world with larger numbers of ethnic groups who will each need to be reflected in policing.

3. Industrial tribunals; historically there has been a rise in cases of discrimination, which had a financial impact on public services (Clements, 2000). This trend has now reversed as the coalition government has increased employment tribunal fees; new racial discrimination cases are down by 60% since 2013 (Boffey, 2015). However, race claims against the police continue to emerge (Dodd & Bowcott, 2014).

4. Policing by consent; a proportionately representative number of BME officers is required to maintain the principle of ‘policing by consent’ (Reiner, 2010).

These points raise key questions regarding human rights, the marginalisation of communities and the persistence of racial prejudice and discrimination within the Police Service. These issues will be explored throughout this thesis by evaluating the concept of IR and by analysing the experiences and perceptions of BME police officers.

While there are implicit suggestions in policy (Home Office, 1999, 2004) that increasing BME recruitment and opportunities for subsequent career progression might counteract internal cultural practices that may be racist, others (Cashmore, 2002, p. 337; Holdaway & Barron 1997, p. 138) suggest that habitual racist practices by white officers create barriers to recruitment, retention and progression. This thesis proposes that existing professional understanding of the root causes of why there is little BME progression is incomplete, and that this is due to limitations in the way evidence of that lack of progression is collected and used by the police, in particular the lack of narratives from BME officers themselves. The challenges for BME officers remain the same in terms of dealing with overt and covert racism and their stories are seldom told.

Analysis of discrimination against employees from a BME background in the Police Service (Clements, 2000, p. 8) provides consistent evidence that BME officers continue to perceive that the workplace does not provide fair and proper opportunities for advancement. Perhaps this is because BME senior officers are a relatively new phenomenon in Britain where, historically, white people have made up all of the police officers in society as well as controlling policing agencies. Commentators such as Fryer
(1984) and Mullard (1973) argue that the culture adopted by the police towards immigrant communities became institutionalised based on past imperialistic structures. The question still remains: is the Police Service a racist organisation blocking the progression of BME police officers? An alternative view could be that BME officers may lack certain talents and skills that are required to integrate into the Police Service due to their cultural backgrounds. This research will explore dimensions of both BME and white officer perceptions about progression in the Police Service and will, in particular, examine personal perceptions about cultural norms and the overt and covert ‘rules’ for progression.

The research centres on the assumption:

That BME officers perceive that they are disproportionately affected by institutional racism that reduces their progression in the Police Service.

The policy of the police organisation, in stating that transparency, fairness and equal opportunity for BME progression are strategic aims (Home Office, 2009, para. 4.9), will be tested by conducting interviews which explore the perceptions of a group of BME and white officers at the rank of Superintendent. Senior BME officers have been selected for this study because:

1. They have had sufficient life experience and have experienced four promotional processes.
2. They are able to provide a substantial amount of data about the issues affecting progression viewed from the middle of the organisation, being able to comment on line reports as well as executive officers to whom they report.
3. An assumption is made that many will be coming to the end of their careers and will be more open in providing responses than those with aspirations of promotion to the next rank.

The results will be analysed against the research assumption. Within the limitations of the research, semi-structured interviews were undertaken to include a national spread of BME and white senior officers.
Why Not Gender And Race?

At the time of writing, the published Police Strength by Rank and Gender shows that there are 203 Superintendent ranks in England and Wales (Home Office Statistical Bulletin, 09/12 2012, p. 18). However, there are no nationally published statistics for BME female Superintendents. Through the NBPA and Superintendents Association of England and Wales at the start of the research period, it was established that there were three female BME Superintendents in the United Kingdom. The small number of BME female Superintendents would constitute too small a sample to provide valid, stand-alone, transferable knowledge. The key concern would be protecting the anonymity of those who took part in the research.

Feminist research methods have been discussed for years, with some academics arguing that there is a distinctive method of research for feminist subjects (Harding, 1987, p. 486;). Any feminist research would have meant a critical review of this feature and consideration of an explanation of the variety of methodological stances, conceptual approaches and research strategies (Fonow and Cook, 2005, p. 2213).

Harding’s key standpoint is that the role of conservative values in social research is maintained by the male gender. Blaikie (1993) argues that all science is based on a masculine way of viewing the world, which is androcentric, and omits or distorts women’s experiences. Hese-Biber (2013, p. 3) comments argues that:

Feminist research positions gender as the categorical centre of inquiry and the research process... feminist researchers use gender as a lens through which to focus on social issues.

Including gender in this research would broaden the remit to both race and gender, which would require alternative methodologies. Race and gender may widen the scope to the point that no detailed analysis could be made. It is assumed that, during this research, there will be reference to gender issues but this will be contextual to the main research question, not additional. Feminist research involves reflexivity on the part of the researcher; placing them in the same world as those being researched. Being a male researcher there is an argument that the author could not achieve the reflexivity required to uncover gender issues.
Aim and Objectives

Contemporary research has repeatedly demonstrated that there are inherent problems in the inclusion of officers who are not white males into the Police Service (Holdaway & O’Neill, 2004, p. 860; Bolton & Feagin, 2004, p. 74; Cashmore, 2001, p. 649). The proposal made for this research is to improve professional knowledge of BME police officers’ progression through the inclusion of narratives from BME senior officers which would assist the Police Service in achieving the strategic aim of building the trust and confidence of all communities in a service that more accurately reflects the community it serves (Home Office, 2009). The overall aim of this research is to:

Examine barriers to career progression that affect Black Minority Ethnic (BME) senior officers, so professional knowledge is improved for police leaders to consider alternative employment practices.

The research objectives are derived from previous studies such as those by Holdaway (2004) and Cashmore (2001). These will also influence the methodological considerations for the work. This is an examination of a current live professional issue that affects the Police Service, and the researcher was uniquely placed in having access to police personnel and material to add real value to this area of professional knowledge.

The objectives of the research are to:

1. Identify factors that impact on the progression of BME officers in the Police Service.
2. To provide analysis on how perceptions of barriers affect the progression of BME officers.
3. To identify and make explicit proposals for change initiatives to improve the career progression of BME officers in the Police Service.

The research will examine the progression of BME officers and then contrast the data with that collected from a white officer group, thereby producing a comparative analysis from which to draw results. To examine this phenomenon it was necessary for the author to examine his own values and worldview in the context of the research. The study began by drawing upon his own personal experiences, beliefs and values, in order to frame the enquiry and to formulate an understanding of understand the experiences of
BME officers. The research paradigm assisted in selection of the research methods, ensuring that both the Police Service and academic community would accept the conclusions.

The definition of IR, as produced by the Macpherson (1999, para. 34) inquiry, will be used to explore the narratives of BME senior officers. The definition provides a framework for developing research questions around the constructs of race (ethnicity), processes (policy) and attitudes (covert behaviour). This framework will guide the research methodology and methods.

**Original Contribution to Knowledge**

The rationale of this research is to develop new professional knowledge regarding senior BME officers’ experiences of their career progression. The analysis has the potential to be used by policing executives to improve diversity in the Police Service and provide for a representative workforce at all levels, thereby achieving the strategic aim. There is a stark contrast between research in the USA, where numerous scholars have researched minority officer advancement (Bayley & Mendelsohn, 1969; Bolton & Feagin, 2004), and in the UK, where there is a relative lack of research on barriers to the progression of BME officers. This study also seeks to extend current research knowledge obtained by scholars such as Holdaway and Barron (1997), and Waddington (1999), who describe police culture in terms of constructs of attitudes that require explanation or as the values and practices arising from other dynamics, such as occupational culture. This current knowledge is a descriptive account of police culture, which concentrates on elements that are single phenomena (stereotyping, racism, and so on), offering broad generalisations rather than providing clear themes of the inter-dependency of social actors in the workplace.

This research will initiate theory building to provide an academic underpinning for an understanding of the dynamics that affect BME officers’ progression. Given that progression of BME officers has been a strategic aim of the Police Service, there appears to be a lack of quality research evaluating the success or otherwise of the initiatives that have been developed and, more importantly, there has been no research which has sought to obtain the views of BME officers themselves, to provide a social construct of the barriers to promotion that they face. Social construction is the theory of knowledge in
sociology where individuals rationalise their experiences and create a model of the social world. Berger and Luckman (1967, p. 13) define knowledge in social construction theory as, ‘the certainty that phenomena are real and that they possess specific characteristics’. The major focus of this thesis will be to uncover the way in which respondents provide words which construct their perceived social reality. In summary, there is no known research describing a social constructionist account of how police culture influences the progression of BME senior officers.

There is an opportunity with this research to gather information from senior BME officers to assess what barriers and opportunities are presented to them in comparison to their white colleagues. Whilst there is research on BME progression (Cashmore, 2001; Taylor, 2004; Sutton, Perry, John-Baptist & Williams, 2006), these studies were localised to particular forces and do not include national narratives. This research will, for the first time, provide primary accounts and narratives from senior BME officers across the country, and thereby contribute to the national debate about delivering the strategic aim of the police, to be a diverse workforce.

The aim of this thesis will be to use this data to produce a conceptual account that can explain the discrepancy between policy aims and the reported experiences of BME senior officers (Verma & Beard, 1981, p. 10). This study seeks to provide a link to past data as well as to provide new data to further stimulate the advancement of knowledge concerning BME progression. Although this is contemporary research it will also endeavour to shine a light on the historic failure of policies ostensibly designed to promote a more diverse police workforce and to ensure the more effective career progression of BME officers. The next chapter reviews the sociology and background of BME progression in detail to provide a baseline of current professional knowledge in relation to BME senior police officers’ progression.
Chapter Two: BME Officers and the Police Service

This chapter examines the background of policing and race and explores the key efforts made to recruit, retain and progress BME officers. Why these efforts have not succeeded in building a representative service that includes BME officers at senior ranks will be explored. Key themes, that BME officers face racism and fail to progress, will be analysed using contemporary research and Home Office data. The emergent themes will be used to test the validity of the research data gathered from the perceptions of BME and white officers that took part in this study. The chapter first reviews the sociology of race and ethnicity and the history of BME officers in the police. Home Office statistics are then presented, along with a description of BME officers experiences and identity, and the culture affecting progression. The legal and social aspects of positive action are examined followed by an examination of the mistrust of police by BME communities. The concept of IR is critiqued, including how it was adopted into the police and some theoretical problems posed by it. The watershed for racism within the Police is then scrutinised through the findings of the Macpherson (1999) Inquiry; the introduction and application of I.R is evaluated presenting a lifecycle of the concept. A framework to assist understanding for this thesis concludes the chapter.

Sociology of Race and Ethnicity - The Police Context

The sociology of race and ethnicity, in contemporary form, has been to study social, political and economic relations between races and ethnicities at all levels of society, including the Police Service. These studies include racism, racial segregation, educational and societal achievements, such as why there are so few Asian footballers or senior chief executives, and occupational and earnings gaps for people from BME backgrounds (National Audit Office, 2008, p. 11). The gap in progression for BME officers is an on-going debate in policing. As Franstine Jones, president of the National Black Police Association said of the findings of the most recent survey of BME officers (College of Policing, 2014):
It is clear from the findings in the survey, that BME officers face unfairness and discrimination which stops them from being able to progress to more senior ranks in the police service. ACPO leaders need to take robust action to eliminate the unfairness and discrimination experienced by BME officers and staff in their forces.

(Jones, 2014)

The unresolved issue in British policing has been the influence of race on police attitudes and treatment of minority ethnic communities. For policing, two minority communities have arisen: the first being BME communities in the general public, the other being BME staff and officers within the Police Service. Race as an issue is intricately tied to many aspects of British policing and continues to be a source of highly charged discourse and research. A current example reported by Dodd and Bowcott (2014) illustrates continuing cases of racism for BME officers. An industrial tribunal ruled the Metropolitan Police to have ‘singled out and targeted’ a black female firearms officer, upholding findings of sexual and race discrimination. The officer’s advocate commented:

Fifteen years after the Met was branded 'institutionally racist' they have failed in addressing discrimination which pervades the system.

(Dodd and Bowcott, 2014)

Race and ethnicity are terms that have not only become features in social research but are included in conversations between people from different backgrounds and cultures in the UK. The question of racial and ethnic relations is constantly explored through political and social discourse, widely influenced by the factors associated with waves of immigration (Kivisto, 2001, p. 562). The focus is centred on incoming immigrants struggling to keep their own culture and identity while also assimilating into broader mainstream British culture (Kivisto, 2001, p. 563). The terms race and ethnicity are used by the government to define categories of people and are used for political change, such as improving the BME representation within the Police Service. In policing, the terms race and ethnicity are used frequently in conversations with different meanings and little understanding of the concepts behind the terms (NPIA, 2010, p. 119; HMIC, 1999, p. 56; Coaker, 2008, sec. 2.2). Without clarity of meaning a constant state of tension exists between BME officers claims of individual racism and the pervading culture of IR
(where institutions promote policies that favour certain groups, this term is analysed later) contrasted to the commitment and promotion of equality made by police leaders (Breen, 2014).

There is a large body of academic discourse for the terms ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’, for example research into the sociology of police work (Cain, 1973 and Skolnick, 1969) and police practices (Hall, 1996 and Reiner, 2000). For this study there is a requirement to define the meaning of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’. The concepts of race and ethnicity are debated by polemics without a consensus on how they should be used in any study of police.

As such, the terms within policing are linked or interchangeable. To illustrate this point, officers in the police that are black or Asian and those not from Great Britain are all commonly ‘labelled’ as Black Minority Ethnic (BME), denoting both physical and cultural differences. The BME group of officers are then portrayed as a homogeneous body whereas, in reality, there are many variations in terms of gender, heritage and culture within this group. Bhopal (2004, p. 441), describes ethnicity as a ‘multi-faceted quality that refers to a group which belong, and/or are perceived to belong, as a result of certain shared characteristics, including geographical and ancestral traditions and languages’. Ethnicity can thus be problematic to measure objectively. It follows that any research to study ethnicity should focus on factors such as language, religion, country of birth and family origins.

The experiences of BME officers will be different to each other in terms of the intricate relationships of class, gender, sexuality and racism. Singh, cited by Marlow and Loveday (2000, p. 35), calls the categorisation of people into two simple social strata of ‘blacks and whites’, where hierarchically the white classes are dominant and black classes subordinate, an ‘erroneous theory of social stratification’. Singh went on to define social stratification as ‘one of the ways that people categorise social people and have preferences to respond to people that look, sound and act like them’. In this research it would be naïve to assume that all BME senior officers have been objects of racism or to apply the simplistic social stratification of these officers being in the BME class subordinate to the dominant white class. Equally there is little understanding of
race and ethnicity in terms of progression in the Police Service to rebut the proposition of
social stratification within the Police Service.

Takaki (1993) cited in (Tai & Kenyatta, 1997, p. vii) points out that race ‘has been a
social construction that has historically set apart racial minorities from European
immigrant groups’. Harry (1992, p. 3) observed that, in the US, ‘the use of the term
*minority* essentially represents an attempt to categorize by race, not by culture. Yet the
specifics of race are only important on one dimension: whether one is white or not’. The
formation of the British Empire and subsequent colonisation theories of race developed
to divide humankind into fundamentally different types, with the term ‘race’ linked to
physical or visible differences (Gilroy, 2000, p. 35). These theories conveyed the idea,
explicitly or implicitly, that populations marked by characteristic appearance were
constitutionally or biologically different (Cashmore and Jennings, 2001, p. 306).

The accepted knowledge in the 19th century was that humankind was divided into
peoples with different and unequal capacities. This was held as social, political and
scientific thought, which invariably placed the ‘whites’, or those in power, at the top of
the hierarchy (Malik, 1996, p. 218). More recent research now has concluded that it is
not possible to categorise people into distinct races on biological criteria and then to
relate their biological characteristics to their culture and behaviour according to Rex

Although population geneticists have now declared that there are no ‘races’, in an
objective biological sense, the social and political constructs are reproduced across
generations in many societies. Loury (2000, p. 228) comments that ‘racial identity is a
stubborn reality, one that survived the demise of the 19th century anthropology from
which it arose’. (Loury, 2000, p. 228).

Hall (2000, p. 223) further argues that the processes of biological and cultural
differentiation through the categories of race and ethnicity are not two separate
discourses but are ‘racism’s two registers’. Race is now acknowledged as a social
construct where there is no biological basis for defining differences by race.
Race’ is a social construct. Its changing manifestations reflect ideological attempts to legitimate domination in different social and historical contexts. Racism is therefore not about object measurable physical and social characteristics, but about relationships of domination and subordination.

(Bhavnani, Mizra, Meetoo, 2005, p. 15)

In the case of Mandla (Sewa Singh) and others v Dowell Lee and others (1983) 2 AC 548, what constituted a racial group was examined where a Sikh boy had been discriminated against because school rules refused to admit him unless he cut his hair and removed his turban. The school argued that Sikhs were not a racial group. Deliberation of this case examined the Race Relations Act, 1976 and produced the following ruling for ethnicity having the following features:

1. A long shared history of which the group is conscious as distinguishing it from other groups and the memory of which it keeps alive.
2. A cultural tradition of its own including family and social manners, often but not necessarily associated with religious observance.
3. A common, however distant, geographical origin.
4. A common language and literature.

Ethnicity then relates to all people irrespective of physical characteristics. However, it is common usage in media and common understanding in the general population for ‘ethnicity’ to be synonymous with ‘non-white’ or ‘non-western’, for example ‘ethnic clothes’ and ‘ethnic restaurants’ (Bhavnani, Mizra, Meetoo, 2005, p. 213). Whilst ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ are different they are often compounded, particularly in the US. The European trend has been the abandonment of the term ‘race’ in favour of ‘ethnicity’. ‘Race’, although a traditional scientific term, is still used to refer to people sharing physical features reflecting ancestry and geographical origins. In the British context, black, Asian, Welsh or Scottish people are often each described as a race (Cashmore and Jennings, 2001, p. 377). Classifying people by physical appearance becomes unreliable and of questionable validity. Each racial group such as ‘white’ could have a wide genetic and geographical variation.
The Equality Act HC Bill (2010, Sec.9) (15) (Electronic version) provides the definition of race including colour, nationality, ethnic origins and national origins. This definition incorporates ethnicity as a sub-set of race. This legal categorisation describes whom and what can be protected in race-specific law, however it provides no sociological framework to examine behaviour leading to the end results of racism or other discrimination. The Equality Act HC Bill (2010, Sec.9) (15) (Electronic version) demonstrates the malaise by defining Race, to include a) colour; b) nationality; c) ethnic or national origins, thus using both race and ethnicity as a compounded term. However, despite these difficulties the term ‘race’ is used widely in legal and policy contexts.

One of the outcomes of the British Empire was a hierarchy of races, producing concepts of superior and inferior races (Anthias, Yuval-Davis and Cain, 1992, p. 9). This could provide some explanation of the relationships and tensions between black and white people living in Britain, both past and present. The effect of colonisation and the actions of police officers are described by Holdaway (1996, p. 3) as a commentary on social structure and social action. Both Miles & Phizacklea (1984, p. 75) and Gilroy (1987, p. 109) argue that it is the ‘common sense’ understanding of race, which becomes a resource of knowledge that often guides actions. Therefore ‘common sense’ may be guided by stereotypes and bias impacting on how people think and act in the progression of BME officers.

Holdaway (1996, p. 23) argues that it is more appropriate to speak about racialised relations than race relations. The argument posed by Holdaway is that the meaning of race is negotiated as a result of human actions, where structural variables such as immigration, occupation, income and gender, as well as the social context determine the salience of race. Racialised relations according to Holdaway can be explained by examining the history of immigration and exclusionary practices used to maintain inequalities. There are also key areas identified by Holdaway which are sites of racialisation which include race relations and reform of the police. The relationship between the police and BME communities is defined, according to Holdaway, by the racial stereotypical characterisations of BME groups and where they live; he argues that this leads to notions of race being ingrained into police policies, practices, ideas, beliefs and actions. For Holdaway, race is ‘intertwined with other features’ (1996, p. 76) of the
social world of the rank and file of the Police Service. This leads Holdaway to the conclusion that social criteria are used to racialise relations.

The theme of occupational culture of the police has been intertwined with race and this can be argued as racialised ideology (Holdaway, 1996, p. 76). Miles & Phizacklea (1984, p. 9) suggest that this ideology is not only handed down from one class to another and one generation to another but is also being constantly created and renewed by people in response to the world as they experience it. This argument extends that the ideology will change over time. However, Miles & Phizacklea (1984, p. 10) argue that a fixed feature, which is racism, identifies individuals as belonging to a group on the basis of real or imaginary biological or inherent characteristics. This ideology can constitute a foundation of discriminatory or unfavourable treatment of individuals belonging to a different group. Miles & Phizacklea (1984, p. 10) make a further observation, that in reality it is often difficult to disentangle the ideology of racism from the practice of discrimination, although it is possible for each to occur without the other. Waddington (1999, p. 288) argued that the conceptual bridge linking thought to actions is contextual and does not relate what officers say in the canteen to their actions on the streets.

The socially constructed perspective of race and its outcome of racism are widely accepted within sociology. Holdaway & Barron (1997, p. 6) suggested that minimal research attention has been paid to the way the ‘notion of race’ has been constructed and sustained in everyday relationships. Whilst attention is paid to the quantitative collection of facts and figures of BME police progression, Holdaway & Barron (1997) argue that there is little research examining the processes of racialisation. The unexplained lack of knowledge is illustrated by the Equality in Employment Report – Policing in England and Wales, which reported:

There have been no evaluation studies that provide robust evidence on what aids progression and tackles organisational and institutional barriers to progression for different groups.

(NPIA, 2010, p. 102).

Current police knowledge is based on ‘policing-based evidence’ rather than ‘evidence-based policing’. The policing-based evidence is a combination of intelligence derived
from crime statistics coupled with police opinion on why phenomena such as anti-social behaviour occur, Neyroud (2003) cited in Williamson (2008, p. 6). This outcome-based approach is rooted in the decision-making model used by the police, the National Intelligence Model [NIM] (National Criminal Intelligence Service) [NCIS] (2000). A NIM based approach to accumulating knowledge is risk-based and relies on numeric outcomes of activity to show success or failure.

To illustrate this point, a recent survey conducted by the College of Policing (2014, p. 1) of the perspectives of BME officers on recruitment, retention and progression failed to survey non-BME staff, resulting in a lack of comparative analysis. This resulted in quantitative findings that were presented without providing any explanation of the experiences of BME officers. Previous research on BME officers progression has had an emphasis on examining numeric targets for progression rather than exploring notions of race that affect BME officer progression. According to Holdaway & O’Neill (2004, p. 858) police knowledge is generally a post-positive approach rooted in a legal framework; an implication being that traditional police research fails to recognise social constructs and feelings. Morgan & Hough (2000, p. 54-55) reviewed funded criminological research by the Home Office and concluded that it was ‘entirely a theoretical fact finding, narrowly focused, and designed to be policy friendly’. By reviewing the research objectives it was clear that using police-based models and methods of research would not inform police practice fully. This thesis does not have the capacity or scope to examine the psychology of race but seeks to examine how race is constructed for BME officers in progression.

The terms race and ethnicity will in this study not be viewed as universal or timeless, but it will be accepted that within different social contexts and relationships they may have varied definitions. To provide clarity to this research, the key question is ‘can we use race and ethnicity interchangeably or are there fundamental differences?’ As previously stated, race and ethnicity are problematic to measure objectively. Therefore, the accounts provided by BME and white senior police officers will examine how the terms race and ethnicity are utilised in relationships and how participants describe these terms.
History of BME Police Officers

In 1962, the National Council for Liberties provided evidence to the Royal Commission on Police (The Royal Commission on Police, 1962, p. 723) and identified that without having ‘coloured constables’ in the Police Service the police would not create a positive relationship with the black community (The Institute of Race Relations, 1979). As far back as the mid 1960s, the issue of having BME officers was an explored concept, however there is evidence that black people had tried and failed to be recruited because they were black (Rowe, 2004, p. 24).

Early pioneers such as PC Darr and PC Roberts were recruited respectively to the Coventry City Police (1966) and Metropolitan Police (1967). The early press reports indicated that, for PC Darr, the public provided no hostility, but accounts of right-wing movements, such as the National Socialist Movement, are recorded asking the chief constable in Birmingham to re-think recruitment of BME officers. A swastika was daubed on the training college following the appointment of the first black recruit in Birmingham (Rowe, 2004, p. 23). Despite targeted campaigns, progress to recruit BME officers in the 1970s was slow. Various attempts at improving the numbers of BME officers since the 1970s have generally met with little success (Rowe, 2004).

Recruitment of BME officers in the Police Service has been impacted by the relationship of the police and the minority ethnic communities in day-to-day operations. This relationship was originally studied by Skolnick (1975, p. 42) who described the ‘working personalities’ of police officers as the product of the milieu in work, which affects ‘the distinctive ways of perceiving and responding to their environment’ Skolnick said:

Suggestions have been made to enlist colored (sic) policemen for colored neighbourhoods, or to bring in trained colored policeman from the Commonwealth.

(Skolnick, 1975, p. 69).

Skolnick’s suggestion was based on the theory that existed in the US following riots in black communities. The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968) reported that the lack of diversity was a major impetus behind the heated racial tensions. Wilson and Henderson (2014, p. 48) commented, 'In the 1960s, as a result of race riots, it was theorized that the hiring of minority officers would decrease the tensions between
the African American community and law enforcement personnel.’ Black recruits in the US would reduce community tension in two ways: one was that the community see black officers and feel represented; the other was that the presence of black officers would affect the actions of their white colleagues and make them more sensitive.

Following riots in the UK, Scarman (1981) reported that under-representation of black and Asian people had been a long-standing concern for the police which recognised that, although efforts had been made to recruit minority officers, there had been reluctance amongst the black community to join the police (Scarman, 1981 para. 5.6). A key recommendation made by Scarman (1981, para. 5.12) emphasised: ‘A police force which failed to reflect the ethnic diversity of our society will never succeed in securing the full support of all its sections.’

The shortcomings of the police were noted through various reports, notably a survey conducted by Oakley (1996) on behalf of the Commission for Racial Equality [CRE]. Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) (1996) and the CRE both suggested that further steps be taken to ensure that the Police Service reflected the ethnic diversity of British society. The impetus for achieving a more diverse workforce was directed towards the concept of policing by consent of the BME community.

The watershed in terms of racism within the Police Service was when a black teenager, Stephen Lawrence, was murdered on the streets of Eltham, South London on 22nd April, 1993 (Macpherson, 1999). The incident itself would become the most renowned in terms of impact to the Police Service. The incumbent Home Secretary from the Conservative Party refused to hold a public inquiry but in 1997 a general election bought into power the Labour Party, who made it a priority to win back trust from the BME community towards criminal justice. This became part of the Labour Government philosophy of radical modernisation of public services (Home Office, 2001a, p. 6). The new Home Secretary announced a public enquiry, chaired by Sir William Macpherson.

The inquiry covered details of the investigation, but also reviewed wider policing matters, such as ‘stop and search’ and deaths in police custody. This approach took a broad view of policing and the BME community. Three broad themes emerged: firstly, the incompetence of the police; secondly, suggestions of police corruption; thirdly, the
role of racism within the incident. The inquiry concluded that the police investigation was sabotaged by ‘a combination of professional incompetence, institutional racism, and a failure of leadership by senior officers.’ (Macpherson, 1999, para. 46.1). Following the publication of the report, the Home Secretary adopted the main recommendation, which was to establish a ministerial priority to ‘increase trust and confidence in policing amongst minority ethnic communities’ (Macpherson, 1999, p. 327).

The Macpherson Report made 70 recommendations regarding a wide range of issues affecting the policing of minority ethnic communities. The following were specific to recruitment and retention of BME staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>That the Home Secretary and Police Authorities’ policing plans should include targets for recruitment, progression and retention of minority ethnic staff. Police Authorities to report progress to the Home Secretary annually. Such reports to be published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>That the Home Office and Police Services should facilitate the development of initiatives to increase the number of qualified minority ethnic recruits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>That HMIC include in any regular inspection or in a thematic inspection a report on the progress made by Police Services in recruitment, progression and retention of minority ethnic staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Recruitment, Retention and Progression Recommendations, Macpherson (1999, p. 334)

The report also recommended that the Home Office establish performance indicators relating to recruitment, retention and progression (Macpherson, 1999, recommendation 2 [ix]). The conclusion from this report was that racism in the police should be treated as a concept rooted in the occupational culture of the Police Service. The report suggested that integration of more BME officers would challenge perceptions of the BME community by white officers. It was theorised that BME officers working in close proximity to white officers would make them more aware and sensitive to the needs of the BME community.
The Government’s response to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (Macpherson, 1999) was to produce the ‘Breaking Through’ action plan (Home Office, 2004). A previous report ‘Race Equality – The Home Secretary’s Targets’ (Home Office, 1999) contained targets for the recruitment, retention and progression of minority ethnic officers for every force in England and Wales. The Macpherson Report (Macpherson, 1999) recommended that the Home Secretary and Police Authorities’ policing plans should include targets for recruitment, progression and retention of minority ethnic officers, which led to the target of 7% BME police officers by 2009. The target of 7% BME employment level within the Police Service set in 1999 has not been achieved within the 10 year plan. Having this target, however, provided an impetus and was a major driving force for workforce change.

The overall advancement of the targets was co-ordinated by the Stephen Lawrence Steering Group [SLSG] who stated that:

> representative Police Services are essential to provide appropriate service, tackle racism and gain the trust and confidence of BME communities.

(Stephen Lawrence Steering Group, 2004, p. 13)

The steering group added that police leaders had to produce a business case for a representative service. This notion of business case was a shift from the moral argument of being fair to all, and now towards an argument of what skills and added-value could be obtained from BME officers, such as language and cultural knowledge.

All public inquiries into race consistently call for more recruitment of BME officers and better efforts to tackle distrust between the police and the community (Scarman, 1981; Macpherson, 1999; Cantle, 2001; Morris, 2004; Butts, 2010). The focus of having more BME recruits hinged on two strategic policies for the Police Service: firstly, the recruitment of BME officers and civilian staff; secondly, the delivery of diversity training with the aim of restoring the trust and confidence of BME communities. These policies, designed to address police racism, according to Cashmore (2002, p. 332), were ineffective at enhancing cultural change in the police and also presented a false outward
image of effective action which he called ‘window dressing’. Other researchers, (Holdaway & O’Neill (2004, p. 865), disagreed with the conclusions of Cashmore, arguing that the emergent Black Police Associations (BPA) were helping change the nature of racism in terms of recruitment and diversity training. Where previously BME officers identified themselves as police officers that happen to be black (Holdaway & Barron, 1997), BME officers were now identifying themselves as black police officers (Holdaway & O’Neill, 2004, p. 498). This change in language represented a significant shift for BME officers:

In this respect, the minority ethnic officers were trying to minimize the centrality of their ethnic identity and status for their job, whereas their colleagues would accentuate ethnicity and use it (deliberately or not) as a basis for exclusion from full membership in the police team.


Holdaway and O’Neill (2004, p. 499) did report that some BME officers saw their ethnicity as a source of pride and central to their self-identity. However, Cashmore (2001, p. 657) reported that not all BME officers identified ethnic identity in the way Holdaway and O’Neill described.

The Tripartite Oversight Group, a national police group formed to improve the diversity of the workforce of the police, met in April 2010 and recorded that it would take many years to progress women and BME officers to the levels required in the Police Service (NPIA, 2011). The group also commented that there was a need to identify and remove barriers to progression, and recognised the lack of data in that only two strands of data were available in any detail, these being gender and ethnicity. This lack of professional knowledge of BME progression still remains a barrier to understanding the factors influencing BME officer progression and hinders the production of effective initiatives to improve the numbers of BME senior officers in the Police Service.

**BME Police Officer Statistics**

This statistical review is an attempt to frame the explanation of why the Police Services of England and Wales experience difficulties in recruiting BME officers. The national target for BME officer recruitment for England and Wales was set at 7% in the Home
Secretary’s Action Plan (Home Office, 1999). The original targets included BME officers only, not the wider policing family. The widening Police Service profile, according to Harron (2008, p. 54), has provided limited success by including additional personnel within BME recruitment targets, such as Special Constables, Police Staff, Police Community Support Officers and Police Volunteers.

Population estimates by the Office for National Statistics (2015) recorded that the United Kingdom population stood at 64.1 million, with 56.5 million in England and Wales. The Minority Ethnic population of England and Wales is 14% and did not rise to 20% as predicted by the NPIA (NPIA, 2011, p. 8). As at 31 March 2015, there were 213,620 full-time equivalent staff working in the 43 police forces of England and Wales. Police officers accounted for 61.1% of this total, police community support officers 6.2%, traffic wardens and designated officers 2% and other police staff 30.6% (Home Office, 2015). There were 6,715 Minority Ethnic officers representing 5.2% of total police officers. However, BME officer representation still remains a challenge for most Police Services in the United Kingdom. Past research on BME employment levels in the Police Service (Brown, Hegarty & O’Neill, 2006) pointed out that even a combination of both special measures and targets are unlikely to increase levels of BME officer representation, saying:

> Given the current recruitment rate and taking into account the 26% attrition rate in probationers’ wastage rates, a conservative estimate calculates it will take 23 years to achieve 7% BME representation.

(Brown, Hegarty & O’Neill, 2006, p. 3).

Analysis of Home office data (Home Office, Statistical Bulletins; 14/10, 2010b, p. 6, 13/11 2011 p. 15, 09/12 2012, p. 11 and police workforce, England and Wales, 31st March 2013, section 4.2 & police workforce, England and Wales, 31st March 2014, section 5.2) shows the levels of BME officer numbers for each rank in England and Wales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Strength</th>
<th>Percentage of Minority Ethnic Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACPO</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendents</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspectors</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constables</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority ethnic strength</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: A Comparison of Minority Ethnic Police Officer Strength (including Central Service Secondments) by rank from 31st March 2010 to 31st March 2014 in England and Wales.

Minority ethnic officers represent 5.2% of the total police strength, a rise of 0.2% compared with a year earlier (5% on 31 March 2013). The total number of Superintendent and Chief Superintendent ranks in England and Wales are 1,123 and out of this total 44 are BME officers (3.9%) (Home Office, 2014). This is the number reported in Home Office statistical bulletins that are retrospectively a year old; current estimates of the actual numbers are given as 52 from the Police Superintendents Association of England and Wales (S. Payne, personal communication, August 7th, 2014). The current data reveals that the Metropolitan Police had the largest proportion of minority ethnic officers (11%), followed by West Midlands (8.4%) and Leicestershire (7.3%). Minority ethnic officers were under-represented in senior ranks, accounting for 3.8% of officers at the rank of Chief Inspector or above, compared with 5.7% of constables. The ethnic background of the officers reflects the immigration profile for the U.K in the 1960s/70s, that being 39.7% of current BME officers classify their ethnicity as Asian or Asian British, 28.6% as Black or Black British, 20.1% as Mixed and 11.6% as Chinese or Other ethnic group.
The Policing Minister’s Assessment of Minority Ethnic Recruitment, Retention and Progression in the Police Service report (Coaker, 2008) reported that BME recruitment was 7.2% against the national target of 7.0% set by the Home Secretary in 1999. However, BME officer strength was well below target at 5.0%. The 7.2% represented inclusion of BME Police Community Support Officers [PCSOs]. Coaker (2008) commented that the Police Services of England and Wales were under-represented at all ranks of BME officers above the starting rank of police constable, with BME officers under-represented at senior ranks, accounting for 3.2% of officers at chief inspector or above. An assessment of Minority Ethnic Recruitment, Retention and Progression was made by the Home Office (2010, p. 14), which reported that initiatives for positive action resulted in little change over the 10-year period. It found that BME officers occupied lower ranks and were under-represented at all ranks above constable. BME officers were rooted to the bottom and middle ranks with only 3.6% of sergeants from a BME background in comparison with 96.4% of their white colleagues. There is sufficient research to suggest BME officers plateauing in middle management and then slowing down in senior management roles (Bolton & Feagin 2004, p. 140 and Butts 2010, p. 76). Almost half the forces in England and Wales, (47%) had not reached employment targets in relation to BME officers (Home Office 2010a).

The statistical review of the data describes how small the actual numbers of BME officers at the senior levels are and that any attrition, either through resignations or retirements, can make a dramatic difference to the percentage numbers. The loss of 3 BME ACPO officers in 2010-2011 resulted in the percentage of 3.9% being reduced to 1.3% in the course of a year. The percentage numbers of BME officers for each rank are not showing any gain in substantive numbers and the overall pool of BME officers seems to have stagnated. There is no central data for length of service of BME superintendents, which provides little or no projected resource planning nationally. What is puzzling is that, given that BME officer progression is a Home Office priority, why this data is not being collected, as was highlighted by the Tripartite Oversight Group (NPIA, 2011).

The Tripartite Oversight Group, charged with monitoring and promoting diversity within the Police Service of England and Wales, reported that BME officers still remain under-represented in ranks above constable and that on-going positive action and monitoring is required to ensure that target representation levels are achieved across all ranks over time.
(NPIA, 2011). The statistical analysis used by the Police Service paints a picture of BME senior officer progression as slow moving. The Metropolitan Police Authority report, ‘Talent Management and Succession Planning Scrutiny Report’ (2007, p. 73), reported that ‘there is no clear ‘joined up’ approach or follow up action’ to tackle the under-representation of members of minority groups. This suggests that the Police Service is still in pursuit of an effective business strategy to inform how talents from a diverse group are developed.

**BME Officers’ Experiences**

The different use of powers by police towards the young, the lower classes, and black and minority ethnic people, invites the question of how effective the Police Service would be in recruiting and progressing BME officers from those communities. Rowe (2004, p. 28) provides alternative views set against the history of poor relations between the police and minority ethnic communities, the first being that BME recruits do not realise the real nature of policing, the second being the discourse that there was still a public perception that BME officers might expect racist behaviour in the workplace. Interviews with white police officers and support staff revealed that there was an emphatic view that perceptions of racism in the police were erroneous since racist behaviour that had in the past been tolerated was no longer part of the routine of police working life (Rowe, 2004, pp. 28-29). The new order of working life in the police as described by white police staff is countered by the perceptions of BME officers who repeatedly and consistently report racist behaviour in the workplace (Cashmore 2001, p. 650). Racist abuse was used against BME officers by white officers to test their loyalty and belonging (Cashmore, 2002, p. 337). An earlier review of BME officers that resigned from the Police Service revealed that over three-quarters cited they had experienced racist language. Interestingly white officers that had also resigned corroborated this fact, but down-played the effect it had on black and Asian colleagues (Holdaway & Barron 1997, p. 138). The idea of joining an organisation that exhibited racist behaviours has been widely reported by researchers such as (Rowe, 2004 p. 24; Bland et al. 1999, p. 33) as a factor inhibiting BME recruitment, whilst other factors, such as encouragement from family members, informal recruitment networks and being seen as ambassadors for their community have not been sufficiently explored by academic research to measure their significance or effectiveness as ways of rectifying the situation (Stone & Tuffin, 2000, p.13).
The way in which the Police Service has reacted to ethnicity has been recorded by Holdaway & Barron (1997, p. 139), who state that white officers often applied negative attributes to BME officers that were derived from their own stereotypes. BME officers were identified with the perceived characteristics of whole ethnic groups. Research conducted on BME officers has consistently found that BME officers feel they are viewed by white colleagues as black, ethnic or a minority first and then a police officer second (Holdaway 1996, p. 226). The inference made is that BME officers racial status seems to impede their integration into their professional status. Holdaway & O’Neill (2004, p. 856) summarises this as BME officers receiving daily reminders in the form of racial jokes and epithets combined with more subtle forms of exclusion to render them perpetual outsiders. Despite public announcements charting the success of internal policies to change the culture and behaviour around racism, an undercover documentary, ‘The Secret Policeman’ (Daley, 2003), exposed a culture that allowed new recruits to exhibit racist behaviour in a training school in Manchester, behaviour condoned by the trainers who were supervisors. The incident highlighted that not only could people with racist views join the Police Service but also that they could display racist behaviour without being challenged by supervisors.

Livers and Calver (2003, p.19), commenting on black African American executives in the US, stating that corporations create a myth on the assumption of similarity, where the reality is difference. This approach is couched in the philosophy of critical black theory. The theory is based on accepting that race is a key feature of the environment and asks white leaders to deal with the reality of experience rather than asking for a business case to identify if racism actually exists. Gillborn describes the theory as:

1. Racism is a permanent feature of society and there is no need to explain it exists.
2. There is scepticism that neutrality or colour-blind liberalism works.
3. Strong emphasis on narratives from BME people.
4. An argument that civil rights serve white interests.

(Gillborn, 2008, p. 11)
The alternative theory, used by the police currently, is the notion that policing is carried out in a ‘colour blind’ way, the implication being that race does not play a part in decision-making. Researchers have suggested that the claims of the police being colour-blind are implausible for a number of reasons. The first is that stereotypes result from cognitive functions including the need for officers to categorise and form judgements about subjects in the environment (Wilson & Dunn, 2004, p. 357). Harris (2007, p. 21) adds that most people harbour unconscious racial bias which works independently of conscious beliefs resulting in those who are not consciously prejudiced in fact operating on the basis of those stereotypes when acting automatically to situations. This implies that there may be an eruption of unconscious bias expressed in behaviour when a person is under stress. The police’s own inspection body, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary (1999, p. 9) found that, ‘many officers have race issues in the forefront of their minds.’ Whilst the police policy is to operate in a colour blind way this may be proving a false sense of non-discrimination whereas the situation may be somewhat different.

**BME Officer Identity**

One of the key questions that needs to be addressed is the subject of BME officer identity within the Police Service, given the conflict between the police and BME communities. From 1968 to the present day, the concept of the creation of an identity that is both BME and British is held, according to Alexander (2000, p. 2), creating an ‘anomaly, if not a travesty’. The argument made by Alexander is that key politicians in government have stifled the creation of a new British identity.

The cultural clash of minority ethnic groups and the native groups in the UK raises the question of how this identity is managed by the police. Barker (1981, p. 17) states that culture becomes a primary source and symbol of differentiation and a boundary is maintained, in which ‘nationhood’ and ‘way of life’ are indistinguishable. The cultural norms of society towards minority ethnic groups have shaped how they are treated in the wider sense by the government. Given the fact that policing is inherently and inescapably political then there is an argument that the Police Service and its relationship with the minority ethnic community are not neutral or independent. A key factor shaping perceptions of racial discrimination was the extent to which people’s self-concept was predominantly based on a personal identity, defined through their own personal
attributes, or on a social identity, defined through a strong identification with a group, based on nationality, ethnicity, religion or colour (Tajfel, 1981, p. 275). Aligned to this self-identity were the outcomes of interactions between the police and the BME community, which resulted in actual experiences, or events experienced vicariously through the narratives of others. A major social function of the police is to maintain the existing group-based hierarchies (Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p. 14). The argument proposed is that ‘white officers tend to hold stereotypes and prejudices that are linked to or are shaped by their policing role.’ (Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p.14).

Breakwell (1992, p. 225) proposes that identity should be conceptualized in terms of a biological organism moving through time, which develops through the accommodation, assimilation and evaluation of the social world. The model is governed by four principles: distinctiveness, continuity, self-esteem and self-efficacy. The principles together provide personal worth or social value. Hogg & Abrams (1988, p. 25) suggest that social identification is defined as ‘identity contingent self-descriptions deriving from membership of social categories of nationality, race, sex, occupation etc’. The self-identity of BME officers will be explored to understand their feeling of worth and social value within the Police Service.

**Police Culture Affecting BME Progression**

Police culture has been a concept used to describe outcomes of police behaviour towards BME officers. To understanding police culture and its effects on BME progression it is useful to define this concept. The three most contemporary and used definitions are:

A layer of informal occupational norms and values operating under the apparent rigid hierarchical structure of police organisations.

(Chan, 1997, p. 43).

Accepted practices, rules and principles of conduct that are situationally applied, and generalized rationales and beliefs.

(Manning, 1997, p. 360).
A patterned set of understandings, which help cope with and adjust to the pressures, and tensions, which confront the police. (Reiner, 2000, p. 109).

The culture of the UK police has been a subject of research for decades, with commentators describing prejudice and racism experienced by all BME officers. Bolton & Feagin (2004) and Holdaway & O’Neill (2004) argue that the culture of the police is ‘white culture’. This culture is a web held together by informal relationships and networks that assist information dissemination critical to assessing the workplace and potential progression. (Forret & Dougherty, 2004, p. 432) provides a number of examples of how these networks can discriminate against individuals. Examples of exclusion could be the inability to informally socialise in bars due to religious beliefs or lacking the skills to participate in sports events. Nishii and Raver (2003) explain that employees share their perceptions of identity on race and organisational status informally rather than through the formal organisational structure. This could mean that BME officers, whilst sharing the physical environment, do not share the cultural norms of the dominant group. Mischel (1974) reported that strong cultures produce a high number of situations in which group members are called upon to support cultural norms; those that deviate incur sanctions. Rowe (2004, p. 30) states that the power of culture causes ethnic minorities to suppress their own values and to fit-in in order to be accepted as part of the group. This could mean that BME officers in upholding norms of the police may depart from their own values.

Researchers such as Manning (1997), Holdaway & Barron (1997) and Reiner (2000), all conclude that police culture is rooted in occupational norms and values operating in a hierarchy. Holdaway (1996) further argues that the strong sociology within the police is able to sustain the power of police occupational culture. Given that the police hierarchy is white-dominated, the informal culture may be a barrier to advancement in that it is exclusionary (Holdaway & O’Neill, 2004; Bolton & Feagin (2004). Kandola (2009, p. 92) describes ‘old boys’ networks and the way organisations are biased as disadvantaging minority groups. This occurs through structures of power that are inscribed in organisations by habit of association. By definition, any system of social stratification will involve a sense of social inequality, for example in information, advancement and support.
Most chief officers in the police have been part of building the culture as they have progressed through the ranks. Those officers on fast-track programmes are also mandated to spend time in a number of departments and it can be argued they can either change or sustain the cultural norms. However, very little research has been conducted to ascertain their biases or cultural norms. Kandola (2009, p. 114) suggests that, where there are rigid structures and formal career paths, these tend to perpetuate discriminatory practices. An assumption could be made for this thesis, given that substantial numbers of BME officers do not hold high ranks in the police, that this could be influenced by perceptions and judgements made by chief officers, prior, during and after promotion procedures. This is a natural phenomenon as Keltner and Robinson (1996, p. 1068) propose that, when a person comes from a powerful group or holds a powerful role, they may feel subjectively powerful or behave in a powerful way. Kandola (2009, p. 83), further states that privilege is rarely discussed but may have a profound influence on progression, adding that ‘if you are a minority ethnic in an organisation you will be aware how privilege adheres to those that are white.’ (Kandola, 2009, p. 92).

Abrams (2010, p. 17) adds, that people in powerful roles who are judging others are more likely to attend to information that confirms stereotypes than information that contradicts stereotypes.

Research in this area finds more subtle and complex forms of ‘banal’ racisms, Black et al (1996) cited in Brown (1998), or what have been described as ‘covert, stealth, neo-racisms, subtle or modern racisms’, Lentin (2004, p. xi) and Sutton et al (2006, p. 11) argue that ‘banal’ racisms have evolved to perpetuate race and prejudice which seek to avoid legal or moral censure, thus allowing for a disabling environment for BME officers in terms of progression and wider employment opportunities. The outcomes of the Macpherson report (1999) were reviewed by Foster, Newburn & Somuhami (2005) who noted that there had been an urgency to tackle racist language in the police but that this was not mirrored by other forms of discriminatory language and behaviour, namely sexist and homophobic language. They concluded that the experiences of women and minority ethnic staff suggested that the excision of racist language had not led to broader changes in the internal culture of the police organisation. There may be an unintended outcome, as organisations create the impression that they care about anti-discrimination legislation when their actions speak otherwise, Kandola (2009, p. 106). Senior police
leaders in their actions with respect to progression of BME officers may be operating fairly at a cogitative level but unconsciously acting in discriminatory ways. The question is, whilst BME officers continued to experience exclusion, isolation and discomfort as a result of various forms of discriminatory behaviour (Sutton et al, 2006 p. 13), are the changes in racism cosmetic or has the culture of the Police Service been improved?

Unconscious bias may be exhibited even without the awareness of the individual. Gaertner & Dovidio (2000) cited in Abrams (2010, p. 40) identify ‘adverse racism’ where they suggest that emotional reactions to some minority groups can be deeply embedded in consciousness and cultural stereotypes. If this is applied to the decision making process used for general progression in the Police Service, this may be having a subtle effect for BME senior officer progression.

**Police Research**

There is a lack of research into understanding the attitudes of the minority ethnic communities, to better understand the relationship between BME officers and the Police Service. A research project (Stone & Tuffin, 2000), examining the attitudes of people from minority ethnic communities towards a career in the Police Service, concluded that attractive aspects of police work were outweighed by envisaged drawbacks. Key perceptions from the community were the police being racist, the lack of BME role models, the negative impact of policing tactics, e.g. stop and search, and negative reactions from family members. The main drawback was the thought of working in a racist environment and facing prejudice and isolation in a predominately white culture (Stone and Tuffin, 2000, p. vi). Twice the number of BME officers as white officers resigned from the Police Service citing bullying and discrimination as relevant facts for leaving (Home Office, 2004, p. 4).

Race inequality can be shown in the employment gap between the BME community and the rest of the population which is 15%, only 1.3% lower than 1987 (Hart, 2009). The professional improvement agency for the Police Service, the NPIA (now known as COP), stated that promotion opportunities will become scarcer during efficiency-saving programmes, which will have an impact on development opportunities for all officers (NPIA, 2010). The COP (2014) has now started a *BME Progression 2018 programme*, which is designed to improve the recruitment, retention and progression of BME officers.
and staff. The key difference for this programme over past programmes that have failed to increase BME numbers in the Police Service is that improvements will be ‘based on a firm evidence base’. The existing evidence for this programme is taken from surveys which use a quantitative research approach. The current programme is not attached to an overall strategy and has no set targets but seeks to build on the baseline percentage of BME officer in 2014 as reported by the project lead (Superintendent M. Thandi, personal conversation, 17th February, 2015). The College of Policing BME Progression 2018 programme reported.

Overall, forces rated the use of targets for recruiting BME officers and staff and the introduction of external monitors to the recruitment process as less important than some of the other initiatives listed.

(College of Policing, 2014, p. 4).

The review of the literature reveals that a number of academics have researched policing in relation to race, however, the focus has been on junior ranks and the external community and police relations (Chan, 1997; Holdaway & Barron, 1997; Cashmore, 2000; Bowling & Phillips, 2002 & Rowe, 2004). Analysis of contemporary police research on police officer progression is descriptive or explanatory in nature, seeking only to gather information. The research does not test theories or conduct comparative studies on multiple sites or contexts. This concurs with the experiences of researchers in the US (Brunson and Gau, 2011, p. 221). The Home Office has sponsored limited research (Bland et al, 1999; Stone & Tuffin, 2000; Holdaway, 1996) that covers BME recruitment, retention and progression and the perceptions of BME communities towards the police. According to Taylor (2004, p. 9), little research has obtained narratives from senior BME officers with the aim of examining the barriers to career progression. No contemporary research exists to examine blockers and enablers for BME senior officer progression. Given that BME officer progression has been a strategic aim for the Police Service, the research commissioned seems limited.

Positive Action
Positive action has been used as a tool to increase the levels of BME officer representation in the Police Service for a number of years. Affirmative action in the US (Civil Rights Act, 1964) and positive action in the UK Equality Act HC Bill (2010) (15)
(Electronic version) are utilised in pursuit of racial and gender equality. Other protective characteristics defined in the Equality Act HC Bill (2010, Sec. 4-12) (15) (Electronic version) are now also subject to positive action by the Police Service. This act brings together previous anti-discrimination legislation prohibiting discrimination on the grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, and race. Affirmative action in the US is aimed at social reform and compensating racial groups for the discrimination suffered during the days of slavery, allowing quotas, enshrined in law, to permit recruitment of minority officers over white officers to fill vacancies. Affirmative action programmes implemented in the US frequently provoke a high level of popular condemnation (DeSlippe, 2012, p. 296).

By contrast the UK model of positive action focuses on gender and race-based equality in actions aimed at remedying societal inequality. Affirmative action or quotas are unlawful within the Equality Act HC Bill (2010, Sec.9) (15) (Electronic version). The duty on public bodies for positive action to improve equality in employment is not mandatory but voluntary. The term ‘positive discrimination’ is intertwined with the term ‘positive action’ and both terms are used interchangeably within police discussions. To illustrate this point, Randhawa (2015) on the Kent Police website provides a guide to the differences between positive action and discrimination, reiterating that that positive discrimination is affirmative action and illegal. This suggests that, in spite of years of use, understanding of positive action is limited.

The Report of the Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland (Patten et al, 1999, p. 83) referenced the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) and set out proposals for an affirmative action policy of recruiting 50% of its trainee officers from a Catholic background and 50% from a non-Catholic background. This was proposed to address the under-representation of the Catholic/Nationalist community that has existed for many decades in policing; in 2001 the Royal Ulster Constabulary was drawn almost 92% from the Protestant/Unionist community. This provides a model for addressing the current lack of BME senior officer progression, however it is one that causes the most controversy (Shackleton, 2013).

Holdaway (1996 p. 190) argues that positive action initiatives are resulting in BME and female staff taking legal action for acts of prejudice and discrimination. The policies are
risk-based rather than based on a moral imperative to make real change. Holdaway (1996 p. 191) argues that:

if chief officers do not clarify the nature of their equal opportunities policies they will not fully grasp why there is confusion and conflict about the purpose and rationale of those policies.

Positive action to recruit BME officers was slow and appeared to have little senior police leadership support. As a result, a study was commissioned by the Home Office to carry out research into specific initiatives taken by police forces to recruit members of ethnic minorities (Home Office, 1990). Holdaway (1996) reported that there was an inadequate policy framework to tackle minority ethnic recruitment and subsequent policies should be based on positive action. The integration of BME officers in the UK and of American officers in the US into a white dominated workplace has been slow and partial. Jovellet (2008, p. 18) reported that US initiatives based on affirmative action rooted in legal statute and the UK initiatives based on positive action have not achieved anything like proportionate parity with similar white groups, in particular at executive levels. The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) re-iterated the concept of positive action as a means of affecting the culture of the police. Positive action remains a contentious measure being used in the police.

The Mistrust of Police by BME Communities

There has been a history of disturbances involving the minority ethnic communities rooted in the central theme of mistrust of the police by the minority ethnic community. This has a direct correlation with the recruitment of BME officers. The relationship between the police and BME communities is described by Holdaway (1996) in terms of racialisation processes and the working practices of the police impacting on BME communities. The working practices of the police have been shaped by past events and, in particular, breakdown of relationships with minority communities, (Scarman, 1981) (Macpherson, 1999), which have led to questions being raised about the legitimate and adequate nature of policing, in particular race relations. The History of police and race is shown below to provide a chronological timeline.
The institutionalisation of the Police Service, according to Fyer (1984, p. 381), is linked to the colonial past and an imperialist ideology, with the conceptualisation of perceptions of the majority white host community towards those from an immigrant background. These perceptions in major public institutions became institutionalised and part of the culture of the UK, according to Fryer, who states that, between 1958 and 1968, ‘Step by step, racism was institutionalised, legalised, and nationalised.

The police occupational culture and its effects on BME communities are documented by, amongst others, Chan (1997), Holdaway & Barron (1997) and Cashmore (2001), who advance the themes of police culture, prejudicial values, and racial profiling resulting in racialisation practices towards BME communities and officers. These themes have systematically impacted negatively on police relations with the BME community in the UK. Despite the considerable published literature on race relations, little attention has been paid to the way routine policing has impacted on the relationships between officers and members of the minority ethnic communities (Holdaway & Barron, 1997 p. 2).

There is still a complex and not yet fully understood relationship between the wider societal context of race relations, the police and ethnic minorities.

This history of conflict between the police and ethnic minority communities, coupled with inequitable service by the police to ethnic minorities, has at its heart a power dimension, in that the police retain a benefit to the white population in contrast to differential treatment to minority ethnic communities. However, this proposition is a too simplistic with a deterministic outcome, in how the Police Service has dealt with race relations in the UK. Commentators such as Holdaway & Barron (1997) and Keith (1993) argue that there is no inevitability about a social deterministic theory that forms the origins of heightened tensions between the police and minority ethnic communities.
However, from previous research (Scarman, 1981; Macpherson, 1999 and Cantle, 2001), there does appear to be a deterministic link between dissatisfaction with the form and style of policing towards the minority ethnic community and routine poor treatment by the police that suggests that further conflict is likely. The prospect of conflict leads to the central question of police legitimacy with the BME community.

The history of Police and Race is relevant to set the background. However, it is not the focus of this thesis. For a detailed description see Appendix A.

The Concept of Institutional Racism

Although the concept of IR in the UK emerged in political and public discourses during the 1990s, the origins are based in the political struggles of ‘black’ Americans in the post-World War Two period. Racial segregation and disparities in wealth between black and white Americans spawned the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. This movement gained substantial victories for ‘black’ social reform such as the Civil Rights Act (1964), which was intended to end the legal basis of discrimination against black Americans. The intended equality outcomes for many black Americans did not materialise in terms of health, education and criminal justice, leading to the rise of the Black Power Movement. This movement was to re-examine how social and legal reforms could be developed using a different form of analysis and political action. The key tenet of the black leaders was that although legal protections in law had been passed, there was a lack of change because racially discriminatory behaviour was entrenched within the structures, organisations and power relations of American society. Change could only be achieved where power structures were challenged. Within this context Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) introduced the concept of institutional racism. This concept altered the analysis of racism, where a shift occurred away from individual acts of prejudice and discrimination to ‘anti-black and pervasive operation of anti-black attitudes and practices’ that were locked into the structures, procedures and operations of major social institutions (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, p. 5). In other words, overt and covert acts of racism. Overt acts were explicit racism from individuals and covert acts were anti-black attitudes and practices that were ingrained in institutions maintaining a black disadvantage. IR was a form of ‘colonialism’, according to Carmichael and Hamilton, who stated that black Americans ‘stand as colonial subjects in relation to white
society’ (1967, p. 5). In terms of unintentional racism, where white individuals did not actively subscribe to racism they said:

Thus acts of overt, individual racism may not typify the society, but institutional racism does – with the support of covert, individual attitudes of racism.

(Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, p. 5)

According to Carmichael and Hamilton, legal reforms, assimilation and integration policies that had failed to change black disadvantage required an alternative concept for political action against white power structures of American society. The term IR was taken up in popular academic discourse from the 1970s onward and challenged the old paradigms of racism of the 1950s and 1960s which focused on ‘individual prejudices, authoritarian personalities and cultural pathology’, Singh cited by Marlow and Loveday (2000, p. 13). The shift of paradigms switched the focus from individual acts of racism to the organisation of society and power relations.
Some example definitions of IR are shown below together with my own analysis of the concept being presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Definition of Institutional Racism</th>
<th>Researcher’s Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jones (1972, p. 121)</strong></td>
<td>‘those established laws, customs, and practices which systematically reflect and produce racial inequalities’</td>
<td>Rooted in the way things are done, <em>culture</em> and <em>production</em> of racism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blauner (1972, pp. 9-10)</strong></td>
<td>‘interactions of various spheres of social life to maintain an overall pattern of oppression’</td>
<td>Hierarchical structures to maintain dominant and non-dominant groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Downs (1970, p. 79)</strong></td>
<td>‘a process of placing or keeping persons in a position or status of inferiority by means of attitudes, actions or institutional structures which do not use colour itself as the subordinating mechanisms indirectly related to colour.’</td>
<td>Maintenance of hierarchical dominant and non-dominant structures. Production of disadvantage not necessarily related to racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commission for Racial Equality (1985, pp. 2-3)</strong></td>
<td>‘For too long racism has been thought of in individual psychological terms, reducible, to the actions of prejudiced individuals. The concept of IR draws attention to the structural workings of the institutions, which exclude black people regardless of individual attitudes.’</td>
<td>Inequity maintained through processes and procedures that manifest inequalities by those that are not necessarily racist. Doctrine not checked for unintended consequence of policy being applied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Definitions of Institutional Racism with Analysis.
All the definitions of IR shown above illustrate the collective and individual actions that allow institutions to maintain power structures that benefit dominant groups in society. During the 1970s and 1980s, the term IR was predominately used to explain, at one level, BME disadvantage through organisation processes and practices, and, at the next level, that actions could be without racist intent. There was a clear shift to explain outcomes with unconscious attitudes. Al Badawi and Abdulla (2012, p. 6) describe two outcomes from unintentional racism. The first being proximal which occurs immediately following racist behaviour, for instance racist jokes and distal being something that occurs later in the future, for instance supervisors not intervening when racism occurs. The lifecycle of institutional racism is presented below to show the progression of the concept from inception to the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry:

Table 4: Lifecycle of Institutional Racism

IR has three key characteristics:
1. That actions and ideas produce general disparate outcomes for minority ethnic people rather than specific individual racist acts.
2. That a combination of beliefs, processes and practices results in minority ethnic inequality.
3. That racism exists in the structures of the organisation and is not limited to individual actions.

Even with these characteristics there was criticism of IR as being ‘conceptually imprecise, vague and obscure Singh (2000, p. 31). Phillips comments that:
The concept is often used in a loose, descriptive manner and has come to embrace a range of meanings, which are often imprecise, sometimes contradictory and frequently lacking theoretical rigour. Discussions of individuals attitudes, stereotyping, implicit guidelines, explicit rules and procedures, organisational arrangements power sharing and structural determinants of minority status have all been subsumed within the analysis of institutional racism.


**Criticism of Institutional Racism**

Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) used IR to describe collective social power and dominance. The locus of racist intentions is both in the institution and individuals, which has outcomes of racism. Carmichael and Hamilton defined IR as the residual social inequalities of overt racism that resided in the structures of societal institutions. Proponents of IR argue that the resultant outcomes reproduce inequalities linked to the history of overt racism and also reinforce the ideology on which racism is founded (Moschella, 2007, p. 36). The IR concept is both an academic and political tool for social change. Bullard (2004, p. 18), in his study of the public health risks of lead poisoning, concluded that communities from racial minorities faced a higher environmental risk than white communities. IR for Bullard was caused by government policies, specifically public health officials not taking preventative steps to safeguard minority communities. In Bullard’s study, racial disparities were classed as racist even where other variables, such as class, were present. What was not separated in this study is the causal link of racism. For instance, which of the institutions or processes were racist? A counter-argument could be made that unequal outcomes may not be racist but processes from institutions may produce inequalities for people from different classes, education and occupations. Garcia (1996, p. 282) argues that jobs offered through ‘word of mouth’ are not racist even if they result in disproportionate impacts for disadvantaged communities. The causes of the outcomes are insufficiently clear for Garcia to class them as racism because they are also based on other variables such as gender, class or ethnic groups. Using Garcia’s argument, the concept of IR only serves to show that particular people are disproportionately affected, not that there is anything racist about the practice or institution. In particular Garcia challenges the argument that racism leads to ineffective resolution. Blum (2002, p. 43) agrees, saying that most institutions produce disadvantages that are economic in nature and when processes are identified as
IR, policy makers should not only view disadvantaged minorities but all races that are affected. Both these views dilute the argument of racist outcomes from an institution that disadvantages historically disparate minority communities. Garcia and Blum disregard past social inequities and argue that institutions are only interested in economics and therefore bear no relevance to past racist constructs. If, for instance, a healthcare institution denied access to its services to a socio-economic group that is from one ethnic group, such as gypsies, and failed to recognise their heritage, this argument would be redundant. Both Blum and Garcia concentrate on the outcomes rather than racism as a source of the outcomes and so dismiss the social and historical link of disadvantage for BME communities. It can be argued that even if race is referred as a social construct with no real material base, the common sense understanding of race and racist assumptions continue to shape institutions and social interactions (Miles & Phizackela (1984, p. 75; Gilroy, 2000, p. 109).

The Introduction of Institutional Racism to British Policing

Both Scarman (1981) and Macpherson (1999) used the concept of working practices when summarising their inquiry conclusions, with differing approaches: Scarman argued that the service as a whole was not racist and there were only a few officers that performed some duties in a conscious racist state, thus defining IR only as an overt racist policy consciously pursued by the institution. He asserted that Britain as a society did not knowingly, as a matter of policy, discriminate against black people, saying:

It was alleged by some of those who made representations to me that Britain was an institutionally racist society. If by that is meant that it is a society which knowingly, as a matter of policy, discriminates against black people, I reject that allegation.

(Scarman, 1981, para. 2.22).

Scarman also rejected the notions that racism could be unintentional or unconscious, for him IR was only overt, based on intentional practices and policies that set out to discriminate. However, reflected:
If, however the suggestion being made is that practices may be adopted by public bodies as well as private individuals which are unwittingly discriminatory against black people, then this an allegation that deserves serious consideration, and where proved, swift remedy.

Scarman (1981, para. 2.22)

The Macpherson (1999) inquiry took a contrary approach and marked the introduction of the concept of IR to explain racism within the Police Service. A key departure from Scarman was that now an unconscious state of racism was accepted. First, Macpherson defined racism as:

racism in general terms consists of conduct or words or practices which advantage or disadvantage people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. In its more subtle form it is as damaging as in its overt form.

(Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.4).

It was not accepted by Macpherson that racism was the universal cause of the failure of the police investigation or that all officers were racist. Macpherson (1999) referred back to Scarman (1981, p. 11) and developed the theme that unconscious and unintentional racism were situated in police practices. Macpherson described unwitting racism as follows:

Unwitting racism can arise because the lack of understanding, ignorance or mistaken beliefs. It can arise from well-intentioned but patronising words or actions. It can arise from unfamiliarity with the behaviour or cultural traditions of people or families from minority ethnic communities. It can arise from racist stereotyping of black people as potential criminals or troublemakers. Often this arises out of uncritical self-understanding born out of an inflexible police ethos of the ‘traditional’ way of doing things.


The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) provided a plethora of IR definitions. The Commission for Racial Equality (Macpherson, 1999, para, 6.30) and the Runneymede Trust (Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.29) provided definitions that included practices and processes that were either unintentional or intentional. By contrast, the Association of
Chief Police Officers (Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.50) presented a definition that encompassed attitudes, stereotypes and occupational culture, whilst the newly formed Black Police Association [BPA] asserted in their definition that discrimination lay in the source of occupational culture (Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.28). Sir Paul Condon the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, accepted that individual officers could be responsible for overt acts of racism however he denied the existence of IR. Sir Paul also expressed a view that providing a definition for IR would cause issues: ‘I acknowledge the danger of institutionalisation of racism. However, labels can cause more problems than they solve.’ (Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.25). Whilst accepting that labels can sometimes cause anxiety, the Inquiry team’s response was not to resolve the debate on the nature or concept of institutional racism, rather they condensed the submissions made to develop a definition within the boundaries of the inquiry brief:

But the fact is that the concept of IR exists and is generally accepted, even if a long trawl through the work of academics and activists produces varied words and phrases in pursuit of a definition. We repeat that we do not pretend to produce a definition, which will carry all argument before it.

(Macpherson, 1999, para 6.26).

Macpherson (1999, p. 8) concluded that the Metropolitan Police operated an ‘unwitting’ form of racism, which, by implication, extended to the whole of the British police. Macpherson (1999) suggested it persists because of the failure of the organisation to openly and adequately recognise the existence of racism and address its causes by policy, example and leadership. The key aspect of the criticism was the colour-blind approach of the police not being sensitive to the needs of those from a minority ethnic community. Macpherson (1999) defined IR as:

The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin. It can be detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amounts to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantages minority ethnic people.

Macpherson (1999, para. 6.34).
Singh (2000, p. 33) argues that the definition was developed to make sense of the experiences of the Lawrence family, the failures of the investigation and a wider problem of racism within the police. Following the publication of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) there seemed to be an admission that the police were IR by chief police officers, including Sir Paul Condon accepting the concept of IR (BBC, 1998). The Stephen Lawrence Steering Group was set up by the Home Secretary to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the Inquiry. Police forces also set up working groups to utilise the new term IR without any guidelines of how to apply this new concept.

Post Stephen Lawrence – The Application of IR

Following the Macpherson Inquiry (1999) the concept of IR has become popular in political and criminal justice discourse. The component parts of the concept and how it is understood are fundamental to this research and how the findings will be interpreted. Police thinking around race and racism has continued to use the concept, frequently without providing a description of how the concept operates and influences behaviour. Solomos (1988, p. 3) commented that IR had become a ‘catch all phase’ to describe all situations where racial discrimination manifested itself. Academics such as Williams (1985, p. 323) argue that the concept of IR does not provide a ‘theoretical adequate account of the perpetuation of racial inequality, lacks guidance, research and reduces policy improvements for racial inequality to remain at a rhetoric level.’

The argument made by Lea (2000) is that Macpherson ‘failed to locate with sufficient precision its racism roots within the structure of operational policing’. Phillips (2011, p. 174) argues that the concept failed to ‘differentiate between IR as outcome and cause, recognizing the agential overt and unwitting practices of individuals but not the interacting causal structural conditions.’ The overall result was to provide academics with conceptual ambiguities for the concept of IR and, moreover, no theoretical application to assist in persistent racial inequalities within the Police Service.

The thrust of the Macpherson definition of IR was not to point to policies that were racist but rather how these were implemented in the words and action of officers (Macpherson, 1999, para. 46.27). Carmichael and Hamilton (1967) rooted the locus of IR in the structural features of a capitalist society, which involved class domination of white
people over black people. Although inferred, Macpherson did not state that institutional processes discriminated against historically marginalised racialised groups. What Macpherson (1999) did not describe is how IR is located in mechanisms and processes that produce unwitting thought which then lead to differential treatment of minority ethnic communities. Other academics (Anthias, 1999, p. 4 and Solomos, 1988, p. 284) also found the concept put forward by Macpherson to have conflated individual and institutional racism. This lack of analysis has the effect, according to Anthias (1999, p. 4), of ‘conflating the issues of mechanisms and procedures that require correction’. For example, racism operating within a given culture produces explicit racist outcomes or work practices that produce racist effects, for example, stop and search.

The Macpherson definition had the potential to ‘racialise’ every encounter between the police and the non-white public. This was due to the Macpherson recommendation of a racist incident, which was: ‘A racist incident is any incident which is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person.’ (Macpherson, 1999, recommendation, 12).

This recommendation did not rely on the police officers’ interpretation of the offence but allowed any person to report racist incidents based on perceptions. Whilst reporting may be increased the treatment of the offence still lay in the control of police officers.

Macpherson (1999) presented an elaboration of the concept in terms of racist acts or prejudice emanating not from the individual but from a socialisation process, whereby individuals are socialised by the institution. Macpherson relied heavy on the submission of evidence by Dr Robin Oakley who stated:

The term IR should be understood to refer to the way institutions may systematically treat or tend to treat people differently in respect to race. The additional work ‘institutional’ therefore identifies the source of differential treatment; this lies in the sense within the organisation rather than simply with the individual who represent it. The production of differential treatment is ‘institutionalised’ in the way the organisation operates.

(Macpherson, 1999, para. 6.32).
Macpherson omitted to identify what factors were present in the nature of police work undertaken which produced a working culture that would lead to differential treatment by police officers. Unlike Skolnick (1975, p. 42) Macpherson failed to describe ‘working personalities’ which showed a distinctive way of perceiving and responding to the BME community. Macpherson identified that a key factor was the notable lack of contact between the police and the black community. The key issue was not the lack of contact per se during police enforcement of the black community, but the lack of contact outside the enforcement practices, for example, arrests and stop and searches. One conclusion could be that more negative attitudes than positive ones are accumulated by white officers due to the majority of contact with the BME community arising in ‘negative’ enforcement situations which are not adequately counterbalanced by ‘positive’ informal contact and normalised relationships. A conclusion from Macpherson leads to a possibility that white officers impose their attitudes due to a lack of contact with BME communities that in turn creates and perpetuates the working culture. Lea’s (2000, p. 221) analysis of the ‘ambiguity’ raised by Macpherson’s interpretation of IR raises the key problems of identifying precisely the processes that sustain racial discrimination both by the individual and by institutionally generated behaviour. Macpherson (1999) failed to answer fundamental questions about the relationship between the agency and the intent of individual behaviour.

These questions arising from the analysis in this thesis are:

1. Actions of individuals may not be inferred to the workings of an institution.
2. The collective failure of a group of officers may not be shared by a wider section of officers, particularly where incompetence and lack of leadership are seen as contributory factors.
3. Macpherson locates the social and cultural life of officers as the source of racism rather than the dynamics of operational policing.

By compounding the overt and covert racism constructs, the Macpherson definition presented the police with a new definition of institutional racism, which switched the focus from individual actions to a collective failure by organisations. The definition of IR posed two difficulties, the first being that the question of racist motive and intention in the sense of overt conduct would fall outside the boundary of empirical verification; the
second was that any significant anomaly in police statistics could be used to suggest that the Police Service was institutionally racist, for example, if BME officers did not advance according to the set targets then, by default, the Police Service was institutionally racist. No explanation of how IR was promulgated is offered. What does it mean when it is said that systems and institutions are exhibiting institutional racism? If the outcomes of IR were a combination of government policies, officials producing procedural guidance, the actions of professional police bodies and racist behaviour by individual members of the Police Service, then disentangling racism and the intent would be near impossible.

**IR – A Framework to Assist Understanding**

Despite the conceptual ambiguities of the Macpherson (1999) definition of IR and a lack of published guidance to analyse institutional racism, the concept remains central to the nature of policing. The concept has been taken up by a wide range of public and private institutions and is included in debates about racism throughout the UK. The concept of IR and the raft of recommendations based on its definition have been part of a significant change in society, policing and community relationships. It may well be the popular discourse has diluted (Bourne, 2001, p. 14) the original intent in locating hidden forms of racism. However, there is still merit in using the concept to investigate the origin of discriminatory practices in progression to generate origins of covert racism test the concept as an analytical tool in this research. Therefore this thesis will adopt the IR definition to explore the research question. This will provide a framework to progress the analysis of the research to provide a theoretical explanation of the findings. The next chapter presents what methods were considered and used to gather the data to answer the research question, in the light of the literature reviewed.
Chapter Three: Research Methodology

The aim of this chapter is to guide the reader through the method used to collect primary data and the analytical procedure used. The data collected was to support analysis exploring BME officers experiences of progression in policing. The research methodology was designed to operate at two interconnected levels: the first level was the descriptive collection of ideas, beliefs, thoughts and feelings of BME senior officers; the second level was interpretative analysis into the explanations of why the BME officers reported the responses.

The overall approach to the methodology was to employ grounded theory using the constant comparative method. The chapter is presented in three sections. The first section provides the rationale of developing the research strategy by reviewing the research question, the research paradigm used, explaining why grounded theory, in particular the constant comparative method, was employed, concluding with the limitations of grounded theory. The second section focuses on the data collection process, which used interview schedules detailing how the sample was drawn, the ethical considerations, how reliability and validity was improved, and ending in the experience of transcribing the interviews. The third part provides a description of the analysis of data and coding, a description of the NVivo 10 software used for the nine cycles of analysis and concludes with evaluation of the reliability of the analytical process.

Part 1: Developing the Research Strategy

Reviewing the Enquiry

To link the research objectives to the methodology I reviewed what had to be studied and what was known about the phenomena of BME senior officer progression. Loftland and Loftland (1984, p. 7) describe this process as ‘starting where you are’. Research on BME officer progression has been completed in individual force areas, such as the Metropolitan Police Service (Talyor, 2004) and Kent Police (Tapang, 2012), but little research has been conducted comprehensively across the UK. The analysis of contemporary literature outlined in Chapter Two together with the lack of national research led me to the conclusion that there was a lack of professional knowledge of BME officers’ progression nationally. Previous police and Home Office research of
BME progression has been empirical and quantitative. In particular, it was ‘uncritical’ in the sense that it did not question government policy but appeared to support it. This failed to situate the findings to any theory or concept such as IR.

Traditional police research fails to recognise social constructs and feelings. Previous research on BME officers’ progression has had an emphasis on examining numeric targets for progression rather than exploring variables that affect the phenomena of BME officer progression. According to Holdaway & O’Neill (2004, p. 858) police knowledge is generally a postpositive approach rooted in a legal framework. Morgan & Hough (2000, pp. 54-55) reviewed funded criminological research by the Home Office and concluded that it was ‘entirely a theoretical fact finding, narrowly focused, and designed to be policy friendly’. Reviewing the research objectives it was clear that using police based models and methods of research would not inform police practice fully.

Previous analysis provides little insight for methodologies for obtaining qualitative data to build conceptual models or identifying underlying issues impacting on BME progression. The objectives of the research are repeated here to ensure that a clear link is made between the phenomena being studied and the methods used to achieve this task.

1. To Identify factors that impact on the progression of BME officers in the Police Service.
2. To provide analysis on how barriers affect the progression of BME officers.
3. To identify and make explicit change initiatives to improve career progression of BME officers in the Police Service.

The purpose of this study was to develop new ways of thinking and provide a framework for improving BME officer progression. To select the method the author first considered which research philosophy would be most appropriate to guide the research strategy and the research instruments. The starting point for selection of the method would be my own worldview. As Sapsford (2006, p. 175) advises ‘A philosophical stance of worldview that underlies and informs a style of research.’ Consideration of a philosophical stance for this thesis is shown at Appendix B.
Research Paradigm

Having established the philosophical stance consideration was given to the epistemological (what is known to be true) position against doxology (what is believed to be true), which underpinned various research philosophies. In order for this research to transform believed things into known, doxa to episteme, two fundamental research philosophies namely, positivist (quantitative) and interpretative (qualitative) research methods were examined.

To select the most appropriate method a review of the distinctions between qualitative and quantitative research was conducted. These distinctions according to Bryman (2008, p. 22) can be explored through three elements; epistemological, ontological and links to theory and research, describing them as positivist/empiricist and interpretative/hermeneutic paradigms. Using Bryman’s descriptions of the paradigms a table showing comparative differences between the two paradigms is produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positivist/Empiricist Paradigm</th>
<th>Interpretative/Hermeneutic Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Entails a deductive approach to the relationship between theory and research, in that the accent is placed on the testing of theories</td>
<td>• Predominately emphasises an inductive approach to the relationship between theory and research, in which the emphasis is placed on the generation of theories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Has incorporated the practices and norms of the natural scientific model of positivism in particular</td>
<td>• Has rejected the norms of the natural scientific model and of positivism; emphasises the ways individuals interpret their social world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embodies a view of social reality as an external, objective reality</td>
<td>• Embodies the views of social reality as a constantly shifting emergent property of an individual’s creation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. A Comparison of Positivist / Empiricist and Interpretative/ Hermeneutic paradigms, adapted from Bryman (2008, p. 22)
The distinction between the two paradigms is not arbitrary or as clear cut as described above, however, the core epistemological values have a consequence for this research. The first is that this research is not examining a naturalist world of animals, physics or chemistry but is seeking to access the inner world of perception and meaning-making in order to understand, describe, and explain social processes from the perspective of study participants. Quantitative data may be useful in measuring variables such as attitudes across a large sample but would not have allowed me to learn about participant’s perceptions and feeling about their attitudes. The research methodology was concerned in creating new ways of viewing senior BME experiences of progression and as I was not testing out theory, therefore grounded theory method appeared to be the most appropriate method. In terms of reliability, the author makes no claim to stay out of the ‘hermeneutic circle’ (Scott & Usher, 1996, p. 19). The author had been a BME senior officer in the police and this carried with it advantages in obtaining access to and connecting with the perceptions of BME and white officers interviewed. Whilst accepting limitations of the qualitative approach such as having lower creditability and being difficult to use to make quantitative predictions; the counter argument is that it can be more interactive in scope to builds a social relationship with those being researched, allowing insights and collective understanding of the phenomena of progression. As Hammersley & Atkinson (1995, p. 15) state, the reflexive nature of the researcher cannot ‘avoid having an effect on the social phenomena we study’. It was evident to me that only a qualitative method would provide the responses to the research objectives. This research adopts a grounded theory method for this research.

Grounded Theory Used In This Study

The evolution of grounded theory requires a clear explanation of how the theory was to be used and the philosophical underpinning for the method. For this study the data collection and analysis of the data required explanation of whether an objectivist or constructivist approaches were being used. The original work of Glaser and Strauss (1967, p. 79) advocated a truly inductive study without reviewing the existing literature and that data should be collected with a ‘blank mind’. This assumes that theory will be built or ‘discovered’ in the data, this being a objectivist or positivist paradigm (Charmaz, 2000, p. 401). Strauss then took different direction and with Corbin, advocating that the researcher had to ‘actively’ obtain the theory from the data (Corbin and Strauss, 1990, p. 58). The worldview, background, beliefs and values would mean that the researcher
would place focus on different aspects of the data. Charmaz (2000) developed a counter approach to both Glaser and Corbin and Strauss, arguing that both approaches took a positivist and objectivist stance. Charmaz (2000, p. 344) stated that theories were not discovered but needed to be interpreted because both the interviewee and researcher both construct reality. The method of grounded theory is based on the interpretation of grounded theory advocated by Corbin and Strauss and Charmaz. Glaser’s approach is that reality is objective and neutrality could not be applied to the intangible nature of BME officer progression. The approach used in this study does not commence with a prior hypothesis to be tested and proved but with a focus of inquiry that takes both and inductive and deductive iterative approach to data analysis. The aim is not to achieve statistical generalisations but to discover contextual interpretative findings. The findings would have the value of transferability rather than generalisations. Shenton (2004, p. 73) describes transferability as ‘Provision of background data to establish context of study and detailed description of phenomenon in question to allow comparisons to be made’.

The characteristics of grounded theory method that would guide this study would be to:

1. Focus on life experiences
2. Value participants perspectives
3. The research would be an interactive process between the researcher and respondents
4. Primarily descriptive and relying on people’s words

(Marshall and Rossman, 2010, p. 30)

A constant comparative method using interviews to gather the data would be used in this study to understand, describe and explain the social process of BME senior officers progression.

**Constant Comparative Method**

The method of analytical process adopted by this study is based on the constant comparative method according to Maykut and Morehouse (1994) who draw on the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) in their development of this methodological framework. As Maykut and Morehouse (1994, p. 18) point out, ‘words are the way that most people come to understand their situations; we create our world
with words; we explain ourselves with words; we defend and hide ourselves with words’. Thus, in qualitative data analysis of this study the author’s task was to find patterns within those words and to present those patterns for others to inspect while at the same time staying as close to the construction of the world as the participants originally experienced it. It was accepted that respondents would provide an interpretation of their experiences, an interpretation that makes no claim about ‘truth’ that corresponds with an ontological reality (Glaserfeld, 1995, p. 24). This approach would not place knowledge as true or false but rather as having meaning to the respondents in its context of use. The main concern was to delve beyond the actual words voiced by participants and abstract key issues that lay behind the meaning.

While the constant comparative method used in this study is not given to mathematical abstractions, it is nonetheless systematic in its approach to data collection and analysis. In analysing data generated by the constant comparison method responses would not be grouped according to pre-defined categories, but salient categories of meaning and relationships between categories, which derived from the data itself through a process of inductive reasoning. The constant comparative method would offer the means whereby access could be gained to analyse these perspectives to explain the social processes of progression.

The constant comparative technique involves breaking down the data into discrete ‘incidents’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) or ‘units’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and coding them to categories. Categories arising from this method generally take two forms: those that are derived from the participants’ customs and language, and those that the researcher identifies as significant to the project’s focus of inquiry. The goal of the former ‘is to reconstruct the categories used by subjects to conceptualise their own experiences and world view’, (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 105); the goal of the latter is to assist the researcher in developing theoretical insights into the social processes operative in the site under study. Therefore ‘the process of constant comparison stimulates thought that leads to both descriptive and explanatory categories’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, pp. 334-341). Categories undergo content and definition changes as units and incidents are compared and categorised, and as understandings of the properties of categories and the relationships between categories are developed and refined over the course of the analytical process. As Taylor and Bogdan (1984, p. 126) summarise; ‘in the constant
comparative method the researcher simultaneously codes and analyses data in order to develop concepts; by continually comparing specific incidents in the data, the researcher refines these concepts, identifies their properties, explores their relationships to one another, and integrates them into a ‘coherent explanatory model’ (Taylor and Bogdan, p. 126). The aim of this research is to produce an explanatory model derived from the data.

**Limitations of Grounded Theory Methodology**

A key limitation of grounded theory methodology is that it can be complex and time-consuming due to tedious coding and memo writing (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 65). This research has sought to reduce this complexity by using specialised software to help speed up organisation and analysis of data. A key philosophical objection to grounded theory methodology is that it seeks to explain and predict a phenomenon or to build a theory; this then becomes a very subjective process, relying heavily on a researcher’s abilities. To counter this limitation this study seeks to be open about the worldview and background of the researcher and will demonstrate the methodological path taken to gather, analyse and then present finding.

**Part 2: Data Collection**

**Interview Schedule and Techniques**

Using grounded theory for the collection of data was by means of conducting interviews with study participants drawn from a purposive sample. These were participants that were randomly selected according to the criteria specified in the *Research Sample* section that will follow. According to Bryman (2008, p. 551) there is general agreement between academics that levels of categorisation and coding of data is necessary in order to draw out interpretative repertories in this research to attempt to develop a new one. The interview guide was designed as an instrument using grounded theory and provided a basis for generating coded data from participants. The variables and concepts are initiated by the interviewee but developed through constant comparison of all data. Whilst the qualitative interview will be more open than a quantitative interview, there is still need to identify general ideas of topics that will be of interest and relevance to the study. Bryman (2008, p. 105) suggests that a systematic review of relevant literature provides a reliable foundation on which to design research because it is based on a comprehensive understanding of what is already known about a subject.
The questions asked form a convenient start for analysis. As Cassell & Symon (1994, p. 4) state, ‘with this type of research, we are never entirely clear at the outset what we are interested in or how we can explore the issues, or even what the major issues are or how these will emerge and evolve’. This allows for the grounded theory approach to work where known and unknown knowledge were incorporated into the interview guide to provide co-ordinates, similar to map reading, to start to gather information from participants. Questions were derived from the literature review, personal experience and the preliminary small scale Professional Doctorate study (King, 1994 cited in King & Wincup, 2008, pp. 14-17).

To refine the research questions, the literature review was examined to look for key topics that would guide the interview schedule. These key topics were:

Social inclusion policy of the British Government does not have reduction of institutional racism in the Police Service as an objective. There is little research that examines the nature and dynamics of institutional racism within the Police Service.

(Sutton, Perry, John-Baptist & Williams, 2006, p. 7).

There is little research to examine the impact of institutional racism on the progression of BME officers. As a result there is a potential lack of interventions, which attempt to remove the organisational and institutional barriers where these exist.

(Coaker, 2008, para. 2.11).

There are recorded differences in the careers of BME officers and white officers in recruitment, retention, promotion and selection of specialist posts. There is also a clear reluctance to link this with institutional racism.

(Bland et al, 1999, p. 25).

Totally unstructured interviews were discounted as they would allow the interviewee free response to the question and would generate too many variables. It seemed logical that a semi-structured interview would fit the research objectives and tie in with the key topics developed through the literature review. A semi-structured interview explores what interviewees have to say, but also has the danger of creating bias or leading questions. The aim of the interview in this research was to elicit BME and white officers’
perspectives and, in the first instance, reduce any influence the researcher had on this process. Kvale (1996, p. 174) defines the purpose of qualitative research interviews to ‘gather descriptions of life-world of the interviewee with respect to the interpretation of the meaning of the prescribed phenomena.’ He then adds that neither in the interview phase nor the analysis ‘is the purpose primary to obtain quantifiable responses.’ This suggests that the semi-structured interview does not pre-suppose a rigid framework for obtaining information from the interviewee, as with a structured approach, nor does it allow the interviewee the freedom to explore unrelated topics. The author wanted to ensure that interviews were conducted with purpose and with open questions that allowed responses that were specific to the questions asked rather than ‘abstractions and general opinions’ (Kvale, 1996, p. 176). It was also accepted that any interview guide might not allow the researcher genuine access to the worldview of those being interviewed.

From a smaller pilot study the author had conducted in Sussex Police (Verma, 2010) there existed a bank of tested questions that had already been used and which had also been validated by the Surrey Police Research Unit. The author had also been invited to deliver a workshop at the NBPA conference (12th – 13th October, 2010). During the session responses were invited from BME focus groups with regard to recruitment, retention, progression and workforce modernisation. A copy of the workshop PowerPoint presentation is attached at Appendix C. Areas for the interview guide were drawn from the literature review, a smaller scale study and also responses from the BME focus groups. From this bank of data I formulated a number of questions that were open and would act as a prompt, which would then allow the interviewee to respond freely. The author would then follow up points that were not understood to develop clarity. The author wanted the interview to be an oral history interview rather than a life history interview. The life history interview would invite the subject to look back in detail across his/her entire life to have the ‘inner experience of individuals, how they interpret, understand, and define the world around them’ (Faraday Plummer, 1979, p. 776). The oral history interview invites the subject to reflect upon specific events or periods in the past. This approach was selected due to time and cost considerations. The chief problem accepted by me was the possibility of bias introduced by memory lapses and distortions, Grele (1978, p. 94). Taking this into account a semi-structured interview was designed around the individuals’ view of career progression and what impacts they perceived on their lives. The interview schedule is shown at Appendix D.
As the approach was using grounded theory, the interview guide was modified through use by the researcher. King & Wincup (2008, pp. 19-21) suggest the need to maintain flexibility in the face of incoming data. This meant that during the interviews the researcher restructured the order of questions and included additional questions into the guide. A large change was made to the interview schedule after the first interview, which developed into three distinct parts as discussed later in the section on experience of interviewing. A practical application would be to allow for free flowing dialogue and self-reflection. This is essential to make sure that the interviewee uncovers their own connections and thoughts rather than being directed by me. At the time of the interviews the author was a tutor at the National College of Police Leadership [NPIA] and was experienced in facilitating large groups and in particular conducting one to one coaching sessions. Using this experience a ‘non directive’ approach to interviewing was adopted.

To reduce any bias the author intended not to interrupt during interviews and to be aware of his own body language, such as nodding or confirming a response by a smile/frown. This approach leads back to the researchers own ontological assumptions in that it allows for flexibility in the procedure. The style adopted during the interviews was to be as objective as possible and to allow the interviewee to talk as much as possible with the least inhibition or distraction.

King and Wincup (2008, p. 21) also suggests that the interview should finish with some upbeat general questions as the interview is an effective phenomenon arousing; this was interpreted as the interview revealing feelings that may have been dormant for some time. These feelings would not be captured by the digital recording as a descriptive account therefore the tone, language would be noted and how the researcher felt about the meeting would be recorded in a reflective interview log.

The way in which the questions were asked would also induce different responses to ‘inhibited talk’. It was also recognised that interviewees would have different styles of communication and thinking, i.e. some may be reflective and want more time to consider questions in contrast to some extroverts that might want to keep talking. The guide had, at each question, a secondary prompt which would keep the interview on track and avoid silences or rambling answers. Prior to the interviews the author drew up a personal guide to conduct the interviews.
This was:

1. The interview guide would be semi-structured allowing for secondary questions if required.
2. The questions would be formed from topics derived from the literature review, personal experience and prior research.
3. The author would be as flexible as possible (bearing in mind the data would need to be analysed) and would keep an open mind to revision and addition of the guide.
4. The author’s skill as a facilitator would conduct interviews in a ‘non directive’ way and allow for uninhibited talk. The aim is for the interviewee’s interpretative accounts to be collected, not mine.
5. There would be an acceptance that emotions would be generated. These would be recorded and the interviewee ‘debriefed’ to ensure they are as comfortable as possible.

This research has been incremental in that it was first piloted on a small group of BME officers in Surrey Police. Only one of this sample group held a senior post. The interview guides were developed and piloted on four interviews that have not been included in the final data. The framework of open questions obtained a large amount of data. My concern was how to improve tactically to allow time for free speech but also manage time effectively. From the pilots I drew up a self-help sheet that included a technical checklist to guide me through the process, this is shown at Appendix E.

**Research Sample**

The procedure for selecting the sample was problematic from the start in that there was no national database with the current names and locations of BME Superintendents. The Home Office issue statistical bulletins reporting the numbers of BME officers in each force but lack personal details to locate them across the country. The author was aware of the existence of an informal BME Superintendent network and contacted a member to obtain the names all the BME Superintendents in that group. This had limited success in that this network was informal and not all BME Superintendents were members. Using this approach, the author could account for 35 BME Superintendents. Using the Home Office, Statistical Bulletins (2010b, 2011, 2012) the author then contacted the Superintendents Association of England and Wales obtaining another list with BME
Superintendents which accounted for a further 7 Superintendent’s names. The author then asked for a letter to be sent through the General Secretary of the NBPA to all affiliated force BPAs to ask for assistance to locate the final 3 BME Superintendent’s names. This process itself revealed that as a group no one agency, either statutory or informal, was holding a central register of BME Superintendents. The author knew at the time of selecting the sample that there were 45 Superintendents working in England and Wales. The BME Superintendents were then grouped together into the 8 ACPO geographical regions of England and Wales as shown below:

**Figure 2. ACPO Regions of England and Wales**

The police forces representing the ACPO regions are shown at Appendix F. The southwest region and Police Service of Northern Island (PSNI) did not have any BME Superintendents. One non-Home Office Police Service was also included. Scottish forces were added as a whole country rather than splitting this into Scottish regions. To protect confidentiality of individual participants the name of the force will not be published in these findings. Superintendents in the Metropolitan Police Service represented 24% of the whole population of BME Superintendents in the UK, which equates to 11 BME officers that would be available for this study. To include a wider variety of sample size the pool of officers from the Metropolitan Police Service were
reduced to half. Not to do this would have resulted in the research becoming biased towards the Metropolitan Police Service and not a national research study. Once the officers were clustered into the regions by name they were selected to take part in the study by using a randomiser programme, against the number of people in that particular region. So, for all regions, there was a probability of at least one officer being selected (one region had two) and, for the Metropolitan Police Service, five officers were selected as potential participants. The sampling technique was purposive in identifying BME officers in geographical regions. Fifteen BME officers (33% of total BME Superintendent population) were selected and contacted to take part in the study. There were two BME females and thirteen BME males that took part in the study.

A further seven interviews took place with white Superintendents, volunteers were asked to take part from those delegates attending the Senior Leadership Programme which the author had delivered as a tutor. The selection criteria set was that respondents needed to have been a Superintendent for at least three years. White respondents were also matched with the same force areas that randomised BME officers had been selected from. For instance, if a BME Superintendent from force X was randomly selected then a white Superintendent from force X was sought to take part in the research. The rationale was for the respondents to be compared as working in the same organisational workplace. The make-up of this white group consisted of five white males and two white female Superintendents. All interviews took place between 3rd Nov 2011 and 18th April 2012.

The small number of BME Superintendents represents a challenge for the researcher in being explicit in describing the sample size. The author’s experience in the Police Service was that there is a culture of mistrust and suspicion about confidentiality from all ranks of officers. This could be in part due to the fact that documents given the status of confidential are sometimes required through legal procedures to be disclosed to courts or tribunals. The experience of the author is that sometimes there is an unwitting identification of personnel. The confidentiality promised to BME officers in return for their free and uninhibited thoughts conflicted with the need to adequately describe the sample to enable evaluative judgements to be made about this research. To reveal any further detail about the sample size could lead to compromising and identifying BME officers due to the low numbers in British Policing. This became an ethical dilemma for
me. To overcome this dilemma some general points to increased representiveness in the sample size is provided.

1. The sample contained a mixture of men and women. The proportion of women could not mirror the general proportions to the police, as there are so few female Superintendents.
2. A similar number of white female Superintendents were interviewed.
3. In the majority of cases white Superintendents were matched to the force from which the BME interviewee had been purposely selected to provide an in depth understanding of their perspectives of progression.
4. There were a variety of minority ethnic backgrounds represented.
5. The sample included a range of lengths of service.

Experience of Interviewing
The author was aware that the interview experience provides an underlying sense in which the researcher is in control certainly of the questions and the path of the conversation during the interview situation. Even the interviews that took place in the interviewee’s workplace for the author transformed that domain into his own in a symbolic sense of controlling the conversation. The previous roles of the author in policing provided the opportunity to meet and get to know to some extent those that had been selected to be interviewed. Whilst this provided a good opportunity to build instant rapport, it also posed a concern that, due to the past relationship, there may be a tendency for the participant to influence the outcome of the research or make assumptions that the author shared the same meanings of language and concepts during the interview. To mitigate this risk, the author adopted a business-like approach and factored in a de-brief at the end of the meeting which provided additional field notes about the interview subject and interview experience. These notes added context to the interview and contained my own thoughts on how the interviewee had responded in terms of behaviour and words used.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the interview guide is likely to be modified during the time of the research (King, 1994 cited in King & Wincup (2008, pp. 19-21). This occurred during the first interview, a BME Superintendent offered some professional advice for this research. The individual was also a holder of a doctoral degree and had
worked in this field with Professor Reiner. Using the past work of Reiner (1991, p. 360) modification was made to the interview schedule he had constructed for personal background and social perspectives.

The interview guide was split into three parts; the first part gathered biographical data that would allow the interviewees to ease into the interview (King and Wincup, 2008, p. 21); the second part explored the interviewee’s socio-economic and class background and reflection on the interviewee’s oral history; the third part examines key areas of progression. There was a temptation to send parts one and two of the interview guide to respondents as a survey. This was rejected as, during the earlier small-scale study, the experience of the author found that surveys were incomplete and response rates low. The sections being completed by the researcher assured a 100 per cent return and could also explore other areas of note. Parts one and two also provided a way of inducting the interviewee gently into the process of question and answer.

The experience of interviewing was both intellectually and emotionally satisfying. There was a sense of privilege to gather the interviewee’s narratives, and emotions around progression. There was then a sense of responsibility to make thematic connections and re-tell the narratives in a way that would improve knowledge. A reflective account of the experience of interviewing is attached at Appendix G.

**Ethical Considerations**

An ethical framework was constructed for this thesis, to guide actions and responses in order to avoid harm to the participants. Whilst this framework was bespoke for this thesis, the advice of Bulmer (2001, p. 160) was applied, who said ‘The best counsel for the social researcher is to be constantly ethically aware’. It was imperative to set out ethical considerations, not just for the start of the thesis but also those ‘that would continue through the entire research’ (Kvale 1996, p. 110). The University of Portsmouth ethics self-assessment form was completed and the British Society of Criminology ethical guidelines noted. The letter from the chair of the Ethics Committee agreeing this research is attached at Appendix H. The author wanted to obtain the best possible data on the reality of truth for participants, but correspondingly wanted to ensure that his actions would not harm or disadvantage anyone involved in the research.
Respecting the human dignity of the interviewees was the underlying core value for my ethical considerations.

Bulmer (2001, p. 146) suggests that ethical considerations should take into account informed consent, respect for privacy, safeguarding the confidentiality of the data, harm to subjects and researchers, deceit and lying. Deceit and lying would not be used and, to ensure this, all communications with participants and interactions were guided by the core principle of respecting their human rights, which would ensure the thesis was transparent, open and respectful.

Informed consent was obtained by personal contact explaining fully why, what and how this thesis would be carried out. This information was then sent out formally in a letter to their private addresses. This letter also contained a confidentiality agreement (Appendix I), which explained that they could withdraw at any time and their data would be destroyed. The role of the researcher was explained and explicit information was provided to explain what was expected from them and how their data would be treated and presented in the final thesis. This process provided the participants with the fullest information and the explicit knowledge that they were research subjects but had control to stay or leave the research at any time.

Safeguarding confidentiality impacts not just the collection of interview data but also the storage and dissemination of data. The data was stored in audio format on a MP4 file and backup disc. These interviews were sent electronically to the transcriber who was also subject to the confidentiality agreement. Once the interviews were transcribed and returned to me, the transcriber destroyed all copies of the data that they had. This process ensured that the author was the only one that held the data. This provided a safeguard that confidentiality would be preserved for the participants.

The harm to subjects split into two issues; the first that any breach of confidentiality would place senior officers in a vulnerable position, especially if they had expressed non-corporate views on race; the second related to their emotions during and after the interviews. The author anticipated that racist incidents that the interviewees had been involved in might cause anxiety or stress to the participants. The first harm was mitigated by substituting a number e.g. T.1, for their name. This ensured the author was
the only person to have the data that cross-matched the name to the transcript numbers.
The second harm would be to ensure the wellbeing of those interviewed would be taken
care of. The skills in counselling and facilitation of the author would cater for most
situations during the interview process. The author also set up a small support group
consisting of NBPA counsellors that agreed to be contacted to provide support for any
participant that may need additional post interview support. These NBPA counsellors
were also subject to the thesis confidentiality agreement. Time was factored in to
conduct informal de-briefs after the interviews to assess the interviewee’s emotional
wellbeing. There was also some consideration of the potential for harm to be directed
towards the researcher. The researcher may be viewed by those in the Police Service and
past employers, NPIA, as potentially producing findings that may not show the police in
a good light, thereby possibly damaging the reputation of the police. By being open and
transparent with the NPIA and providing organisational updates as to emergent findings
this harm was mitigated against. This sharing of knowledge built up confidence and trust
in me as a researcher by a key stakeholder in the Police service. The next stage of the
strategy was to design the interview schedules and decide the best techniques to be used
with research participants.

**Improving Validity**

Validity was an issue another issue that was considered to ensure that the interview
would actually measure what it was claiming to measure. In qualitative research the
concept of validity is similar to the quantitative approach, which focuses on methods
used whereas qualitative research concerns the validity of interpretations. Cresswell
(2009) argue validity procedures for qualitative approaches should contain
‘trustworthiness’ which includes creditability, transferability, dependability,
conformability; and authenticity containing fairness, personal constructs, leads to help
improve constructions of others, stimulate action and empowers action.

The style of semi-structured interviewing would allow me to increase the validity to
pursue trustworthiness and authenticity. Bryman (2008, p. 194) describes this as the
variance of the interviewer behaviour. To be consistent I used a schedule of questions
that were asked to all participants and recorded in the same way. I did ask questions out
of numeric sequence if the participants moved to those questions without being asked but
all the questions were presented to participants. This allowed me the latitude to ask what I regarded as further significant questions.

**The Experience of Transcription**

The interviews were recorded on digital recorders and transcribed. During the thesis the methods employed to obtain written transcripts from digital media changed as lessons were learned. This emphasises that the author needed to thoroughly plan each and every part of the research from collecting data to presentation. A detailed reflective note outlining my experience of transcription is shown at Appendix J.

**Part 3 Analysis of Data and Coding**

**Using Software for Analysis**

Qualitative data analysis is described by Seidel (1998, p. 10) as a process consisting of ‘noticing, collecting, and thinking steps’. This process is both iterative and progression in nature as analysis cycles repeat in an infinite spiral. It is also recursive as data is constantly being reviewed back to previous cycles of analysis. The purpose is to make sense from the data. Noticing in this study meant producing a record of things noticed during and after the data collection in particular breaking the extensive data into pieces and assigning them codes that would be used to build up a jigsaw of meaning.

For this study a word processor, Microsoft Word, and qualitative analysis software NVivo 10 were used to manage and code the transcribed interviews. The data collected was imported in NVivo 10, a computer aided qualitative analysis system [CAQDAS]. The benefits of using software in research according to Weitzman (2000, p. 806) as cited in (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) is to manage writing up, editing, coding, storage, search and retrieval, data linking, content analysis, data display and graphic mapping. The constant comparative method would require disaggregation before being re-constructed into themes that would answer the research objectives, which provided me a concern about time constraints to complete the study. The concern of dealing with a large amount of data was reduced using the NVivo 10 software, which allowed me to manage, re-arrange and organise the data for the first coding process. As Weitzman (2000, p. 805) points out that the software will not carry out the analysis process for the researcher who can only be supported by the software to conduct the intellectual analysis. Using this qualitative data analysis software, the author did not capitulate the hermeneutic task to
the logic of the computer; rather the computer was used as a tool for efficiency and not as a tool which conducts analysis and draws conclusions. NVivo 10 software’s logging of data movements and coding patterns, and mapping of conceptual categories and thought progression, enabled all stages of the analytical process to be traceable and transparent. A key aspect of using the software was to produce a more detailed and comprehensive audit trail than manual mapping of the data.

**Importing Transcribed interviews into NVivo 10**

Transcribed interview data, memoranda and field notes were transferred into NVivo 10 where all the passages and words could be interrogated. NVivo 10 allowed after coding all passages assigned a specific code to be viewed together on the screen and to be printed if required. All the transcribed interviews were assigned codes with different colours for easy distinction and comparison. The key advantage of NVivo was that it would log all activity, which would be given a date and time stamp, even where corrections or codes were changed. This function provided a clear audit trail to trace the origin and development of codes and how these were linked to other codes. Specific words and sentences could be searched across all data sets and compared, printed and interrogated against all interview subjects. This process allowed me to explore the data, code it and carry out particular queries; visualisation of data allowed reflective notes to be recorded in memo’s outlining my thoughts.

**Cycles of Analysis**

Prior to analysis of the data a memo was produced to set out the cycles of analysis planned for this study using the NVivo 10 software. This memo setting out the cycles of analysis is shown in Appendix K. There were nine discrete cycles of analyses. These ranged from the initial categorisation of open codes to data reduction that produced an abstract theoretical framework; this prompted deeper thinking of the data which led to findings from which conclusions were drawn (Bazeley, 2009, p. 328). The next section provides a summary of how the cycles of analysis produced the final themes for his thesis. For a detailed account of the authors experience of coding using NVivo 10 software see Appendix L.
There were four phases of managing codes. The first phase was developing open codes generated from the line-by-line examination of the interview transcripts, field notes and personal documents. Open codes were derived from single words as well as text segments or as Maykut & Morehouse, describe as ‘units of meaning’ (1994, pp. 126-149). The full list of open codes are shown at Appendix M. An example of how the textual segments were selected and lifted from the transcripts is shown in figure 3 below:

![Figure 3. Example of Textual Segments Selected to Suggest Open Codes](image)

The second phase involved categorisation of codes before merger and re-labelling, the second phase is shown at Appendix N. Phase three, reconstructed the codes into categories or units of meaning. Some of the original code names were changed to provide more interpretation of the themes being developed whilst others retained the labelling from open coding. The categorisation, re-labelling and on-coding final list of codes is shown at Appendix O.

The fourth phase involved breaking down the now categorised themes into sub-themes to offer more in depth understanding of the highly qualitative aspects under scrutiny. Some of the codes and concepts shared similar characteristics and were placed together to form abstract concepts. The process used was to search for shared properties between the codes also known as coherence (Agar, 1986, p.51).
An example of how the sub-categories were developed is shown at Figure 4 shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Codes</th>
<th>Coherence Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Making mistakes</td>
<td>BME officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of Confidence</td>
<td>proving capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported by BME officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working harder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Coherence of Open Codes**

Phase five consisted of writing summary statements against lower order codes to define the codes for the research. The sixth phase was interpretative where codes were affiliated to each other to develop themes and were reduced to interpretative higher-level codes. This phase was particularly important organising the codes to develop the final themes. Data reduction codes are shown at Appendix P.

In the seventh phase, analytical memos were produced committing the thoughts of the researcher to the synthesis of themes ensuring a reflective intermittent thought process; these memos were powerful to step to transform literal data to conceptual interpretative themes. Phase eight of the analysis was validating the data across all categories of collected evidence, and the literature review. Practically this was cross-referencing the emergent themes against the whole data set.

The final ninth phase produced the six themes derived from the whole analysis process. The technique used was a logical reduction process that produced interpretative propositions and not objective facts. The conceptual map to organize and structure the findings reduced into the following six themes:

1. Institutional operation of racism in BME officers progression
2. Hidden barriers in promotion
3. Exclusion from Power
4. Social capital of BME senior officers
5. Lack of Positive Action
6. Support needed by BME Senior Officers

**Improving Reliability**

To reduce researcher bias and ensure reliability I have made an explicit account at the beginning of the chapter about my approach and presuppositions. The University of Portsmouth’s Graduate School, provided workshops and continued support from qualitative data analysis experts. I availed of this service to utilise knowledge from others that have had more extensive experience and knowledge of using NVivo software and applying it to meet an academic standard. The lead consultant for QDA Training (the company hired by the University to deliver such training and support) trained and coached me through the analytical phases, providing challenge and support (QDA Training, 2014). In this way an external person reviewed the analytical stages and provided me with assurance that the process deployed in conducting my data analysis was entirely consistent with constant comparative method using grounded theory.

The process outlined above presents a logical approach to the collection, management and analysis of data; the reality is that a number of activities are occurring at the same time with one process informing the other. As Suddaby (2006, p. 637) states, it is a ‘jumble of literature consultation, data collection and analysis conducted in on-going iterations that produce relatively fuzzy categories that, over time, reduce to fewer, clearer conceptual structures.’ The five themes from the data will now be used to explain the experiences of BME officers in relations to progression.

In summary the analysis provided the basis to lead towards a conceptual understanding of the research data to build a theory. The next chapter continues with the findings that explore deeper the categories and concepts found to explain the phenomena of BME senior officer progression.
Chapter Four: Presentation of the Data

This chapter aims to present the data from the interviews conducted and present the major themes that were found within the data. The aim is to guide the reader to understand the experiences reported by BME and white officers with regard to progression. The findings will refer back to the previous literature to either corroborate or not existing knowledge of BME officer progression. There is no acceptance of one truth over another however similarities and differences contained in the narratives will be explored. A more in depth analysis of the finding will be reserved for the next chapter. Finding will be presented in major themes with sub themes. Each theme will describe the finding using actual words, summaries and variations in responses. To protect the identities of respondents, quotations will be represented with representative notation, T, followed by the transcript number; for example, T.1 would be a quote from transcript one. Three dots … between the quotations indicates that more was said in the sentence but it was relevant only to the point being illustrated.

To provide the divergences within the sample group, the terms minority, half and strong majority will be used to describe how many of the respondents contributed to a particular finding. The term minority for the BME sample represents three respondents but less than seven respondents; the term half represents seven respondents but less than twelve respondents; a strong majority being twelve respondents or over. For the white sample group; the term minority represented two respondents but less than four; half, represents four respondents but less than six; a strong majority represents six respondents or over.

Part one of this chapter provides the analysis of the biographical data to provide the reader some context of the respondent’s background. Part two of the chapter provides social perspectives of the respondents giving a glimpse into general social characteristics, such as family, qualifications and so on. Finally, part three provides the findings of the analysis of the transcripts.
Part 1: Biographical Data

Part one of the interview schedule was designed to obtain base level data to ensure that the sample spread and responses could be triangulated against qualitative data. The table below details respondents by rank, ethnic group and gender describing the composition of the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/Supt</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Respondents Rank, Ethnic Group and Gender

The average minority ethnic respondent age was 47 years and 44 years for white respondents. These finding corroborated earlier research (Bland et al, 1999, p. 26) in that age-related factors would not lead to further explanation of the differences of progression in the sample group.

According to the data, it takes BME officers slightly longer to achieve promotion than it does white officers. This disparity becomes incrementally pronounced towards the senior ranks. A possible explanation could be that white respondents were generally selected whilst attending the Senior Leadership Programme [SLP] by me in my role as a tutor. The target group for the SLP is newly promoted Superintendents, which may not have reflected the average age distribution of the wider white Superintendent population in the Police Service. Earlier research by Bland et al (1999) reported on average ethnic minority officers took 12 months longer than their white colleagues to reach the rank of Sergeant and 23 months longer to reach the rank of Inspector. The finding in this study show no difference between BME and white officers to reach the rank of sergeant but BME officers took six months longer to achieve the rank of inspector compared to their white colleagues. At Sergeant and Inspector ranks there is a reduction of average time to achieve promotion between BME and white officers. The finding from this study provides new knowledge for Chief Inspectors and Superintendent ranks, as this data did not previously exist. The findings reveal that it takes BME officers 6 months longer to achieve the rank of Chief Inspector and fifteen months achieve the rank of Superintendent. This finding for Superintendents represents a significant differential
time to achieve promotion in comparison to white officers. Attempts to pass promotion boards were not examined in this study as they were in the study by Bland et al (1999).

The analysis of the data revealed that BME respondents are much more likely to have a coach or mentor than white respondents. Six white respondents said that they did not have a coach. Half of the BME respondents said they had a coach and minority said they had a mentor. All of the four female respondents stated that they had a mentor. BME respondents with coaches or mentors took longer to achieve rank progression than those without. The table and chart below shows how BME respondents with coaches or mentors progressed slower than those without.

![Figure 5. BME Respondents With or Without Coaches and Mentors - Average Years to Achieve Ranks.](image)

Half of the BME respondents said they were, or had been, a member of the BPA. Only one BME female reported membership of the BPA. The limited volume of response suggests that BPA Membership has no positive effect on the length of time taken to achieve rank progression. BME respondents with BPA membership achieved rank progression thirteen months slower than BME respondents who were not BPA members.

**Part 2: Social Perspectives**

Part two of the interview schedule was designed to gather data about respondents’ social perspectives and to provide further details about their personal background. This followed the method used by Renier (1991, p. 360) used in his study of Chief Constables.
This was included in the thesis to provide holistic characteristics to provide similarities or differences of BME and white officers.

The respondents were born between 1958 and 1970 with the majority being married. Only one white respondent stated that their parents were born outside of the UK. All but one of the BME respondents reported that their parents originated from a country outside the UK, which were former colonies of the British Empire.

Over half of the total respondent group thought that Britain was a harmonious society. A strong majority of the BME respondents used more positive language than white respondents who caveated their replies with hesitation and negative phrases. There were no clear trends of families influencing the progression of respondents. The work background of respondents’ fathers ranged from carpenters and labourers to doctors and engineers. The work of the respondent’s fathers did not make a significant impact on their progression.

A strong majority of the total respondents (16) felt that socio economic factors such as class and wealth are the most important social divisions in our society. More than half of BME respondents (10) felt that race, ethnicity or cultural background is an important factor in social division. No Female respondents identified gender as a social division. No white respondents indicated race or ethnicity as an important social division in society.

Data analysis did not link educational levels to rank progression. There was an even spread of academic achievement between the BME and white respondents. Most respondents had attended comprehensive secondary schools before going to college or university. These findings do not agree with research conducted by Bland et al (1999, p. vii), which found Asian officers having higher educational qualifications in comparison to their white colleagues.

A strong majority for both white and BME officers’ (18) stated the reason for joining the police was linked to a sense of duty towards providing service to the community. This was particularly evident in responses from a strong majority of BME officers who stated they wanted to ‘make a difference’ and ‘service the community’. In contrast, just under
half of white officers responses were they were either ‘disillusioned’ in other professions or ‘fell’ into the police job. An average of 85% of the total respondent group reported satisfaction with their police career, however less than half said they would re-join if they had their life again. Only one of the four female respondents said they would re-join. The strong majority of white and BME respondents (19) would encourage people from BME communities to join the police. A minority of the BME male respondents (3) were steadfastly against encouraging more BME officers into the police reporting BME staff were not valued.

Part 3: Findings from the Semi-Structured Questions
Making Sense of the Narratives
As explained earlier in the methodology chapter, the analysis of the interviews was in two stages; the first, involved lifting textual sections of the transcripts to start to make sense of the respondents narratives. These correlated with stories or snapshots of how the participants viewed the world, in particular their feelings. The second level of analysis was, as the researcher, connecting the narratives to provide a conceptual account of progression in the Police Service. In effect, this becomes a second ‘telling’ of the narratives but fixed in a theoretical framework to provide a new meaning.

Credibility was sought by peer scrutiny of the research project (Shenton, 2004, p. 67). I sought opportunities to obtain scrutiny over the methodology and project through colleagues, peers and academics. The observations, challenges and questions helped to refine the method and provide better research design. This provided a level of reassurance that the finding of this research would be convincing and have acceptance within the police community. The following peer scrutiny took place:

1. A methodology challenge by the Research Analysis and Information [RAI] department, NPIA (05.10.11).
2. A presentation sharing the emergent findings with the Equality, Diversity and Human Rights [EDHR] Department, NPIA (15.08.12).

To aid the reader the finding are presented in key themes together with sub sections to explain what was discovered by this thesis. The perceptions of BME officer and white officers are interwoven into an interpretative commentary that will allow the reader to
contrast and consider similar and differing perspectives on the progression of BME officers.

**Theme 1: Institutional Operation of Racism in BME Officers’ Progression**

**The Effect of Institutional Racism**

IR had different meanings for the whole of the sample group. All respondents recounted variations of the definition adopted from the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) however, the BME senior officers described IR with a detailed and nuanced knowledge of the concept and how it operated in tangible outcomes. The strong majority of BME and white respondents acknowledged that the Police Service had changed in behaviour and words following the Macpherson (1999) Inquiry but that IR was now ‘hard to measure’ (T.10). Over half of the BME officers provided examples of how the concept worked in an unintended way. As one BME senior officer said:

‘...some of the policies have been traditionally because it’s a Christian country- some of the terminology is Christian as well. It’s like what’s your Christian name? and I say I haven’t got a Christian name and that speech is still used...I think it’s been unintended consequences of doing things in a set way without realising what the impact it has on minority communities.’

(T. 4)

The strong majority of BME senior officers, provided accounts where the effects of I. R. had unintended consequences on progression. They described IR as being covert and its affects demonstrated through external police operations and the internal culture of the police. An example of external IR was using stop and search tactics in BME communities disproportionately more than in white communities as a proportion. In terms of internal culture, over half of the BME senior officers referred to ‘pockets of culture’ (T.5) that affected the progression of BME officers. A strong majority of BME officers reported that they did not feel part of the wider Superintendent group. The existence of IR to discriminate subtly rather than overt racism was a key factor for BME senior officers, as this respondent summarised:
‘I think the more subtle barriers still exist and some of the other barriers that exist, which I guess are more organisational.’

(T.15)

The strong majority of all respondents cited white officers, especially chief officers, as maintaining the culture of progression that contained subtle barriers. IR The subtle barriers form progression relied on relationships with influential decision makers. One BME respondent summarised this point as follows:

‘It’s a club like any other. I think the biggest institutional barrier is it’s a network and when you get to this level it’s overtly a network I mean its seen on the senior command course that you have to network yourself into another job, so its effectively who you know and that’s partly about your track record, your credibility and where you’ve worked and who you’ve worked for and what you’ve delivered. So I’m not saying it’s some kind of corrupt with a major C thing.’

(T.19)

The majority view of both BME and white officers was that selection procedures maintained an air of transparency. As this BME respondent expressed:

‘Whether we like it or not, think that a lot of it is preordained. I think that they believe that certain people are favourites and it is no point in them entering. I think this is all about is the process open and transparent and have they got confidence in it.’

(T.9)

Half of the BME and white respondents perceived that the promotions process was controlled by chief officers and there were unwritten rules, which would guide candidates to success, a major factor being part of a network. A white respondent reported:

‘The joke is that it is very transparent. You know who has got the job before it has even been advertised’

(T.20)
The promotion process was not viewed as a meritocratic but one that operated subjectively that according to BME officers created a barrier for them to progress. BME respondents reported:

‘So institutionally because of that organisation being mainly white male who select people in their own image, black officers and particularly black female officers struggle to get selected for posts.’

(T.10)

And

‘I think some of the institutional barriers are probably the more subtle stuff around what people are looking for in terms of promotion processes. Who writes the promotion processes? I guess the majority of them will be white people.’

(T.11)

Whilst a few white officers stated that they were excluded from networks the majority of BME respondents stated that they were excluded from the informal processes that occur during promotion procedures and perceived these as additional barriers to those faced by white respondents. These responses corroborated the finding of early academics (Jones, 1972, p. 121; Blauner, 1972, p. 9-10) that argued that IR was rooted in culture and the production of racism thereby creating a hierarchical structure of dominance.

**Discrimination Faced by BME Senior Officers**

Half the BME respondents provided accounts of discriminatory practice where postings subtly disadvantaged them from advancing through the ranks. This phenomenon was also replicated for all the female respondents. No male white respondents reported that their postings disadvantaged them. A strong majority of BME respondents were posted to roles that had predominately community partnership responsibilities. These roles were viewed as important to BME officers but were reported as not having high creditability or kudos within policing. When promotion opportunities came around they were then informed that they did not possess the necessary operational experience to be considered for the next rank. A minority of BME officers referred to this subtle exclusion as,
‘I call it an invisible barrier, people talk about a glass ceiling’

(T.5).

These findings has some corroboration to research conducted by Cashmore (2001, p. 98) which found that deployment of minority ethnic officers to police areas of high minority ethnic communities perpetuated the stereotype that only BME minority officers can police minority ethnic communities. Cashmore hypothesised that minority ethnic officers deployments may disadvantage their future promotion prospects; this thesis now has gathered evidence from BME senior officers to confirm this assertion.

A strong majority of BME respondents compared their own experiences against that of colleagues receiving promotion which resulted in them feeling that those in power did not care what happened to them. A direct consequence reported was isolation and estrangement from the wider Superintendent group within their forces. This sense of isolation from the wider network of white superintendents naturally precludes the BME group, creating what Bolton and Feagin (2004, p. 162) ‘call a racial other’. As these respondents recalled:

‘So the organisation chooses to post them in those areas requiring a better understanding of communities, understanding of other organisations and then when it comes to promotion will say actually you haven’t got sufficient operational experience.’

(T.8)

‘I’ve been operationally deployed in a lesser role because I was a woman and they didn’t want me in the main role and I have had people working for me actually tell me to my face that they didn’t like working for me because I was a woman.’

(T.15)

In terms of promotion procedure, a strong majority of BME respondents suggested that the process was discriminatory due to their differential racial characteristics of being
from a BME group. A BME respondent represented the general comments about treatment in promotion processes:

‘When I asked the question of how I had been treated, particularly over the last 2 years then if I was going to compare that with some of my white colleagues then, for me, it is just racism alive and kicking. I will never prove it but that’s how I feel.’

(T.11)

ACPO line managers were seen as a key for career progression by all respondents in this study a finding corroborated by Taylor (2004). Half the white respondents believed there was a hierarchical ‘pecking order’ (T.4) for promotion controlled through the chief officers. As a white officer described the promotion procedures as:

‘I think it is reasonably fair but I do still think that there is an element there probably not a visible element – of people getting certain positions because they are known by certain individuals.’

(T.18)

There was a difference between white and BME respondents when they had been unsuccessful during the promotion process. Over half the white respondents were placed into new roles to develop them whilst BME officers reported no such development deployments. For some BME officers they viewed these practices as discriminatory and excluded them for future promotions. One BME respondent with a substantial number of years in service, said:

‘everyone tells me that I am really good I've been graded as exceptional many many times well if I am that good why isn't the push been sort of greater.’

(T.6)

All respondents stated that formal policies were published which indicated that an inclusionary framework for progression. Half of the BME stated that, although promotion policies were published and appeared to be fair the process still discriminated
against BME officers being promoted. The premise offered by respondents was that although ACPO teams market force promotion processes as fair and equal, the decision-making process disadvantages and denies promotion to BME respondents. This corroborates earlier literature where inequality is maintained whilst racist behaviour is not overtly displayed (Dummet, 1973, p. 131; Commission for Racial Equality, 1985, p. 2-3; Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p. 141). Mainly white organisations control promotion procedures and whilst the legal framework with a meritocratic outcome instead they operate in terms of covert practices (Kandola, 2009, p. 92). The view of the strong majority of BME respondents can be summed in by this comment:

‘So, you have to get over those barriers. So institutionally because of that organisation being mainly white male who select people in their own image, black officers and particularly black female officers struggle to get selected for posts.’

(T. 10)

**Institutional Racism off the Agenda**

There were also comments from half of the BME respondents that race had slipped from the agenda. Reflecting on the effect of institutional racism post Macpherson (1999) one BME participant stated:

‘Why did it stall? Because as a service we have probably done with institutionalised racism what we do with a lot of things. We’ve got to get a grip – it’s the big thing – lots of effort and energy into it and people driving it and then it comes off the agenda and something else goes on.’

(T.12)

Over half reported that a lack of political will, as a casual factor of the race agenda, whilst the other half cited the switch to other priority, namely the female agenda. The rise of very senior female chief officers was cited as being extremely positive to advance the female agenda however all BME female respondents reported the lack of BME female role models are a key in the lack of advancement for BME female officers. One BME respondent summed up the lack of direction for the race agenda as:
more often that I like to hear “we’ve done race, race has been done and any issues around race have been resolved so let’s move on to other areas of discrimination/disproportionality, so I think in that time the confidence has dipped because there was an expectation that was never realised and what is happening now is that almost and open blockage of BME officers progressing.’

(T. 21)

The narratives collected reflected scepticism of the depth of change in how race was being address in their everyday lives and how this affected the police occupational culture. The finding concur with the concept of institutional racism provided by Carmichael & Hamilton (1967, p. 5) and the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999, p. para. 6.17) in that the perceptions of the BME respondents were locked in inequalities for progression in the police.

Racism in the Workplace
A strong majority of BME respondents did not provide explicit examples of direct racism, although they recited incidents that happened to them at junior ranks, describing racist language, being assigned nicknames, like ‘Guinness’ (T. 10) and being excluded from their teams. White male respondents reported no incidents of racism. A minority of BME respondents provided an explanation summarised by this quote,

‘So, no direct discrimination but I think that is because rank does play a part so people are not going to say anything to you because you are more senior to them.’

(T. 7).

A minority of BME respondents during the formal interview reported that they had never had any experience of racism during their service. However, during the de-brief of the interview examples of personal discrimination and prejudice were provided. Half of the BME respondents did provide examples of BME officers that had come to them for advice who recounted experiences of being subjected to perceived racism.

Half of the BME respondents commented that racism had changed from being overt to now being either ‘covert or subtle’ (T.12; T.20) and ‘insidious’ (T.5). A minority of BME respondents and a strong majority of white respondents reported that the high
grievances present at the time of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) had substantially reduced. A key factor for this reduction was the introduction of training, awareness and early intervention strategies to deal quicker with grievances. This indicates a change in the reduction of overt racist language however a strong majority of BME respondents reported that they continued to experience other forms of exclusionary, isolating and discomforting forms of discriminatory behaviour. Whilst these themes will be discussed later in the section ‘networks’, the changes in language are linked directly to the penalties within forces where the display of racism can result in dismissal. These narratives are similar to the finding of Lentin (2004, p143) and Holdaway & O’Neill (2007, p.401) in that the Police Service, similar to general society, has learned to reduce racist language and behaviour however racism and prejudice are perpetuated in other forms to avoid legal or moral censure; this creates a negative environment for BME officers to progress and gain employment opportunities. As one respondent said, ‘it dis-empowers, it sucks your confidence.’ (T.5) The main theme was that racism was a feature of workplace that in general had a debilitating effect on BME officers.

**Supervision of BME Senior Officers**

A strong majority of BME respondents stated that their supervisors made subjective interpretations of their performance in the workplace based on either race or gender. Whilst a minority of BME respondents stated they were well supported by their supervisors the presence of race within the relationship was prevalent. One BME respondent represents this situation as:

> ‘You get a sense of treading on egg shells. Some managers feel hand strung because they think they are going to be accused of racism if they deal with a matter’

T.7

White Supervisors were seen as being clumsy or lacked knowledge in how to manage and support BME officers. During this research two BME respondents awaiting promotion reported being treated in an unfair and discriminatory way in comparison to white officers. Whilst excited about promotion the lack of understanding of why the decisions were made have left these BME officers to believe that un-conscious race bias was being confirmed.
All BME respondents had mixed views about the quality of their Supervisors; none had a BME line manager and only two had access to chief officers. This was reflective for half of the white respondents. All female respondents had a mentor or role model. The strong majority of BME respondents did not have any development plans and over half of BME respondents were seeking chief officer progression sponsorship in order to become a viable prospect for promotion. A strong majority of white respondents also followed this aspiration. A strong majority of all respondents reported that confidence and encouragement from line managers was essential to consider applying for progression. White respondents also corroborated the informal and cultural norms in the progression processes. One BME respondent commented:

‘I get the feeling, like everyone else, I think this is about people feeling confident enough to come forward. And I think, unless you are told by your line managers and your colleagues that you are good enough you ain’t going to come forward and so you are only going to select those people who do actually come forward.’

(T.9)

The strong majority of BME officers perceived they had to struggle through an informal process and were likely to be subjected to bias during the formal process. This in a minority of BME and white female respondents resulted in officers de-selecting themselves, as they perceived they did not have the sponsorship of a supervisor or a chief officer. One BME respondent said:

‘I think it is as equal as they want it to be. They control it. I don’t think it is objectively equal. Providing the good boys get through then that is fine and if there is space for a few others then they might let you through.’

(T.8)

**Stereotyping of BME Senior Officers**

The social structure of the police in understanding race and knowledge being guided by stereotypes was corroborated by half of BME respondents (Holdaway, 1996, p. 3; Miles & Phizackela, 1984, p. 10). BME respondents provided accounts where they felt that there were subject to stereotyping in the workplace. This was largely a perception that
they were being perceived as not so able as white officers and feeling not trusted to do their job. The stereotypes were based on BME officers having the same characteristics of the general BME community together with expectations and beliefs that BME senior officers’ were less capable to perform the role than white senior officers. These negative stereotypes was reported by one BME respondent as:

‘when you have significantly negative stereotype about black people the first thing the person subconsciously sees when a black person walks in the room is this person a criminal, can they be trusted? Will they work well with my white officers?’

(T.10)

A strong majority of BME and all female respondents reported that they had become respectively, de-fault representatives of race and gender. These respondents felt that matters of race were only debated, challenged by BME or female officers. This created another form of subtle stereotyping where BME officers perceived they were always expected to speak on race issues and conversely female officers on gender issues. BME officers were predominately the only BME member on senior management teams or departments. This isolated position for BME officers created a tension and concern of how they were being judged, especially by their line managers. As one respondent said:

‘Having to speak up in relation to black issues is a subtle form of institutionalised racism for me because when did the last white person make a clear statement about tackling racism effectively.’

(T.11)

Another BME officer added:

‘Only time our voice is heard or given opportunity to express an opinion are on issues of race’

(T.2)

There were clear affects on BME officers in terms of subtle stereotyping. BME officers described the effects of stereotyping as debilitating, one officer reported:
‘all these stereotypical categorisations has meant that minority officers have had to work a lot harder to prove themselves which takes its toll on them and their ability to progress through because significant energies is spent proving themselves rather than getting on some of the networking the white officers have the ability and opportunity to do more.’

(T.13)

Theme 2: Hidden Barriers in Progression

Perception of Barriers

Half of the white respondents questioned how barriers for BME officers had not been tackled and propositions as to why this situation remained, ranged from ‘Police arrogance’ (T.1), ‘invisible barriers that BME officers perceive that re-affirms their concerns for fighting for places’ (T.15) and ‘naïve not to think there is not IR’ (T.17). A minority of BME respondents questioned whether BME officers were creating internal barriers and whether they existed externally. Two BME respondents dismissed that any barriers existed for progression and questioned the over use of the term IR to mask what they described as personal failures. The continuing debate in identifying and tackling barriers for BME officers within the workplace corroborates the previous lack of knowledge in BME progression (NPIA, 2008, p. 102; NPIA, 2011; Cashmore, 2002, p. 337) and recent research to tackle barriers (College of Policing, 2014, p. 3).

Tokenism

A minority of BME respondents reported experiences of being the first or only BME officer in a department or unit. All female respondents also reported this experience. This created a concern of how to deal with race or gender issues as one respondent said,

‘how am I going to manage in terms of race issues because I will be one of the very few minority ethnic officers?’

(T.12)

A minority of the BME respondents stated that they ‘don’t want to be seen as the token black person’ (T.12) but the expectation was that were required to perform duties to assist the recruitment of BME officers into the Police service. These perceptions corroborate previous research on female and black ‘tokens’ as found respectively by (Kanter, 1977, p. 208; Bolton and Feagin, 20014, p. 157). The proposition raised by the
BME respondents is that tokenism is used by the police to provide the appearance of social change whilst the reality for BME senior officers was that their social capital was used for recruitment purposes only. One BME respondent stated:

‘I think if we can be marched out every now and then and we put these nice pictures smiley black people, you know, when we want to make a balanced workforce but it is not necessarily the way all the way through and I think some of that holds up in the figures when you look at it and one Chief Constable who led diversity in and pats himself on the back and says we are now a diverse organisation with 6% of police officers are from a BME group’.

(T.8)

A minority of BME respondents reported that although being asked to undertake high risk operations there was a lack of recognition by peers and line managers, as one BME respondent provide the following example:

‘I successfully policed the Royal Wedding last year and my bit of the ground was, in my eyes, the most vulnerable. But I policed all the vulnerabilities out. I found out some weeks later that a load of people got Commissioner’s Commendations for what they did and I didn’t.’

(T.7)

This corroborates Kanter’s research (1977, p. 216) which she describes, as the ‘token eclipse’ where the ‘token does not have to work hard to have her presence noticed, but she does have to work hard to get her achievements noticed.

Positive Narratives
A minority of BME respondents provided accounts where they have not faced racism or sexism. One BME female respondent was in this category. They were very positive about the workplace and provided personal accounts of receiving support and assistance from others. Also captured in these accounts were vicarious accounts of others around them that faced barriers, racism and sexism. A factor that bound this BME respondent group was that they had access and support from chief officers suggesting future aspirations for advancement.
Fewer Opportunities

Over half the BME and white respondents reported that they had not been provided an opportunity to progress either by advancement or being posted into a specialist role. As austerity measures were starting to be implemented and promotions selection processes becoming less frequent, respondents provided two main reasons for the lack of opportunities. These were lack of black role models to provide support and assistance and existing BME chief officers failing to assist BME respondents. As this BME respondent stated that successful BME senior officers, ‘pull the ladder up, now they have got there’ (T.11). Two BME respondents provided a contrary view, in that they obtained assistance from other BME senior officers to progress. This provided an insight as to what was required and some consequences for the person providing assistance. As this BME respondent said,

‘It’s who you know…and guide you. Actually help you write your application – which is what happens’

adding

‘I know he took some professional hits for doing that and people were questioning his motivation’

(T.7)

The offering of opportunities for BME and white officers were reported as un-equal, in that, some colleagues were favoured and provided time to prepare; these colleagues had strong links to the chief officer team. As one BME respondent expressed,

‘the main one for me is for the organisation to equality of opportunity, not equal opportunity but equality of opportunity’

(T.13)

Two BME staff that had been on the High Potential Development Scheme (HPDS; an accelerated talent progression scheme in the Police Service) reported they were not provided development opportunities despite being on the HPDS that mandated that requirement. One of the BME officers reported that similar opportunities had not been provided to progress as other white officers that were on the HPDS.
A minority of BME officers did report that they had received the opportunity to ‘broaden’ (T.2) their experience and skills should the opportunity arises in the future. Female respondents reported high levels of support from their own peer groups and provided examples of good networks where other female role models irrespective of rank were offered to each other.

When half the BME respondents actively pursued opportunities they all reported that they were unsuccessful. One BME officer commented:

‘there was an opportunity to go on a 8 week secondment to the United States crime fighting thing and the way they picked for that was names out of a hat. There were 2 people and I said it that really what you are going to do? You’ve got me who am unique… and you have got a white middle class equally capable person.’

(T.7)

And

‘a few people in the (force name omitted) who’ve been C/Insp and Supt level who felt very much like it’s been an almighty struggle to get there. But again they didn’t really, they felt they’d been passed over or they’d not been given the opportunity of they’d not been given.’

(T.13)

What was absent from the narratives of BME officers was the encouragement and support from first or second line managers. Whilst there were no overt examples of discouragement there were also no accounts of overt encouragement reported.

**Specialist Departments**

Half of the BME and all the female respondents shared experiences of exclusion from specialist departments. A female respondent recounted,

‘I am aware from colleagues in some specialist departments how difficult it is for them to get in.’

(T.5)
The respondents provided accounts that where there was exclusion due to the lack of female or BME officers in those specialist departments. These departments were viewed as high status roles with a distinct culture that was male white dominated. Recruitment to these specialist departments was not based on objective selection criteria but on who was known within the departments, as friends. One BME respondent said, ‘what I mean by that is peoples’ roots in organisation’ (T.20), indicating it was reputation and whether you would fit into the department being a key criteria to be selected. A minority of BME respondents described a culture of specialist departments that precluded BME recruits from joining, as on BME respondent reported,

‘To me it is the environment that matters. We have many departments where people just won’t go, i.e. the CID’

(T.5)

This finding corroborates previous research of HMIC (2001, p. 25) and Bland et al (1999, p.vi) where there still is a differential of inclusion of BME senior officers in specialist departments.

**Few BME Role Models**

Just under half of the BME respondents reported the lack of positive BME role models that may be able to assist in progression corroborating earlier research (NPIA, 2010, p. 122; Taylor, 2004, p. 100). A minority of BME respondents were critical of very senior BME officers who once had attained promotion appeared to have ‘drawn up the ladder’ (T.3) behind them. One BME respondent summarised this finding as:

‘I think black people are disabled in society or not necessarily empowered in society so there’s that extra bit of support that those people need. I mean, where are the black coaches, where are the black mentors to help and support people? When you step into this organisation where are the role models?’

(T.13)

Over half the BME and all the female respondents also described themselves as role models to other BME staff which bought added pressures not reported by white respondents, as this BME respondent vocalised,
The lack of role models was viewed as a barrier to recruitment by BME communities considering a career in policing (Stone and Tuffin, 2000, p. 12).

Three female respondents reported that they were faced with additional barriers to progression. White female respondents reported that they had to contend with gender bias and BME respondents faced gender and race bias. This for BME female respondents, corroborated a phenomena known as a ‘double whammy’ described by Collinson & Hearn (1996, p. 10) as women in organisation being faced by dominance features of white, heterosexual, able bodied men (WHAMs); as well as features of ethnicity. One BME female respondent stated that she had never encountered racism or sexism, however this respondent was proactive on project groups that acknowledged gender discrimination in the workplace. All BME female respondents had gained access to mentors and sponsors and were receiving coaching for progression. Both white and BME female respondents perceived that the increase of female role models would assist the progression of the female agenda. According to the respondents this would encourage other females to aspire for progression and provide better role models and mentors.

BME female respondents reported they did not fit neatly into a female or BME network and were in a sense unique with little recognition of this fact by their line managers. As one respondent said,

‘Because I wasn’t in the football crowd or the crowd that went to the pub …I didn’t fit into those circles’

(T.12)
Ethnicity Not Valued by the Police

A strong majority of white and a minority of BME respondents reported that ethnicity and difference was not valued within the Police Service. There was a gap between stated policy (Home Office, 2010, p. 6) to achieve a diverse workforce and as to what was perceived in the workplace by BME and white respondents. There was a range of views that stated ethnicity was seen as ‘lip service’ (T.17), ‘tick box’ (T.3). One respondent commented:

‘I just don’t think there is a strong will within the service to rout out racism, to value those of us who come from, you know, ethnics backgrounds to work with communities and all those things but to be fair I don’t think the service knows how to do it. There is a lot of nervousness.’

(T.18)

The lack of valuing ethnicity in terms of respecting racial identity has a direct impact on recruiting more BME officers and staff corroborating earlier findings (Stone and Tuffin, 2000, p. 13; Perry and John-Baptiste, 2008, p. 7). A white respondent expressed the following view,

‘The phrase that comes to mind is lip-service. It is very, very superficial that the services are seemingly obsessed with numbers.’

(T.3)

An aspect of valuing ethnicity became apparent when there were a crisis within the BME community arose, as this BME respondent commented,

‘So, we will talk to people of say the Hindu community or background if there has been a murder…Then we won’t engage with them again until the next murder’

(T.7)
**Culture of the Police**

Half the BME and a strong majority of white respondents reported that culture of progression was rooted in the institutional aspects of maintaining the status quo, as this respondent said,

> ‘I think the culture of the organisation is still based on recruiting people like yourself.’

(T.8)

The comments revealed a workplace that existed at two levels, the formal and informal. The formal level acknowledging the aim of having a diverse workforce (Home Office, 2006, p. 6). The informal level where BME respondents encountered an environment where cultural stereotyping occurred where BME senior officers did not feel valued for their cultural background. As this BME respondent stated:

> ‘So we need black officers because we need to have a service which reflects the communities that we police. And the other thing is that there always seems to be this reluctance by senior people to acknowledge black people for being black and their culture and their religions.’

(T.13)

This expression of frustrations about progression and there is a resultant ‘us’ and ‘them’ construct where the racialisation of BME senior officer leads to exclusion from progression, corroborating previous research (Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p. 96; Holdaway, 1996, p. 23). Previous research argues that social distance of police groups can cause positive and negative outcomes (Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p. 163; Reiner, 1992, p. 1017. A minority of the BME respondents reported that there was a lack of social contact outside of the workplace, one respondent saying,

> ‘I think the classic case is when you ask a white officer how many BME phone numbers they have got in their mobile which isn’t related to work’

(T.8)
For BME respondents the culture of progression was tangible and a key feature of their workplace affecting progression. The strong majority of BME and minority of white respondents reported that the culture of the police where they were viewed as different and had to prove their worth to others,

‘There is still a big thing in terms of us having to prove ourselves because we stand out don’t we?’

(T.18)

BME respondents perceived they needed to prove they hold the post on merit rather than their ethnicity; if they were also female an extra dimension of scrutiny was included. The common theme was the BME respondent’s felt they were being judged and tested and this created additional barriers, ‘White officers don’t have the race barrier to get over’ (T. 10). The cultural environment of the police reported by BME respondents provided a sub-culture that was outside of the processes for white senior officers. There was strong feeling of exclusion from the dominant network. As one BME respondent commented:

‘but the culture is created by people, so the culture is created by the majority, the majority are white, middle class men, most of them are quite good and decent but there is an insidious minority amongst them that they allow to act inappropriately.’

(T.5)

Black Police Association Negative Connotations

The NBPA was launched in 1999 with the full support and financial backing of the Home Office. The HMIC (2001, p. 74) reported this as good practice to encourage and retain BME officers. This research found no links between BPA membership and progression of BME officers. Respondents that were BPA members did not report any benefits of membership however reported that they could network with others for support and advice. A minority of BME respondents reported that members of the BPA limited their chances of progression:
issues around being connected to the BPA and how you are perceived and there are some negative associations of being connected to the BPA.'

(T.12)

And

‘From very senior people, a lack of engagement with the BPA, lack of engagement with black issues has been quite stark and the result of that is that black officers are feeling disempowered.’

(T.11)

The finding corroborates the research conducted by Holdaway and O’Neill (2007, p. 865) who reported that BPAs would probably not have a dramatic influence on policing at this moment. However, they did conclude that the impact of BPAs not yet be fully realised. From the finding from this study it appears association to BPAs appears to have changed from overt support to the present finding that there is a perception of negativity towards membership of these associations. It is beyond the scope of this study to explore the dynamics of the social political relationships of the BPAs with local forces and the Home office.

**Theme 3: Exclusion from Power**

**White Networking in the Workplace**

The strong majority of all respondents provided accounts where informal networks played an important determinant for progression in the police. BME officers provided a varied description of how these informal networks were wholly white and entrenched within the structure of their workplace.

A minority of BME respondents reported they were isolated at the time of joining the police due to their racial identity, thereby maintaining the occupational culture and hierarchy where they remained outside of the informal network. As this BME respondent said:
‘If you are different to the main group, the white Anglo Saxon, protestant group, whether you are female, whether you are gay, whether you have a slight disability or from a minority, you are automatically excluded from that group and that network…it is just like when you are child picking a team for football. You would line up and people would choose their friends whether they have ability of or not…the odd balls would be left till last and would then be selected on to the team and that is pretty much what happens. My view is irrespective to the amount of development the suitability of the individual candidate or not – that if you are not within the network, if you have not tied within the network of that group then it is very, very difficult for you to make in-roads to that group in order to be selected and to be seen as part of the team.’

(T.6)

A minority of BME respondents reported that belonging to a network required an invitation and provided common analogies of picking a football team (T.13, T.6, T.17, T.18). A white female respondent commenting on formal female networks added, ‘very similar to a white group but BME officers are not invited into those groups’ (T.15). The promotion process was reliant on inclusion of the network, which provided advantage to those going through the promotion procedure. BME respondents believed that informal networks benefited white officers and in turn generating barriers for BME officers. These finding corroborate the general finding of previous research in this area where informal networks of the existing workforce determines the day-to-day operations and can disadvantage minority groups (Kandola, 2009, p. 92; Keltner and Robinson, 1996, p. 1068).

Socialising in Networks

A white respondent gave a real example of a network that assisted in their posting,

‘And if you are in the football team you got whatever posting you wanted and you were headhunted for key postings by the people who ran the football team. That was part of the culture and the history of this organisation.’

(T.17)
The proposal here was that if a BME officer joined the football team they would join the network and adopt a new identity without the connotations of minority ethnicity. The lack of social networking between white and BME officers was reported by half of BME respondents as advantaging white officers in the preparation for promotion as this BME respondent commented,

‘Whether it’s through playing golf, whether it’s through going drinking or whatever they have people, they have mentors, they have coaches and we have been quite slow in getting that.’

(T. 4)

All female respondents reported that networking into social and sporting networks was extremely discriminatory in terms of obtaining possible information about organisational change. This accords with earlier research by (Forret & Dougherty, 2004, p. 432) where provides a number of examples of how the organisation can discriminatory effects against different groups and individuals are as a result to informally socialise.

**Benefits of Networks**

A strong majority of BME respondents reported that membership of these networks provided advantage for white officers and by default disadvantage for BME officers. The informal network was seen to link strongly into key decision makers for promotions, as this BME respondents said,

‘I would say that the white have a far superior network to support them as compared to BMEs – which for me is the real key because when you get to a high level it is not what you know, it is who you know and who you know that can support you.’

(T.11)

These sponsors were commonly reported as Chief officers that would facilitate the progression of senior officers. BME respondents that had sponsors added,

‘I think it is linked to having sponsors as you go through the service – people who will pull you through and I’m sure that happens in every walk of life not just in the Police Service.’

(T.18)
The formal promotion process had an informal element where belonging to a network was essential with an influential sponsor, as this white respondent stated,

‘So there is almost like a 2 tier promotion system once you get above the rank of Inspector and passed to be promoted’

(T.14)

Half the BME respondents provided examples of benefits that emanated from the informal networks. The first benefit was the advice on writing the application form,

‘It is very much about networks, who you know who can advise and guide you. Actually help you write your application.’

(T.7)

A minority of BME respondents stated that applications for most BME officers were a weakness and compounded if they were not part of an informal network,

‘if you don’t understand how to present yourself and how to put that down and you’re given no advice and you don’t have a network around you that might be there to give you that advice then that’s a big barrier.’

(T.19)

The second benefit was that of being offered secondments for development purposes. A strong majority of BME respondents highlighted that they had examples of personal opportunities not being presented to a wider group or selection made because of the membership of an informal network. This BME respondent summarise this benefit as:

‘I just wonder sometimes how do some senior people get these secondments, where is the process then and it goes back to my earlier point about white people and particularly senior white people being able to access networks and there is always this question about does this face fit? I am not sure that is always that true when you are black.’

(T.13)
The third benefit reported by a strong majority of BME and half of the white respondents was people in informal networks would be viewed more favourably than those that were not. The power of being in a network was that Chief officers were assessing personal attributes as to how well promoted officers would fit into the existing occupational environment. A BME respondent revealed:

‘I think the real decision making goes on in the background where people actually sit around the table and say we’ve got this group of people with all these skills, who can you work best with – now if you are not having access to all that interaction and network.’

(T.21)

The respondents reported an occupational culture for BME officers to conform to white-determined racial categories of networks that are perceived to be crucial for progression. A strong majority of BME respondents perceived this as ‘white culture’ (Holdaway and O’Neill, 2004) where informal relationships and associations assists in the progression of white senior officers.

**Old Boys Club**

A minority of BME and white respondents gave a name for the informal network as ‘old boys club’ (T.17, T.19, T.10). As this BME respondent recorded,

‘there is the old boys network, if you don’t know people, you don’t get certain jobs’

(T. 10)

Two areas were being reported contained within narrative. The first, the language being used denoting a masculine occupational culture that others have reported previously that resists the incursion of female and minority groups (Miles & Phizacklea, 1984, p. 9; Holdaway, 1996, p. 23; Kanter, 1977); the second being that there is no integration of senior white and BME officers. A minority of BME officers had approached the informal networks resulting in comprise on their cultural values and identity, as highlighted by this BME respondent:
'It depends whether you are prepared to pay that cost. We have seen it in terms of interests, for example, there might be golfing circles, there might be motor-biking circles, there maybe inappropriate behaviour such as the sending of lewd material. There maybe, you know, misogyny. It is almost your right of passage, if you will. And there also maybe behaviours which are inconsistent with your own personal value sets and your own cultural set which you are certainly not prepared to put down.’

(T. 6)

A strong majority of white respondents agreed that networks aided progression within the police although not explicit about the form, structure or nature of the network one white respondent revealed,

‘...discrimination is probably a strong word for it. I think over the years I have enjoyed the old boys network and suffered as a result of it.’

(T. 14)

The research respondents provide a proposition where successful progression for senior officers is reliant on networks and the value attached to individuals by those who decide who will be promoted. Past research has argued that every kind of network can be found amongst any group of managers who require strategic sponsorship to progress, and to an extent the findings corroborate this assertion (Burt, 1992, p. 166). Burt also records that minorities do not achieve top leadership. Burt studied the progression of women, which has similar findings to this study.

**Theme 4: Social Capital of BME Senior Officers**

Social capital is a construct used to understand the importance of social relationship in various setting, in this thesis how individual relationships of BME senior officer assist or otherwise in progression. (Manning, 1994; Pino, 2001). The findings outline respondents reality of how their social capital is used or not.

**Representing the Community**

All respondents reported that the BME officers were necessary to represent the community corroborating recommendations made in previous inquiries that had resulted in the formulation of BME staff recruitment policy for the Police Service (Scarman,
1981; Macpherson, 1999; Cantle, 2001; Morris, 2004 and Butts, 2010). A minority of BME respondents reported that the moral case for being representative had failed and that a focus should be on making a business case where skills such as language would be included in selection procedures. These BME recorded:

‘Public want cops to look like them it’s a business imperative because of the difference that diversity brings.’

(T.4)

And

‘We understand things sometimes from a different perspective. Culturally, we understand difficult communities, difficult issues, we completely understand issues that transcend boundaries around culture, values and things like religion.’

(T.15)

Two BME respondents who, despite their ethnic heritage, had grown up in white families, so this rebutted the assumption that all BME officers possess cultural abilities and skills.

**Self-Identity**

When asked whether BME respondents would describe themselves as either black officers or as an officer that is black, the following responses were provided:

1. Eight of the respondents clearly identified racial identity before the identity of an officer.
2. Six respondents placed the identity of officer before their racial identity.
3. One respondent refused to choose any identity.

Racial identity was the first descriptive featured for over half of the BME respondents corroborating research in this area (Holdaway & O’Neill, 2004, p. 498). The field notes taken describe that for some BME officers it was a struggle to make a choice. Where BME officers did not state a racial identity first the interviews reveal that racial identification was described in their post interview narratives as important to them and affected their work practices. In contrast white respondents choose the following responses when asked if they were white officers or officers that were white as:
1. Five respondents identified the officer identity before racial identity.
2. Two respondents identified racial identity before the identity of an officer.

A strong majority of white officers reported ethnicity did not feature in their description of their self-identity. For all female respondents, gender identification was reported before ethnicity. One BME respondent said:

‘I think naively you want to think you are an officer that is black. But I think experience would teach you that you are a black officer.’

(T.9)

A minority of BME respondents were provided temporary duties where identity was magnified, where even more self-awareness about racial identity was exhibited:

‘I acted up for 12 months sitting at the Executive level and it is a lonely place anyway and when you are black people look at you 3 times.’

(T.11)

**Added Value**

BME officers provided a number of skills, which they perceived added value to the Police Service. The skills reported by BME officers included:

1. Language skills.
2. Formal and informal coaching and mentoring (mainly to other BME staff).
3. Cultural knowledge of their own minority ethnic group.
4. Understanding cultural impacts of police actions on BME communities.

Half of the BME respondents provided operational examples describing their understanding and ability to relate to the BME community. By contrast, the strong majority of white officers provided organisational strategic aims, such as trust and
confidence, rather than proving operational examples or added skills. BME respondents articulated the value of interpreting the community operationally as:

‘Recognise situations as one of playfulness at the Notting Hill Carnival, compared to white colleagues who see danger.’

(T.2)

And

‘I think it is about how we interpret interaction within the community, how we interpret some of things that the community wants and how we understand those things. You can’t understand those things unless you have stood in those shoes or you have got some experience.’

(T.10)

A minority of BME respondents also expressed their ability to probe police community interactions in activities such as stop and search, as this BME officer reported:

‘used in the stop and search world when we talk about disparity and disproportionality, let’s talk about attitudes that may be leading to some of those and exploring some of the attitudes of our officers and see if we can tease out maybe some of those attitudinal behaviours are playing more a significant role in the disproportionality rather than the processes.’

(T.13)

BME officers reported they could ‘Operate in different cultures’ (T.2) and use the skills and abilities. These skills were not being overtly broadcast or recognised by supervisors. This suggested BME officers operated differently to those white officers facing the same operational challenges.

Proving Capability

Half of the BME and a minority of white respondents reported that BME senior officers had to prove their ability in their role over and above that off their white peers. BME respondents provided accounts where they found it necessary to work harder to disprove stereotypes about them, the main one being that BME senior officers were not as capable as white officers, as this BME respondent said:
‘I will feel that I will need to prove that I am here on my own merits and I’m not here just because I happen to have black skin.’

(T. 18)

A white respondent added,

‘additional pressures on BME staff to have to do that bit extra, as people might say, to prove themselves’

(T. 2)

BME respondents also cited visibility as being a factor of proving oneself:

‘…the majority of the white officers are on the inside we are on the outside…The other thing is because they are not necessarily as visible they do not have to prove themselves in the same way’

(T.16)

Adding that there were also external pressures to prove themselves:

‘They don’t have the same level of operational experience and yet time and time again we are told to go out and develop these areas and this is what really, really racks me off – that we go around and we develop ourselves to the eighth degree.’

(T.6)

A minority of BME respondents reported that their white peers did not exhibit the feature of proving themselves, as this BME respondent reported:

‘I think with a lot of white colleagues a lot of assumptions are made about people’s ability yet with me I have always felt…I have to go and do it and prove it and do it twice to prove it or three times whereas a lot of assumptions are made about my white colleagues.’

(T. 13)
A minority of respondents provided a direct outcome of proving themselves as fearing making mistakes. The first outcome being they would be confirming stereotypes about them, ‘stereotypical thinking ‘I told you so’’ (T.21) and second because of their racial identity, ‘Physically different we are remembered for mistakes’ (T. 7). A minority of BME officers offered an alternative reason which was:

‘they feel they do have to prove themselves more than their white colleagues and peers, because always underlying assumption which has been there for a while, probably been reinforced recently as a result of a backlash that educationally probably BME officers are not as capable as the white officers’

(T13)

The BME respondents reported that they were being judged which seemed not to be standard practice for their white colleagues. These work dynamics were generating a burden of representation where they had to work hard to prove themselves capable. The BME respondents provided a description of their work based in occupational norms and values which created a cultural barrier for them, corroborating earlier research (Chan, 1997, p. 43; Manning, 1997, p. 360; Reiner, 2000, p. 109). Whilst this previous research centres on cultural norms detailed corroboration with this finding is found in the US study by Bolton and Feagin (2004, p. 111).

**Lack of Confidence**

A strong majority of BME respondents reported that there was a lack of self-confidence in BME officers and described how this related to promotions processes. All female respondents also reported this lack of confidence in putting themselves forward for lateral or progression advancement. The white male respondents did not report any issues over confidence. This BME respondent summarised the situation as,

‘The majority of BME don't have the confidence or knowledge understanding of how to pass promotion process.’

(T.3)

This linked to the composition of those that operated the promotion processes,
'I think if you ask people around promotion people don’t have confidence in promotion process. There is issues about who the assessors are, assessors recruit assessors like themselves.'

(T. 8)

Half the BME respondents spoke about the low levels of self confidence that inhibited BME senior officer to go forward for promotion, as this BME respondents said of other BME senior officers, ‘crisis of confidence not ready yet’ (T.19). White officers were seen to have issues of self-confidence.

A minority of BME officers stated that the lack of confidence was directly related to how chief officers perceived their ability, ‘you get to know how things work and you get to see and know who the Chief Officers have confidence in’ (T. 18) and that exposure to a wider range of policing politics assisted in gaining confidence. As this BME respondents recorded:

‘I have got that level of confidence from working with people and delivering at quite a high level of the organisation. Some of my colleagues that are BMEs just don’t know how to play the political game. And it is a political game.’

(T. 10)

Whilst this confidence could be gained from chief officers the same BME respondents cautioned, ‘You are under scrutiny all the time’ (T.10). Under these conditions half the BME respondents reported that they had to work against being scrutinised to prove themselves. There was a distinct feeling of BME respondents operating on two levels. The first being corporate, performing the role of a senior officer and then expressing frustration of being a minority in a majority workforce.

‘I’ve mentored some BME officer and I do know one thing is that there’s a crisis of confidence that you don’t see in white male colleagues.’

T.14
In writing field notes the author recorded that there was a sense of frustration and anxiety in the BME respondents that led to an unforeseen outcome of proving competency for all role requirements before considering progression. A strong majority of minority of BME respondents reported that prior to considering any progression they would tick every box in terms of proving evidence for competence to the next rank.

‘women don't traditionally go for things unless they are 100% sure and they can tick every box.’

T.5

The issue of white colleagues not having the same mind-set provided frustration for a minority of BME respondents, one was frustration shared was:

‘I have always felt a lot of pressure to make sure portfolios are completed and yet there is no accountability in there and the majority of those people happen to be white, which I find quite interesting.’

(T. 13)

All female respondents reported this, whereas minority of white male respondents reported the opposite, in that they perceived women more confident to apply for promotion. One BME respondent stated:

‘what I see in some of my BME colleagues is what I see in a lot of female colleagues and with myself that we don’t feel we are ready for promotion until we can tick every single box. And we can evidence every single thing. Whether it is in our DNA or whether it is a mindset we have got ourselves in for but I see predominantly white male colleagues will go ooh the promotion process is out, I will have a go at it.’

(T.9)

One explanation given by a minority of BME respondents was the mainly white occupational culture how that shapes their behaviour. One BME respondent said,
'issues for me have been around my self-confidence and that goes back to growing up in a predominately in a white society'

(T.11)

A minority of white and BME respondents spoke about BME officers carrying ‘baggage’ (T.3) and that if there was failure at promotions it became more visible than white officers due to the small numbers of BME staff. The elements being reported concur with Singh (2000, p. 35) where social stratification simplifies two main classes white and black, in this case the BME group being subordinate to the white hierarchy.

**Working Harder**

A strong majority of the BME respondents reported that they had to work harder than their white colleagues to first, justify their promotion or posting to a new role. One BME respondent summed up why BME officers worked harder by saying:

‘There’s a bit part of assimilation to growing up, you know, you’d have to work twice as hard to get on, and you can’t show out you can’t make a big deal, don’t be chippy basically, just you know keep your head down and work hard and you’ll be fine but you’ll just have to work twice as hard.’

(T. 6)

There were a number of reasons provided for working hard, the first being that BME officers were being scrutinised more which provided added pressures for them in the workplace, as this BME respondents disclosed:

‘I had to work 3 times as hard to achieve exactly the same as my white colleagues because I am very much under the microscope. I suppose that takes a lot of extra energy and a lot of wear and tear’

(T. 13)

The second reason was to uphold their personal reputation and provide a role model for other BME staff, as this BME respondent said:
'Individual probably works 2, 3, 4, 5 times harder than everybody else to get there and doesn’t want to tarnish their reputation. So there is the added complexity of not only looking out for yourself but there is also the pressure of being seen as a role model and what will you do for the rest. So, when you add all those things together it can be a difficult task.'

(T. 11)

Half of white respondents also agreed that BME senior officer worked harder and provide a candid view of why, as this white respondent reported, ‘…they are getting there but based not on merit but because we have to make the numbers up’ (T. 1). In these accounts BME officers work harder to prove themselves and this has a toll on their energy. The main reason seems to be the feeling of being scrutinised and meeting standards and not letting other BME staff down, as they will be the most visible BME officer of rank.

**Theme 5: Lack of Positive Action**

**Promotion Procedure**

The strong majority of BME and white respondents all provided accounts of promotion procedures not being fair and based on subjective assessments made by chief officers. Decisions as to who would be promoted were already made, as this BME respondent stated,

‘…when you get 5 Superintendents or 5 Chief Inspectors going for a job you can always pick out the ones which are going through.’

(T.4)

The accounts provided pivoted on the subjective views of chief officers that determined who would get promoted. This BME respondent linked being in a network to how personal are selected subjectively by chief officers:

‘Chief is prepared to take a punt on people who would appear on paper to be less academically qualified, less professionally qualified, not all the pre-requisite skills but they are the “like mes” who can actually go through because they are good boys.’

(T. 6)
The invisible element reported was based on relationships that occurred prior to the promotion process as this white respondent recalled,

‘I think it is reasonably fair but I do still think that there is an element there that – probably not a visible element – but I do still think there is an element of people getting certain positions because they are known by certain individuals.’

(T. 15)

Promotion procedures were not viewed as fair by half of the BME and white respondents, who commented that the formal procedures were being subjugated by the subjective application by chief officers resulting in disadvantage for BME and female senior officers. As this BME respondent highlighted,

‘Any policy you pick up is fair, but it’s the application of the policy that the problem’

(T. 21)

followed by this comment,

‘I don’t think it is fair. It is down to who you want at the end of the day.’

(T. 4)

The respondent’s accounts of the promotion procedure painted a dual path for progression, a formal procedure and an informal one, as this white respondent said:

‘It has a procedure and it follows the procedure. And the procedure is certainly aware of equality and follows equality and diversity procedures. But that doesn’t mean that it’s promoting the right people’

(T. 1)
Half the BME and white respondents cited the chief constable as essential to progression where reputation and what others said about you were important. The informal process was seen as unfair revolving around relationships with ACPO, as this white respondent said,

‘People’s view are prejudice because they know you already. It is not a blind system.’

(T.17)

A minority of BME respondents reported that chief officers did not support BME senior officer in coming forward for progression as this BME respondent stated,

‘The Chief Officers who have got there haven’t really been vocal in trying to bring on more BME Officers – so the support hasn’t been there.’

(T.4)

Comments also pointed towards those on panels displaying bias, as this BME respondent recounted,

‘You go on interviews and when you are sat in front of a white panel at interviewers and you are a black officer you are at a disadvantage.’

(T.10)

One aspect highlighted by these respondents was that panel members lacked cultural knowledge about BME officers,

‘It can’t be a fair process because there is no independence in that because people who actually interview you or choose you don’t think the same as a BME colleague or someone from a minority group.’

(T. 4)
Half of the BME and half of the white respondents offered one reason of unfairness as progression being the perpetuation of panel members selecting in their own image and retaining power. This BME respondent reported:

‘There are organisational barriers because of general human nature is that we all tend to feel comfortable with like-minded and people who are similar to ourselves. And unless there is a conscious effort to counteract that natural tendency, you will continue to choose people who look like, sound like and behave like whoever is in power.’

(T.11)

And

‘There is still a real reluctance to share the power’

(T. 21)

The responses converged features of power, relationships prior to the promotion procedure and incongruence of being compliant to legislation. These finding corroborate earlier research that where there are rigid structures and powerful groups making key decisions may produce adverse racism affecting the progression of BME officers (Kandola, 2009, p. 114; Abrams, 2010, p. 17; Gaertner & Davidio, 1986, p. 40).

Positive Action and BME Senior Officers

A minority of BME officers and female respondents spoke about the effects on BME officers where positive action initiatives were used. As this BME respondent reported:

‘The moment the same sort of support is requested for a BME there is an un-comfortableness and then a question of whether or not that is fair or whether that is positive action – as if positive action is a negative. There is a fear, which creeps in.’

(T.11)

Half of the BME and female respondents reported that positive action initiatives did not make any real changes for BME officers; rather they were a ‘tick box’ (T. 16) exercise to show compliance to legislation and provide an appearance of change. A minority of white officers that viewed positive action had assisted BME officers to become promoted.
before they were ready. The drive for this being politically driven, as described by a white respondent:

‘by accelerating through the lower ranks without a broad foundation in their career. I do think it has disproportionately affected BME and female officers because of the services well intended but ill thought out desire to promote them and probably, realistically short time scale set by Government or other Institutions.’

(T.20)

Some white respondents recognised that the nature and application of positive action created barriers and perceptions of BME officers, as a white officer reported:

‘when discussing this with colleagues is that it creates that additional challenge or pressure almost at times which is when people do get things legitimately on their own merit and the reaction to the institutionalised racism thing.’

(T.15)

Respondents have provided a description of positive action or the lack of it in BME senior officer progression. The finding concur with the previous research that reported little change despite positive action initiatives (Home Office (2010, p. 14). From the white respondents the term positive action is intertwined with positive discrimination where BME officers are viewed as deriving a benefit and causing confusion in understanding the term, corroborating earlier research (Holdaway, 1996, p. 190).

**Theme 6: Support Needed by BME Senior Officers**

**Support from within the Police**

A strong majority of BME respondents and all female respondents reported that they had little formal support provided for their progression other than performance reviews with their line managers. Most divided their responses into support offered through informal processes, such as informal networks of white officers, and support from other BME officers. This BME respondent highlighted this finding as:
'It is lack of support structures, I mean, the fact of the matter is that our white peers have better support structures...They will have somebody in CID helping them or a group of people working together for promotional exams, etc. Those support structures, which aren’t as visible and available for black Asian groups.'

(T. 4)

Half the BME respondents reported that the informal support provided to white officers was denied to BME officers. Respondents did not ascribe racism as part of this process but that it was a natural tendency of similar people helping one another; this analogy provides a useful summary for a minority of BME respondents:

'They could both be in the same fruit bowl but they are different and you might have a preference for one compared to the other. It doesn’t mean one is better than the other but there is a natural preference which you have and that is life.'

(T.11)

A minority of respondents did cite the white hierarchical culture that drove motivating for supporting or not BME senior officers, as this BME respondent reported:

'Where are the support mechanisms for senior black people to exist in very predominately white hierarchies?'

(T.13)

All the female respondents recorded informal networking, mentoring and coaches that they had acquired proactively. In contrast half the BME respondents reported that they had seen a significant increase in the advancement of white females in the police but for the process of self-support to succeed there needed to be ‘a sizable number of BME officers’ (T.21). This BME respondent said:

‘there has been ad advancement for white women that has led to an increase in white women advancement. Unfortunately we have never had that cohort of BME officers that would allow us to then support BME colleagues through the ranks and through specialist posts.’

(T. 8)
Half the BME respondents reported that disadvantages in society were represented within the police ties within the community, as this BME respondents stated.

‘I think black people are disabled in society or not necessarily empowered in society so there’s that extra bit of support that those people need.’

(T.13)

A minority of BME respondents stated that family ties were so strong that precluded any transfer to another force. A minority of BME respondents also stated within their own communities that policing was

‘not seen as a honourable profession’

(T. 6)

or

‘s o in the Indian culture it wasn’t considered a high status profession’

(T. 19)

These finding corroborate earlier research that found minority communities did not perceive the police as a high status job (Stone and Tuffin, 2000, p. 15).

**Development for BME Senior Officers**

A minority of BME and half the white respondents reported that they had been well supported in their development in the police. The BME respondents had been successful in entering high potential or gateway programmes to executive leadership. The narratives from these respondents were that even though had been accepted onto these programmes by merit they were treated differently, ‘There have been times when it has been a bit of a battle’ (T. 18). Another BME respondent stated whilst on a programme,
‘it was a very white oriented course and I went to the course and I went to Bramshill and there were no black faces there other than the foreign senior people who were paying for their course. Felt a little bit isolated.’

(T. 10)

These accounts provide the sense of isolation either in forces or on the programmes for advancement. Another key differential for respondents were instances of being asked to complete addition task not required by their white colleagues, an example being a BME respondent who was offered a temporary Assistant Chief Constable role and was asked to submit an application whilst white colleagues were not. This example provides a summary of what respondents provided as disadvantage:

‘Now I’m in a position where I can apply for jobs but as we have discussed before I feel at disadvantage now because I have been put back to Superintendent applying for ACC Commander roles. I don’t know anyone else that has happened to.’

(T. 18)

A strong majority of BME respondents reported they did not have formally agreed development plan or received opportunities for professional development and ‘had to do it myself’ (T.4). BME respondents in creating their own opportunities were creating addition work to their portfolios as this BME respondent said:

‘I have sought challenging opportunities for myself and seen them as a means of progression, taking on some of the strategic stuff that is really challenging, the professionalism bit.’

(T.13)

Half of the BME respondents reported that there was ‘still a level of mistrust when minority officers group’ (T.8) that precluded BME staff speaking openly to each to offer support and guidance.

Where opportunities for professional development were provided, there comments from BME respondents questioning the motives and questioned the confidence and trust in the process. As one BME respondent stated:
‘It depends whether it is invited or whether it is voluntarily gained. Whether there is a genuine lateral career development move or whether it is to facilitate some other Machiavellian purposes - I have had to develop myself.’

(T.6)

A minority of BME respondents reported frustration and anger perceiving that they had not been provided professional development opportunities or line manager support to progress. A BME respondent commented, ‘generation of BME officers that have to re fight every posting on lateral development and management level.’(T.8). Half the white respondents also reported similar experiences of professional development being self-sought. The BME respondents also linked any progressive professional development would only be effective when linked to an informal network:

‘irrespective to the amount of development the suitability of the individual candidate or not – that if you are not within the network, if you have not tied within the network of that group then it is very, very difficult for you to make in-roads to that group in order to be selected and to be seen as part of the team.’

(T.6)

**Sponsors, Coaches and Mentors**

A minority of BME respondents had senior sponsors that were working with them to progress them through the Police Service. Half the white respondents had senior sponsors who had either provided ‘an opportunity’ (T. 17) or had been ‘encouraged’ (T.3) by senior sponsors to progress through the ranks. Half of the BME respondents reported difficulties in acquiring or engaging with the senior sponsor to progress. There was disclosure that BME senior officer were excluded from opportunities to obtain guidance with those that could offer support that could be influential. This BME respondent recalled,

‘I have known many occasions where BME officers have either not been invited, not been included and those groups are then able to call on colleagues, often senior colleagues who will be able to support them.’

(T.8)
All female respondents and a half of the white respondents declared they had mentors. Half the BME respondents reported they had mentors and coaches. As shown earlier in figure five, BME respondents with coaches or mentors took longer to achieve rank progression. Mentors and coaches in this context had no power to influence progression but provided practical support and advice to progress and navigate the promotion procedure. BME respondents reported that they had to informally seek mentors and coaches. A BME respondent summarised these views as:

‘But soon you recognise that there isn’t going to be anyone knocking on your door and saying I want to be your mentor, I want to be your coach and I think you’ve got something in and I’m going out of my way to provide opportunities. Once you recognise that isn’t going to happen then life becomes a lot easier.’

(T.11)

BME respondents also reported that through mentoring and coaching access was gained to informal conversation that occurred within the organisation that assisted progression prospects. This BME respondent recounted,

‘Again as I say if you don’t have those other accesses in terms of mentoring, coaching being involved in the informal conversation then you are blocked’

(T.21)

Summary
The findings described in this chapter report how respondents viewed progression in the Police Service. The findings suggest that covert forms of IR in progression are a reality for BME senior officers. Racism is seen not in the context of the 1980’s overt racist language and behaviour but more subtle forms of covert manifestations of IR. These finding provide the basis of building new knowledge of the culture of progression in the Police Service. The next chapter will discuss the analysis that will lead to the conclusion of this thesis.
Chapter Five: Analysis and Discussion

This chapter aims to further analyse the findings to support the development of a model that could be used for policy change. The narratives of the respondents have illustrated a landscape of progression to provide the reader a new insight into the workings of progression in the police. The analysis is grounded in the findings and guides the thesis towards the conclusion. The concept of unconscious racism based in the IR definition provide by Macpherson (1999, para. 6.17) transformed the police practice of dealing with hate crimes such as those associated with race, religion and so on. As discussed in chapter two Macpherson changed reporting of crime from police officers’ interpretation of racist incident towards perception based reporting. The current reporting of hate crime is perception based, where unconscious or unwitting behaviour can be accepted, without the need of justification or third party evidence from the reporting party (The College of Policing, 2014, p. 4). In this analysis the lens of IR will be used to accept the perceptions of BME and white officers. The respondents’ accounts will be the defining factor in determining the effects of IR.

Before moving to the main discussion in this chapter, a review of the aim of the thesis will provide an assurance to check if what was originally proposed has been achieved.

The aim of this research was to:

Examine barriers to career progression that affect Black Minority Ethnic (BME) senior officers, so professional knowledge is improved for police leaders to consider alternative employment practices.

In order to meet this aim there were three explicit questions; the first being what were the effects of progression on BME officers; the second being, developing professional knowledge about BME officers progression; and the third, providing implications for policy. The first two questions have been addressed through the process of interviewing, presenting findings and now analyses of the data. The third question will be developed through this chapter, which focuses on what and why certain phenomena occurred with the final chapter outlining policy implications for the Police Service.
The analysis from the biographical, social perspectives and background of the respondents will be analysed to present a social context for the research sample. This chapter is then structured around the main themes that emerged from the findings. Each theme will be analysed and a discussion will follow. At the end of the chapter the emergent model sections discussed in each theme will be assembled as a model to show how elements of the model interact and inform each other.

**Analysis of the Biographical, Social Perspectives and Background of Respondents**

The data in this section produced expected and un-expected findings. The finding provided no differences between BME and white officers progression in relation to the factors of age, education, membership of a BPA and family. The length of time it took for BME officers promotion in comparison to their white colleagues, for the ranks of Sergeant and Inspector, was reduced from the earlier finding of Bland et al (1999). However, new data for Chief Inspector and Superintendent ranks revealed that BME officers took six months and fifteen months longer for the proceeding ranks to achieve promotion than their white colleagues. The key difference with the Bland et al study was that at that time there were low numbers of BME officers above the rank of Inspector (five) which at the time was the general trend. This also this was also reflected in other occupations (Bland et al, 1999, p. 1). The proportion of BME officers in promoted ranks at the time of the Bland report was 12.4% the current proportion being 19% (Home Office, 2014, section 5.2). The length of time for BME officer progression into the Superintendent rank is significant and suggests barriers that existed previously may still persists today. Established customs and practices in progression may be producing racial inequalities for BME officers (Jones, 1972, p. 121, Blauner, 1972, pp. 9-10; Dummett, 1973, p. 131; Commission for Racial Equality, 1985, pp. 2-3). The process of promotion in terms of application, paper shift and interviews was not examined and may have uncovered more in depth factors for consideration. Future research should include a question on how many times respondents had applied for informal and formal opportunities for progression.

The first unexpected finding was that BME respondents with a mentor took longer to be promoted. BME officers used mentors but the intention and purpose remained vague. There was no formal structure around the relationship of mentors. This is significant as most positive action programmes promote the use of coaches and mentors. If coaches or
mentors do not feature in the informal process of progression nor are valued, then this level of support becomes irrelevant to success in progression.

The second unexpected finding was that BME officers indicated race and ethnicity as a social division whilst white officers did not. This paradox of white officers not viewing race and ethnicity as a social division gains provenance as it is similar to earlier research of race and racism being predominant in police culture (Holdaway, 1996; HMIC 1997). White officers may be attributing a reduction in overt racist behaviour therefore concluding race and ethnicity is no longer a social division. In contrast, BME officers noted that even with reduction of overt racism, ethnicity was still a feature in the culture of the police. Racist behaviour in the police may be being attributed to a change in culture without any theoretical evaluation. Foster et al (2005, p. 38) also posed a rhetorical question, in that although racist language had reduced, ‘it raises the question of the extent to which this is indicative of changes in the culture and practices in the police service’. The following six themes of analysis and discussion will be presented.

**Theme 1: Institutional Operation of Racism in BME Officers Progression**

Descriptions provided by all officers described two categories of racism that were in the workplace; individual racism and institutional racism. The difference between white and BME officers was that the former regurgitated the definition of IR, whilst BME officers articulated tangible examples, such as dealing with the community at carnivals or using the tactic of stop and search. Overt racism was not reported by white officers however both BME and white officers described IR with outcomes that are distal (Al Badawi and Abdulla, 2012, p. 6). Distal in this thesis is where outcomes of progression occurs later in the future as an act of covert racism due to the lack of interventions. For instance the avoidance of reviewing promotion procedures against a theoretical model of IR will over time continue and intensify disparate outcomes for those not in the dominant group. As will not regularly evaluating distal IR outcomes for under-represented groups in policing. A key finding was the form and nature of racism had changed from being overt to covert with intentional or unintentional motives.

Informal practices were reported by BME and white respondents who perceive barriers for progression to be subtle rather than overt. Covert racism in progression was a real feature to overcome for BME senior officers. Forms of open discrimination had
transformed into hidden forms of biases. As Miles & Phizaklea (1984, p. 163) reported, despite racial discrimination being illegal, the practice continued but was ‘less overt’.

Whilst there was a reported reduction of overt racism the effects of IR were prominent for BME officers. Formal practices mask the cultural practices in the way that officers are promoted in forces. An air of transparency was presented, where in reality inequality is maintained either consciously or unconsciously, namely by chief officers (Dummet, 1973, p. 131; Commission for Racial Equality, 1985, p. 2-3; Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p. 141). Unwritten rules for progression where both white and BME officers reported subjective judgements being made by those in control of promotions created barriers for progression.

The posting of BME officers suggests subtle practices that are creating a barrier. In particular being posted into community roles and then being criticised for not having operational or specialist experience when promotion opportunities arose. The postings of BME officers is not inherently discriminatory however working with BME communities does not seem to be a value recognised for progression. The procedure and practice of progression within the Police Service would at face value be declared as fair through policies but may still follow a ‘cultural pathology’ of social stratification creating a us and them culture (Singh, 2000, p. 13). The narratives conjure an image of a plural working environment where BME officers are not being viewed as part of the larger group but being the ‘other’ (Bolton and Feagin, 2004, p. 162).

Stereotyping of BME officers occurred when they became; de-facto representatives of race matters, reflecting they were not as capable as white officers, perceiving a of lack trust in their work. All of these stereotypes created a social structure that was different from their white colleagues. The reported existence of subtle racism by BME and white officers was posted in the application of HR practices, subverted within a hierarchy of power. This power was reported to be consistently directed to those that can provide ‘sponsor mobility’ (Kanter, 1977, p. 181) which, in this thesis, describes those with power in promotions, namely chief officers.

BME officers are either choosing not to join or are being excluded from informal networks or ‘old boys club’ that are linked to the chief officer sponsors. This suggests an
existence of a relationship culture that excludes BME officers. Both white and BME officers in this study are equally frustrated by the informal networks with BME officers believing that those in power are maintaining structures and culture that preclude them from joining these networks sustaining a social order. IR and prejudice reported by BME officers, came in the examples of less favourable postings and lack of understanding from their supervisors, indicating an informal practices that are either intentional or unintentional causing barriers for progression (Bolton and Feagin, 2004, pp. 161-2; Holdaway and O’Neill, 2004, p.857). Another aspect of maintenance of the culture is the lack of political will shown to progress the race agenda, which is believed to have stalled. It could be suggested that strategy and policy are viewed as a series of projects with only short or medium term results (Holdaway, 2013). The finding reveal that BME officers do not feel that concerted work on BME officers has been carried out in a long term strategy. The urgency following the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) seems to have dissipated, with other projects being pursued by chief officers. These exclusionary aspects of the police culture revealed that that white officers have an advantage for promotion through development opportunities different from BME officers.

A key aspect revealed by this research is being part of a network provides ‘sponsor mobility’. This ‘sponsor mobility’ provides opportunities and information, which is vital to position those being sponsored to be at the right place at the right time to seize progression opportunities. A clear example was were police officers were unsuccessful for promotion, white officers reported development and posting to new roles for development whilst BME officers received no similar actions. There is a strong suggestion that the police practice that surrounds progression in the police service has two underlying philosophies; the first the prescribed legislative and strategic directions that are the formal practice; the second a police culture that includes ‘sponsor mobility’, and networks that support an informal, almost secretive, way of progression. With the absence of any body of knowledge to describe the operation of progression, it can be assumed that any guidance would be provided as word of mouth. Using the word and mouth process would lead to ‘the reproduction of the hierarchical status quo within the organisation’ (Jenkins, 1992, p. 155). The argument here is that informal networks, word of mouth communication through informal networks will continue to create an exclusively white dominated workplace at a senior level in the Police Service.
So, why is this occurring? One explanation could be the lack of understanding in the Police Service about the culture of progression and how institutional racism affects BME officers. A counter explanation could be that BME officers are not displaying the required behaviours expected by chief officers? Given the sample was purposive and BME officers were geographically distanced from one another, this appears highly unlikely.

BME officers reported that they did not belong to the general group of Superintendents within their forces, introducing a barrier rooted in intra and inter group bias. An implication can be made that BME officers are being expected to fit into established ways of working. The social structure of the police is perceived to be guided by stereotypes of BME officers causing additional pressures for BME officers, in some cases debilitating their role and social value within policing (Jones, 1972, p. 121; Blauner, 1972, p. 9-10). The culture of progression constitutes unfavourable treatment of BME officers, at this stage it cannot be said there is ideology of racism or a practice of discrimination (Miles and Phizacklea, 1984, p. 10). A process of social stratification and the subtle effect of IR is producing inequality for BME officers and confirms the prediction of Macpherson (1999, para.6.4) regarding IR, ‘In its more subtle form it is as damaging in its overt form.’

There is an argument that existing research lacks qualitative data that seeks to explain the behaviour of managers and chief officers during promotions. It could be that those that control promotions within forces are aware of their own biases. Perpetuating informal practices, which in turn produce the same outcomes. The paucity of empirical studies of how minorities experience their treatment within institutional settings was also noted by Solomos (1999) at the time of Stephen Lawrence Inquiry (1999) with little advancement of research. To confirm this argument, research would need to conducted with chief officers to offer a perspective, this would be would be the next area of inquiry to test the emergent hypothesis.

The concept of IR affecting BME officers in a number of covert actions has been uncovered, however this only provides a descriptive account. A second level of analysis was required to obtain some understanding of how IR is effecting BME progression. Three theories that could explain the informal practices reported in the findings. The
first is cogitative processing theories, which suggest that when assessing performance, managers may look for information and evidence that confirms broader stereotypes such as ethnicity or gender (Rick et al, 2000, p. 2). Although subtle in nature, BME officers provided accounts where they perceived they are attributed negative stereotypes ascribed to racial group such as ‘having to speak up in relation to black issues is a subtle form of stereotyping’ (T.11). The stereotype expectation is where there is a negative stereotype about one’s social identity. Therefore, negative attribution views towards a group could lead to negative outcomes for BME officers, in this thesis BME officers working a lot harder to prove themselves rather than ‘getting on with some of the networking’ (T.13). The stereotypical threat (Matlin, 1987, p. 162) is that BME officers ‘expect they are being judged on the basis of a social identity group rather that performance and potential’.

The theory of ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’ (Alderfer, 1986, p 203) could be used to explain the differences reported by BME officers against that of white officers. The ‘out-group’ is defined as an identity group; in this case, determined by gender and ethnicity, the ‘in-group’ is defined by task, function and/or hierarchy, which is mainly, white males. In-groups members are usually treated more favourably than out-groups members. By not having access to networks, BME officers can be assumed to be assigned out-group status by in-group members and sponsors. Both theories could explain why BME officers may not be able to access networks with ‘sponsor mobility’ due to culture that limits equality of opportunity to the informal practices of progression.

The third theory is ‘adverse racism’ described by Gaertner and Dovidio (2004) as cited in Abrams (2010, p. 25) where emotional reactions to some minority groups can be deeply embedded in consciousness and cultural stereotypes. Averse racism as described by Gaertner & Dovidio as subtle, often un-intentional bias, that characterise many people that ‘possess strong egalitarian values and who believe that they are non-prejudiced’. For progression of BME officers, an adverse racist does not want to discriminate and believe in employment equality. Averse racism is rooted in normal, often adaptive, psychological processes involving cognitive categorization, the desire to maintain power, and a largely automatic internalization of societal values and beliefs. Gaertner & Dovidio’s research suggests that aversive racists act on unconscious negative feelings when they are able to justify their actions in non-racial terms.
Cognitive processing, in and out and adverse theories all carry elements of IR and centre on unconscious bias that are hard to detect and measure. IR as a concept was easy to accept but hard to explain without evidence based research. Policing relies on numeric targets, measures of success and suggests immediate success when responding to the social and political pressures. The argument made here is that the Police Service accepts conscious actions of IR however lack evaluation for unconscious actions of IR for progression.

If informal practices can be assumed to be promoted, challenged or changed by those in power, in these case chief officers, they may be exhibiting ‘adverse racism’ unwittingly. For this thesis chief officers may be providing sponsor mobility to those that are similar to themselves ‘insiders’ rather than BME officers who are suggested through the findings as ‘outsiders’. Keltner and Robinson (1997, p. 104) propose that when a person has a powerful role they may feel subjectively powerful and behave in a powerful way. People in powerful roles, such as chief officers, who are judging others, according to Abrams (2010, p. 20) are more likely to use information that confirms stereotypes than information that disconfirms stereotypes.

Applying this to the finding of this thesis most chief officers may want to be fair according to the law and policy but will avoid letting their true feelings of people from a different ethnicity show. These actions by those in power may be operating fairly at a cogitative level but unconsciously acting in discriminatory ways. Tamkin (2000) found that white managers made decisions, taking into account the ethnicity of workers. There may be an unintended outcome as organisations reported by Kandola (2009, p. 9) create the impression that they care about anti-discrimination legislation when their actions speak otherwise. Without understanding the nature of BME progression and more importantly the barriers for BME officer progression chief officers may not be able to identify how institutional racism manifests itself in progression of BME officers.

The covert operation of progression could create a ‘black elephant’ in the room, where realities of IR are not discussed through open dialogue and background conversations provide the resistance to any change. Ford, Ford and McNamara (2002, p. 108) speak of ‘background conversations’ that take place and constitutes the organisational culture. The author argues the progression practices in the Police Service are held within the
background conversations of those members of networks and sponsors. The suggestion is that background conversations are rules and consensual practices that bind the members of a network to play by the rules in some contexts and not others. BME officer’s conversations seem to remain the background without being evaluated to reveal of how race and IR affect their progression in the Police Service.

My notes from the interviews with both white and BME officers certainly provided examples of resignation and cynicism with progression practices revealing that stated policies and practices were masking informal practices. This could explain why legislation and policy is formally promulgated by the Police Service but also subjugated by the sub culture of progression.

The informal practices effecting the progression of BME officers can also be described using the model of the Difference Factor (Livers and Calver, 2003, p. 18) who propose that where there is impaired interactions, communication and performance this creates an extra burden for Black leaders. In this analysis section barriers were expressed as; postings, sponsor mobility, exclusion from networks, BME officer relationships and the culture of progression. These barriers suggest an extra burden for BME senior officers’ resulting in them working harder, exerting extra energy to complete all the competences of the role, and resignation of the situation, which Livers and Caver call ‘stifling’. The model shown below represents where there is a sub-culture of progression and a lack of embracing difference ‘miasma’ (Greek work for fog) is caused which creates misperception and distortion. For BME officers, being non-tradition leaders or ‘outsiders’ not being valued for their cultural knowledge or potential contributions. The implication of ‘miasma’ from this thesis is that senior leaders in the Police Service may be working to an assumption of similarity where the reality for BME officers is that of differential exclusion.
The white male orientated environment and the culture of progression is a reality for BME officers progression in the Police Service. The findings suggest that the culture of progression may operate through cognitive processes, adverse racism and ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’ theories and explain how BME officers are excluded from the informal practices of progression. The first part of the model of BME officer progression can be shown as:

**Figure 6. The Difference Factor** (Livers & Caver, 2003, p. 18)

Theme 2: Hidden Barriers for Progression

There was a clear perception that barriers for BME progression that were rooted in IR which were covert actions. The first barrier uncovered was the experience of working in isolation or being the first BME to head a department. A minority of BME officers utilised the concept of being a token. Being a token was defined by BME officers being viewed, not as individuals, but as a representative or symbol of their ethnic group. The effect of being a token resulted in; an expectation to attract further BME recruits;

**Figure 7. White Male Orientated Environment and Culture excluding BME officers from Informal practices of progression.**
receiving little recognition for their work; exerting more energy to prove themselves; ticking every competency before applying for promotion.

The narratives of BME officers produce a consistent message that they must work twice as hard as white officers. This reconfirmed previous research on African-American police officers who reported the same phenomenon (Livers and Calver, 2003, p. 22 and Bolton and Fegin, 2004, p. 111). The reasons provided by BME officers were that they needed to justify their postings or promotions. This suggests that BME officers believe that they have to prove their competence in a white dominated environment which resulted in behaviours of expending more energy, feeling less confident about their ability and not wanting to fail. This extra work in justifying competences produced reported stress, anxiety and draining of energy. These negative consequences of being a token were also found by Jackson, Thoits and Taylor (1995, p. 545) reporting emotional difficulties including depression, anxiety and lower self-esteem. Evidence from BME narratives suggests that they perceived that any failure would then reflect badly on the wider BME group in their workplace.

Kanter (1977, p. 212) reported that tokenism could affect performance where there was little recognition of the work performed. Tokenism was defined as being in a minority group being 15 per cent or less (Kanter, 1977, p. 208) which applies to the current statistics for Superintendent ranks. These finding mirror Kandola (2009, p. 82) analysis of the effects that take place on tokens; the first being stereotyping; secondly, tokens may have low expectations fixed in self-fulfilling prophecies; and thirdly, others may have high expectations that could never be achieved.

Whilst using tokens to promote organisations to attract other BME applicants there is anxiety shown by BME officers in that they are wheeled out to showcase how diverse the police is whilst internally have doubts about the internal culture. Token representation for BME officers may increase negative stereotypes about them and as a result promotes greater stereotyping of the role of BME officers. This stereotype of BME officers seems to exclude them from positions of greater authority.

BME officers reported not being provided opportunities for specialist departments, a key factor that was reported was that guidance for the promotions process, such as
application completion was lacking from supervisors and chief officers. Supervision of BME officers was regarded as ‘treading on eggshells’ (T.7) a perception that white supervisors were nervous of dealing with race. The prospect of perceived unconscious bias and existing culture presented BME a barrier for progression. Gaston and Alexander (1997, p. 50) found that a central factor for promotion was the support from others, crucial was support from supervisors. Supervisors are required to provide evidenced performance reviews for those wanting to be considered for promotion so the relationship with the supervisor is crucial for BME officers. The lack of BME officers in specialist posts creates a stereotype that those departments are the domain of the dominant white group, resulting in a negative impact on the recruitment of BME officers. This was recognised earlier by the HMIC (2001, p. 25) who extended this argument saying irrespective of ethnicity the composition of specialist departments would have a negative impact on the recruitment of BME officers in specialist roles.

An adverse effect in BME officer’s straining to prove their abilities is that they may not enter into specialist posts or even contemplate promotion. If specialist posts were attained there was an anxiety that BME officers were being scrutinised for any mistakes leading to a self-fulfilling stereotype that BME officers were not as capable as white officers. The perceptions of BME officers implies that BME officers must be constantly self-aware and vigilant of their actions, namely making mistakes, where white officers were perceived to have support when mistakes occurred. The stereotype fear factor of making mistakes was a reality for BME officers that were not perceived by white officers. This in turn places additional pressure and stress on BME officers that becomes an occupational reality and an institutionalised factor that discriminates against them.

BME officers reported they have less access to sponsors or those that can provide advice and support for progression development. Those BME officers that had progressed to chief officers were reported as not being role models and had distanced themselves from the larger BME group having, ‘drawn up the ladder’ (T.3). BME officers welcomed the increase of BME roles models. However, another form of social stratification of two groups of BME officers became apparent; one group aspiring for promotion and the other achieving promotion. The relationship between these two groups mirrors similar distant relationships with white officers. BME officers; indicated that they may not want to be
seen favouring other BME officers. This discovery of a BME sub culture intra-BME relationships would be worthy of further research.

The value of ethnicity and race was reported as ‘lip service’ (T.17), this again creates a disjoin of intention to be more diverse (Home Office, 2010, p. 6) as reported by white and BME officers. A key area of focus for the police being numbers of BME officers rather an understanding the utility of ethnicity in police operations. BME officers expressed that valuing ethnicity occurs when there was a crisis within the community and this value diminishes until the next crisis. This suggested that ‘racialised relations’ (Holdaway, 1996, p. 23) that are explained through history of immigration and exclusionary practices to maintain inequalities. The relationships with BME officers in this thesis mirror those interactions with the interactions with the BME community, more contact and engagement at times of crisis, rather than ethnicity being a social police feature.

The culture of progression was described as operating at two levels where formal and informal processes occurred ingrained with biases with BME officers’ own identity and ethnicity not being acknowledged or being valued. The lack of social contact and the pressures of proving capability created a social stratification based on race and ethnicity, resulting in exclusion from the dominant white group for BME officers. The experiences of BME officers now deviated from existing literature on culture, which spoke of marginalisation and discrimination overtly, such as racist conversations, the ‘canteen culture’ reported by Waddington (1999, p. 289), to covert conversations of progression. These covert conversations produced inequalities for BME officers and form a new culture of progression. The culture of progression may not necessarily have racist motives but is locked into the structures of progression, which can be described as IR (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, p. 5; Roithmayrs, 2003, p.41).

A counter argument could be made to the culture of progression; policy and practice guidance (Home Office, 2010, p. 7) and the legal framework (Equality Act HC Bill (2010, Sec. 9) (15)) ensures compliance by forces to employ fair and equal processes. Natural market forces, supply and demand should dictate the nature of promotions. This suggests that everyone that seeks work has an equal chance of being considered for the job. The findings of this thesis suggest that a covert or ‘invisible hand’ (Royster, 2003,
p. 12) may be operating to maintain the dominant hierarchy. Whilst no evidence was provided by respondents to describe locked in inequality of IR (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, p. 5), Royster, provides an argument that it provides an advantage for white groups to act and obtain access to networks which act as ‘lubrication for getting things done – in short, they are necessary for learning about and preparing for opportunities, and for being able to fully exploit opportunities once they have emerged.’

So how can the dominant group mask covert action whether they are intentional or unwitting? The finding of this thesis follows the explanation offered by Lorbiecki and Jack (2000, p. 23) which is that diversity management produces a number of outcomes. The first, managing diversity becomes a privileged subject seen as an object to be managed; distance is created between those who manage and those that are ‘diverse’ resulting in a split of two distinct groups, with the property of diversity located amongst ‘the managed’. Second, ‘the managed’ group can be identified, located and controlled in one space which stigmatises oppressed groups. The third, masking out diversity of ‘those that manage’ serving as a control mechanism to erase any questions about human differentials in this powerful group. The outcomes can be that the very policy introduced to combat discrimination perpetuates inequalities, diminishes any difference or discrimination and contains power in the dominant group.

Those respondents in this thesis that were part of the BPA reported being viewed negatively by others. The suggestion made here is that BME officers were being stereotyped twice, once as a BME individual and a second time as a member of the BPA. An argument could be made that the resistance to the formation of BPAs from some in the Police Service has now become covert and subject to the same dynamics as attitudes towards individual BME officers.

BME officer progression has a profound effect through social inclusion of the organisation which produces benefits and opportunities by being connected to the social culture of progression. Informal processes at work seem to maintain a culture and hierarchy that is impacting on BME officers lack of confidence and being valued for their ethnicity and resulting in a number of behavioural effects. Hidden barriers are perceived to resist the total inclusion of BME officers. Due to social inclusion barriers there is a
lack of access to social capital for BME officers. The second part of the model of BME officer progression is described as:

![Figure 8. Social Inclusion Barriers Effecting Lack of Access to informal processes](image)

**Theme 3: Exclusion From Power**

The findings provided perceptions from a strong majority of officers that informal networks were key to progression. BME officers entering the Police Service recorded that they remained outside of existing informal structures and the lack of socialising consolidated this situation for them. The common analogy given by BME officers was that invitation to a network was like being picked for the football team at school indicating that progression culture was rooted to the history of the organisation. Some networks were aligned to social groups such as sporting or drinking groups. The perception was that these networks allowed the exchange of information. Beale and Westall (2007, p. 16) provide practical outcomes of networking as ‘emotional connection’, ‘giving’ and ‘advocacy’.

‘Emotional connection’ in these findings included relationships with those in the network and to key decision makers who were referred to as sponsors. One benefit outlined in the finding was the ability to guide others through the application process, which describes the ‘giving’ element. The element of ‘advocacy’ contains the support from others that could present development opportunities. This suggests an explanation of how BME officers are socially excluded from networks and cannot share knowledge about the informal processes and thus remaining perpetual outsiders, as described by Alderfer (1986) as ‘in-group’ and ‘out-group’.
Burt (1992, p. 14) found in his study that networks can ‘get your name mentioned in the right time and right place so opportunities are presented to you.’ The principle advantage of networks as reported through the findings being that assessments of personal attributes were being made through these networks that served to market the promotability of a person by others speaking up about their achievements; this contrasts with the experience of BME officers who have to work hard to get their achievements noticed (Kanter, 1977, p. 216). This outcome institutionally disadvantages BME officers who are not able to share in progression knowledge or form alliances with sponsors.

The nature of networks provides a form of social capital for the members that result in benefits. Burt (1992, p. 9) describes social capital as social relations that have productive benefits for that network of people as well as for the organisation (Burt, 1992, p. 9). BME officers reported exclusion from the networks and the social capital. Burt (1992, p. 10) describes success in organisations to human and social capital that is used to narrow down the pool of people to the individual who get the opportunity to be promoted. Room (1999, pp. 171-172) provides a theory of social exclusion that incorporates processes and outcomes. He describes how the social capital of a person can be impacted by a ‘shock’ or ‘opportunity’; impacts made by ‘shocks’ and ‘opportunities’ were influenced by an individual’s ‘buffer’ or ‘passport’; the buffers would mediate the effects of ‘shocks’ through strong social networks and ‘passports’ maximise the benefits of the opportunities. The suggestion from this thesis is that BME officers do not have access to the ‘buffers’ or ‘passports’ to navigate the disappointments or the potential opportunities for progression due to their weaker social networks linked to ‘sponsor mobility’.

Bourdieu’s (1990) theory of ‘field’ and ‘habitus’ describes society as an ensemble of autonomous fields; fields are where participants struggle to establish control and authority and, in the course of the struggle modify the structure of the field itself. In simple terms the field is a structure of probabilities, rewards and gains or sanctions whereas habitus is cultural knowledge (Wacquant, 2004, p. 389). The results may be the BME officers, whilst sharing the physical environment, do not share the cultural norms of the dominant group. BME officers may share perceptions of identity and organisational status with white officers however do not share cultural norms or the informal structure of networks.
From the findings of this thesis progression and informal networks could be presented as:
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**Figure 9. Habitus and Field Adapted From Bourdieu (1990)**

Using figure nine above the Habitus of BME and white officers in informal networks will be different and the strategies involved to achieve reward in the field will be different. It is suggested that white informal networks work together through axiomatic knowledge to achieve rewards in the field which, viewed in isolation, provides equality of opportunity; however, the habitus of the white officers is different from the habitus of BME officers which causes different outcomes for BME officers. Sackmann (1991, p. 21) describes ‘axiomatic knowledge’ as fundamental assumptions about ‘why things are done the way they are done’ in an organisation. For this thesis the way in which progression operates in forces represents the culture of progression. Bourdieu’s theory provide a useful way of describing the culture of informal networks that could explain the relationship of BME officers to networks and those within power that may be reinforcing or maintaining the current culture for progression. There is a clear sense that BME officers are characterised within this model as having a lack of access to power via the informal networks and are, as a result, excluded from the benefits derived from membership.

The effects of networks are isolating BME officers, which make it difficult for them to get promoted or to integrate fully into the Police Service. This has the effect of creating a lack of confidence and fear of failing for BME officers. The third section of the model is described below:
Theme 4: Social Capital of BME Senior Officers

There was a variance of responses in how BME officers described themselves in terms of racial identity. The identity of BME officers was also linked to how they perceived their own value, capability and confidence. The skills reported by BME officers were not being utilised fully nor acknowledged as an asset for operational policing. BME officers provided examples where their cultural knowledge of BME communities could assist with positive outcomes.

Even with different skills BME officers felt they had to work harder to be viewed as capable by white officers and feared the stereotypical threat of making mistakes, which in turn led to a lack of confidence. Being *under scrutiny* (T.10) provided frustration and anxiety that led to different working conditions for BME officers. It could also explain why BME officers feel less capable than white colleagues and may thus try to prove themselves by evidencing all competences in their role as a self-defence mechanism to protect against any criticism made.

The key difference reported, was that, BME officers worked twice as hard as their white colleagues. The final effect was that BME officers felt they had to be positive role models and any mistakes would provide a wider stereotyping of BME officers.

The social identity reported by BME officers places them in a social group that is separate from the wider white officer group. Barr (1998 p. 20) reports that organisations consist of a group of insiders, typically white men, who perceive anyone who is different, such as women and BME individuals, as outsiders. Social identity theory developed by Tajfel (1981, p. 45) provides a guide for the BME social group, in that BME self-
identification displays a selection of ‘self’s’ which are contingent on the social context and widening social groups that both BME and white officers are from. Timberlake (2005, p. 38) suggests that social capital through networks is important to the development of individual identity, self-concept and self-esteem. The findings suggest that BME officers do not have equal access to social capital in networks, or an alternative conclusion could be that they exclude themselves. Kandola (2009, p. 46) states that groups ‘may seem to appear spontaneously in human society’ but they are ‘created to serve our needs for security and self-esteem’. From the responses gathered from the BME officers in relation to social identity, being the out-group to the white officer in-group suggests BME officers may be excluded in terms of rewards.

There is a clear pattern from the findings that in-groups consist of mainly white male officers. Social identity of BME officers is causing dissonance in their own confidence and ability resulting in them operating separately to their white colleagues. There appears to be an emergent social theory from this thesis of a pluralistic multi-faceted formation of self-category for BME officers hitherto unexplored in the Police Service setting. The next section of the model represents the cause and effect of dissonance of BME officers.

Figure 11. Social Identity and the Stereotypical Threat of Making Mistakes

Theme 5: Lack of Positive Action

The promotion procedure was described as being unfair but dependent on subjective decision making. There was a dual process for progression in the police, one being overt and the other being informal. The makeup of the promotion panel being all white according to BME officers mitigated progression. The views on positive action ranged from BME officers reporting initiatives as being ‘tick box’ (T.16) to a minority of white officers believing it had favoured BME officers. Positive action has been associated with preferential treatment by white colleagues (Pettigrew and Martin, 1987, pp. 57-58).
The analysis of interviews with white officers found that there was a clear lack of understanding of positive action and more importantly the effects that this may have on BME officers. Positive action was being merged into positive discrimination, a common and repeated discussion in policing. Both BME and white officers reported it was set in a political context; for white officers it was a requirement from government and BME officers believed initiatives were politically compliant but without successful outcomes. BME officers are suggesting that positive action was seen as a requirement rather than a business need.

The perceived special assistance provided to BME officers is re-enforcing the stereotype that BME officers are less able and capable than white officers. A consequence may lead to white officers viewing BME officers as lacking initiative or strategies for advancement without the aid of positive action. The lack of progression by BME officers seems to be centred around positive action rather than understanding how the sub-culture of progression produces negative impacts for BME officers. This becomes the classic bind where stereotyping of BME officers takes place, BME officers do not succeed and therefore require positive action that in turns has a stigma attached to it, that of inferior ability and skills. Without understanding and changing the culture of progression in the Police Service it may remain stuck in a ‘classic bind’ (Kandola, 2009, p. 82). The sub-culture of progression is creating and reinforcing stereotypes resulting in a classic bind leading back to the power and privilege of networks and sponsors. This is shown on the model as:
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Theme 6: Support Needed by BME Senior Officers

BME officers believed they had little formal support provided for their progression with this situation based in social stratification of BME and white officer groups. This lack of professional development for BME officers suggests that there may be conscious or unconscious bias and discriminatory behaviour directed towards them. A similarity between BME and white officers was the absence of formal development plans to seek either promotions or lateral development. Line managers or bureaucratic irregularities could draw an assumption that this may be a lack of competence; another assumption could be that informal processes did not require formal plans for progression.

BME respondents cited that social disadvantages for BME communities were being replicated in the Police Service. There was some trace that BME communities still did not value policing as being a high status profession. Family ties for a minority of BME officers precluded thoughts of transferring to another force. These represented strong social ties to the community that linked BME officers to a wider society.

A minority of BME officers when successfully selected to be on talent progression programmes reported a sense of isolation and being treated differently. Development following these programmes produced either additional tasks or a perception that they were being disadvantaged. A strong majority of BME officers did not have a development plan and had to personally seek opportunities. A new survey found that fifty two per cent of Superintendents had a development plan, which shows a slight improvement (College of Policing, 2014, p. 3). The language of struggle using words such as ‘fight’ (T.8) depicted a workplace which conveyed a confused and predatory nature for progression. Half of the white officers also reported similar experiences but did not attribute networks to effective progression as did BME officers. The implication made is that the subjectivity of the promotion process has a significant impact on the promotional process to both white and BME officers. Bolton & Feagin (2004, p. 142) noted the same phenomena in their US study of black officers, suggesting that assessments centres could be a solution, however where these were employed another form of subjective racism in that white officers would still be conducting screening and assessment.
There was a difference between BME officers and white officers that had senior sponsors who provided encouragement or opportunities for progression. Again a separation of groups occurred where some officers were being invited to groups, again inferring, informal networks, to share information. A proposition that two types of support through coaches and mentors exists; the first through formal channels which may be relegating BME officers towards positive action programmes; the second, the informal channel that contains coaches and mentors with influence and power. Without access to right mentors and coaches, informal progression may be limited for BME officers.

To break any classic bind it is suggested that the first step is to improve the awareness of the current situation that BME officers operate in. To achieve a diverse workforce an acceptance of the realities of BME officers would break the classic bind of continuing IR

**Summary**

From the discussions above, the emergent model shows the causes and effects that were found in the analysis of the data. This provides a new way of viewing the narratives of the respondents and representing them against theories. The full model is shown below:

![Figure 13. The Effects of Progression on BME officers in the British Police Service](image)

The model above provides an interpretation of the analysis that is indicative of a culture of progression. The boxes describe the barriers that exist for BME officers, with the consequences for BME officers shown on the outside of the arrows. The IR circle allows...
the informal practices to continue. Without professional knowledge to break the cycle, IR maintains the structural hierarchy that disadvantages BME officer progression.

The environment and culture allow the existence of social groups that either include or exclude officers from progression practices. This leads to social inclusion barriers that affects the relationships within policing and for BME officers precludes them from axiomatic information and sponsor mobility. The continued lack of access to networks and sponsors impact on relationships and the social value of BME officers is either, not valued nor used operationally. The lack of relationships affects BME officers self-identity, creating feelings of fear of failing and lack of confidence. This behaviour reinforces the stereotypes of BME officers completing the circle and maintaining the classic bind. Binding each element and maintaining the barriers of progression is covert IR. The increased professional knowledge of the culture of progression suggests a way to identify, and then proposed a options to break out of the classic bind

The next chapter now concludes the thesis with some policy considerations that may assist in understanding that could be used to improve BME officer progression in the UK.
Chapter Six: Conclusion and Implications

The aim of this chapter is to conclude the thesis as a whole. The structure of the chapter will restate the aim of the thesis, indicate the importance of this research to policing and provide policy implications. Key conclusions distilled from the entirety of the study will be summarised to show how the findings extend the professional knowledge of BME senior officer progression.

This study set out to examine the barriers to career progression that affect BME senior officers with the aim of building professional knowledge that could contribute to improved employment practices in the Police Service. The experiences of BME officers and white officers provided rich data which supported key findings that could be contrasted against the theories and contemporary research explored in chapter two.

BME officer representation is linked to a wider debate in modern society on race relations and has been a key concern for the modern Police Service. Contemporary research underpinned this thesis and described the experiences of BME officers in the context of social stratification, which maintained a hierarchy of classes, the white class being dominant. A key feature impacting on the culture and workplace experiences of BME officers was the concept of IR. Some academics argued in chapter two, subtle and complex forms of ‘banal’ racisms existed to avoid legal and moral censure; the implication being that racism was shifting from overt to covert forms. Whilst noting the Police Service has expended considerable efforts to address IR, the focus on overt racism may have diverted attention from the very problems that the concept was trying to address, namely subtle and hidden covert discrimination. The findings describe pervasive covert discriminatory effects located in progression practices. Narratives collected from BME and white officers provided the evidence substantiating these findings, evidence which has not hitherto been found using conventional police research methods. Whilst this study did not find racist intent, discriminatory factors that resulted from covert IR were found to negatively impact BME officers’ progression.

This study found that behind the formal practices of progression there are covert practices for progression in the Police Service that affect all officers, irrespective of
ethnicity. However, the cumulative effects of IR impact on BME officers resulting in subtle stereotyping and discrimination. This was described in chapter four, where BME officers with coaches or mentors took longer to be promoted than those that did not. This significant finding shows that coaches and mentors are part of the formal, overt process of progression, but are distinct from the informal process of progression. Having a coach or mentor becomes irrelevant if the chance of success in the informal progression process does not benefit from coaches or mentors. Any programmes initiated to improve BME representation and progression would be doomed to failure if they were designed to operate only at the overt, formal level.

The findings present a culture where the practice of progression is rooted in covert racism. The findings directly correlate to the theory of IR described in chapter two as operating in major institutions. This covert racism has produced consequences for BME officers that were described as distal or proximal. The proximal consequences were the reduction of overt racism; the distal consequences were the lack of awareness of how covert racism impacts, either intentionally or unintentionally, on BME officers. Formal practices that are on face value, fair and equal, mask the subtle practices of covert racism employed in progression. The practices surrounding the culture of progression creates social stratification where BME officers are being perceived by white officers as ‘them’ not ‘us’. This social stratification maintains a plural working environment for BME officers which features exclusion from the dominant group, stereotyping and the application of adverse racism. The difference factor described in chapter 5, describes how these factors impairs communication and performance for BME officers thereby excluding them from informal practices of progression.

The social structure of progression within the Police Service creates a number of barriers for BME officers. The first is stereotyping, where BME officers become de-facto representatives of the BME community they appear to represent. This stereotyping creates a self-identity for BME officers as ‘tokens’, which leads to self-fulfilling prophecies of self-doubt. BME officers describe the fear of failing, lack of confidence and feeling they had to prove themselves. The self-identity of BME officers as ‘tokens’ negatively affects their behaviour, in that they are working harder to achieve recognition from white officers and have their achievements acknowledged. The impact of negativity about positive action added further pressure to the self-identity of BME
officers; this is particularly important in how BME officers perceive the notion of fairness and equality and their unsatisfied need to be recognised as equally valued members of the community of police officers by their colleagues in that very community. The covert IR becomes a defining feature for the self-identity of BME officers in respect of progression. Thus the existence of covert IR maintains a hierarchical status quo within policing. Simply, the racial status of BME officers seems to be impeding their integration into the professional status as was highlighted in chapter two.

In pursuance of the equality agenda, the Police Service has a policy of treating BME and white officers the same without recognising that formal promotion processes produce unrepresentatively low results for BME officers. Positive action policies provide a sense of action for chief officers, but do not, however, counterbalance the impact of informal networks on promotion processes. The police diversity agenda may formally espouse equality that recognises difference but the finding suggests the ideology of being colour blind being applied to the formal progression process. The reported reality for BME officers is that their self-identity makes them distinct and different. The overt uniformity of progression thus perpetuates negative outcomes for BME officers.

The key barrier to progression explained by the BME officers’ narratives was the collective perception by BME and white officers of the existence of a two-tier promotion procedure: the first is comprised of overt practices governed by equality and fairness; the second is comprised of covert, informal practices that illustrate the theory of field the 

\textit{habitus}, explained in chapter five. The covert practice uses axiomatic information in networks providing advantages for white officers; relationships are built with sharing of information vital for progression. The unfair nature of these networks on BME officer progression creates a self-fulfilling prophecy for BME officers who, upon entering the promotion process, consciously believe that they do not have the same networks and sponsors as white officers, which directly affects their confidence. If they perceive the process as not being fair, their behaviour may be negatively impacted, for example feeling they need to working harder in comparison with their white colleagues for the same end result

Social identity theory can be used to describe the experiences of BME Superintendents as sharing the same formal role as white Superintendents, but being excluded from the
membership of informal social entities such as networks. The exclusion of BME officers from these networks confirms the ‘white culture’ described in past research, as outlined in chapter two, which corroborated earlier findings of forms of networks linked to social and sporting interests. These networks occur through the structures of power and have habits of association for white groups. There was clear evidence that there was a lack of contact by white and black officers outside the social setting of policing.

This finding counters the argument made by the major inquires outlined in chapter two, that the introduction of BME officers would counterbalance the lack of involvement of white officers with BME people; thus creating more positive relationships. The cultural norms of these networks appear to contain power of the dominant groups in these networks, which impacts the progression of senior officers and sustains social stratification of BME and white officers. Networks contained elements of emotional, practical and social capital for members, which create a culture supporting progression of officers who are members of those networks. The way in which the networks marketed the promotability of white officers impacts on BME officers, who work harder and tick all the boxes for competencies in an effort to compete with the social capital of networks. Membership of these networks most benefits progression if the member links with a chief officer sponsor. These sponsors influence decision-making processes in respect of promotion processes and can provide mobility opportunities should prospective or failed candidates require development or different postings.

The *habitus* and *field* theory adapted for this thesis together with *The Difference Factor* model, described in chapter 5, provides a theory to better understand the barriers for BME officer progression. The rigid hierarchy of the Police Service with the formal career path situated in a power structure controlled by white officers perpetuates the lack of progression for BME officers. The racial identity of BME officers impedes their acceptance into their professional status as senior officers, thereby maintaining the existing social structure of white hierarchies. The overall conclusion for this thesis is that a social stratification of BME and white officers exists producing different experiences of progression. This suggests that IR, in the form of subtle racism, is pervasive in progression culture and maintains a hierarchical white dominant group that sustains inequalities for BME officers in progression.
The next section of this chapter analyses the implications of this conclusion and makes suggestions for steps, which could improve BME senior officer progression. The fight against racism and discrimination is an ideology that is enshrined in official police policies and set in a legislative framework. The knowledge provided in this thesis could support the development of alternative strategy to tackle the inequalities of BME representation at senior officer levels in the Police Service.

In making the recommendations it is recognised by the author the current pressures that exist economically and politically for the Police Service. Recommendations have been developed to be practical rather than aspirational.

1. **Implications for testing the model in the workplace**

   The model that I have presented is built on the findings derived from the analysis of data. Only time and further research will tell whether this is a comprehensive model. To test this model it is proposed that:

   a) The model needs to be shared amongst key stakeholders in the Police Service including the newly formed National Police Chiefs' Council [NPCC] (formerly ACPO), HMIC, Home Office, Policing Board for the College of Policing [COP], Superintendents Associations, NBPA and BPAs. This would establish if this model was reliable and valid thus providing greater awareness of the findings of this thesis. This could practically be achieved by presentations to the College of Policing, Professional Committee which includes the key stakeholders in the Police Service.

   b) The next phase would be to share the model with those members of the public who participate in the development of advisory roles in the Police, such as Independent Advisory Groups. Police and Crime Commissioners [PCC] elected to represent the community would be included as key stakeholders. This would provide stimulus for professional knowledge to be shared and used practically in forces. The PCCs would be able to use the model to develop force level assessments of progression to measure progress on implementing measures to achieve the legal duty to eliminate
discrimination the workplace. This could be practically achieved by presentations and discussions with the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners.

c) The third test of the model would be through the academic community assessing its worth, by looking for coherence with existing and new theories and offering insights into how this model would be used to evaluate improvement in BME progression. A key area for development through further research would be to establish practical implications of the model for equality impact assessments in the Police Service. This would not only record the positivist outcomes of numbers but also the qualitative landscape of the culture of progression. A pilot could be conducted with a volunteer police force linked to an academic institution to develop a ‘tool kit’ for assessment of progression.

2. Implications for Increasing the Professional Knowledge of BME Officer Progression

a) The College of Policing could review existing strategy for talent management in the police by collecting an evidence base for both BME and white officers. This evidence base could utilise the conceptual model presented in this thesis to build a large national database of experiences. The COP should reconsider the ideology and principles on which progression for BME officers is based to develop a strategy based not just on the positivist research approach of the Police but also on perceptional data from BME officers and staff. The suggestion made here is to respect confidentiality and conduct BME focus group discussions using external facilitators trusted by the group.

b) The organisational culture of the Police Service is conceptualised through this thesis as being white male dominated which will reflect a white male centred worldview. The values held in this culture will be contained in organisational power relationships, which will determine how these will affect those not in the dominant group. There is a clear suggestion that
the accounts of senior BME officers in the Police Service have not been heard or understood. The findings from this research could be integrated into the Strategic Command Course (COP) to help explore how racialisation impacts the process of progression. The Strategic Command Course delivered through the COP is the gateway to police and staff becoming NCPP members.

Potential NPCC officers (both BME and white officers) attending the course would be asked to reflect on how they could change the culture of progression in terms of progression practices and cultural talent management. This would focus on the identification, development and deployment of individuals with a variety of talents, including cultural and language skills critical for the police to have a more representative workforce and build the confidence of the communities they serve.

c) The development of a new network for BME officers could be considered to create a think-tank to constructively assist the Police Service in demonstrating progress against national and force equality objectives. This network would be focused on overt network development using human skills and social capital to assist development areas such as counter-terrorism and community policing initiatives. A vast amount of unpublished research exists that has been produced by BME officers and staff. The benefits of this proposal could be used to build a new knowledge bank for future police initiatives. These networks could be regional and should be located within organisational structures of the Police rather than in external NBPA or BPA structures. Whilst NBPA and BPA would provide pastoral support, the technical and procedural assistance should be the responsibility of the Police Service. The lessons learned from the British Association for Women senior women networks should also be evaluated to identify factors and practices, which could be adapted to support BME progression.
d) Affirmative action as an overall strategic direction should be examined for the Police Service as a model for increasing diversity. Despite the controversial nature of positive discrimination considered by the Scarman (1981) and Macpherson (1999) inquiries, a re-assessment of potential actions to improve BME progression would be incomplete with considering this approach. The Police Service should evaluate affirmative action and explore the ideology to produce evidence-based information for decision makers. A de-politicised debate on positive/affirmative action should take place to identify if either or both approaches could deliver the necessary change in culture and representation in the Police Service.

e) At the heart of this thesis is the premise that there is a social hierarchy in which BME officers are socially excluded from networks and are stereotyped by the dominant culture. The human skills that BME officers bring seem to be unrecognised and under-used. A consideration could be to introduce a new competency framework, which includes linguistic and multi-cultural skills as part of the matrix. Firstly, it would provide a direct link to BME communities and, secondly, it would openly show that BME officers’ unique skills are valued and harnessed to deliver social capital for the Police Service. This would harness un-tapped skills to be used operationally for high-risk challenges such as counter terrorism and community cohesion.

Closing Thoughts
This thesis has extended the professional knowledge of BME senior police officer progression. The conceptual model presented provides a new way of understanding BME progression and an alternative for tackling inequalities. The creation of a skilled workforce is a social process requiring the practice of the meritocratic ideal that in the free society individuals should be judged on their level of competence rather than networks and sponsors. The maintenance of the status quo can neither be a tenable position in law nor morally right nor provide the best service to the public. This thesis could be the starting point for the production of progression knowledge which could
support improved ideology and practices that build a more representative and effective Police Service.

The final word should be reserved for those that contributed to this thesis:

‘I will give you the analogy – BME we are brilliant at rugby union but the organisation is playing rugby league. So there is a sense that it is the same sport but actually it is completely different rules. We play to different rules and I don’t think the organisation picks up on that.’
BME respondent

(T.7)
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Appendix A

History of Police and Race

Police Race Relations
The legacy of police race relations with the minority ethnic community is rooted in mistrust emanating from the dying embers of the British Empire following migration, after World War II in 1945, by commonwealth citizens to the motherland. The response of some in the host white communities was to riot in response to black migrated workers who were thought of taking jobs, often with the police joining forces with the attackers; the first such riots occurring against black seamen and their families in English ports (Solomos, 1988). This began the social debate over how the relationship between immigrants and the white communities would be defined and what social order they would occupy; the key question that emerged politically as the ‘colour question’ revolving around social and economic status of immigrants. This was famously portrayed in the speech by Enoch Powell (1969, pp. 289-90) the ‘Rivers of Blood’, which predicted social unrest due to increased immigration. Fryer (1984, p. 371) stated following the riots in the sea ports a legacy between the police and ethnic minorities was set, reporting,

Present in the overtures were all the themes that the next generation of black people in Britain were to know so well in their daily relations with police.

(Fryer, 1984, p 371)

Cashmore (2001, p. 646) assumes that the themes that Fryer does not specify were that the attacks were racist but the conclusion was that the police shared societal prejudices towards ethnic minorities concurring with findings of Skolnick (1969).
In the day-to-day interactions with the minority ethnic communities the police started to develop a focal point for grievances. Historical analysis of literature highlights that by the 1970’s discrimination existed in the key areas of housing, education and employment for the minority ethnic communities of Britain; the nature and extent of the discrimination in many Political and Economic planning reports between 1974-6 Smith (1977) cited in Fryer (1984, p. 387). The main area of employment discrimination, centred on employers being biased based on colour prejudice with rejected minority applicants not being told the real reason for the rejections (ibid, p. 387). Conflict was further provoked by the manner in which the police approached the minority ethnic communities which according to Cain (1973), had racism as a key component of the occupational culture. Cain (ibid, 1973 p. 117) reported that the perception of police officers he observed used racist language, calling black men ‘niggers’ or ‘nigs’ who were viewed, in the main, as pimps and layabouts living off taxes. A report by the Institute of Race Relations (1979, p. 68) to the Royal Commission of Criminal Procedure outlined that there was clear evidence that the police no longer reflected popular morality, they recreated it by stereotyping black society as muggers and criminals and illegal immigrants. The report also reported a vicious cycle of the police refusing to protect communities under attack from the white population and in ethnic minorities trying to defend themselves resulted in further police reprisals.

**Challenging Police Legitimacy**

This circle of conflict led to the disturbances of 1958 in Notting Hill and 1959 in Nottingham where white gangs terrorised the minority ethnic community. The tipping point for the minority ethnic community came in July 1981, when rioting took place in Brixton where mainly black young people fought on the streets against the police. London followed by disorder including the police and young Asian people in Southall. The central legitimacy of the police function was in question from minority ethnic communities; a new order of policing through key reforms would redefine the relationship between the police and the minority ethnic communities for the next 31 years.
According to Lea & Young (1982) the rioting was a response by the minority ethnic community to police discrimination, depravation and social inequity; the rioting being a withdrawal of consent to be policed further and that the outburst of disorder being the only effective way for a disempowered community to express a grievance to an oppressive style of policing. Lea & Young (1982, p. 13) described this in the following form:

Figure 14. Withdrawal of Police Consent by Minority Ethnic Communities.

Policing by consent of society has had an orthodox view of the police where they have been seen as protectors and friend of the mass of people (Critchley, 1978, p. 326). However, revisionists such as Shaw and Williamson (1972), cited in Reiner (2000, p. 49), argue that survey of public attitudes to the police omitted to take the class dimension into account. There is also a vital omission in terms of minority ethnic views being captured by orthodox researchers such as Critchley. The breakdown of relationship between the police and minority ethnic communities led to the withdrawal of police legitimacy; minority ethnic communities rejected the universal consensus about the norms, values and modes of social behaviour that the police preceded over. Reiner sums up the situation of groups reacting against the police as:
Realistically, the most that 'policing by consent' can mean is not universal love of the police, but that those at the sharp end of policing practices do not extend their resentment at specific actions into a generalised withdrawal of legitimacy from the institution of policing per se.

(Reiner, 2000, p. 49)

Following the Brixton riots, Lord Scarman was appointed by the government to lead the inquiry into the serious public disorders and was, overall, critical of the lack of relationships between the police and the minority ethnic community, calling it a ‘tale of failure’ (Scarman, 1981, para. 4.43). The trigger for the disorders was the heavy handed application of police stop and search powers during Operation ‘Swamp 81’ in Brixton and that they were through:'ill considered, immature, and racially prejudiced actions of some officers’ (Scarman, 1981, para's. 4.61 – 4.68).

Lord Scarman’s Inquiry into the 1981 disorders in Brixton (Scarman, 1981, pp. 56-8) described the fundamental problem in police stop and search tactics as having a disproportionate effect on minority ethnic communities being targeted without evidence. The impact of policing operations on the relations with the black community was summed up by Scarman as:

They provoked the hostility of young black people, who felt they were being hunted irrespective of their innocence or guilt. And their hostility infected older members of the community, who hearing stories of many innocent young people who had been stopped and searched, began themselves to lose confidence, and respect, for the police.

(Scarman, 1981, pp. 51-52).

Scarman (1981) recommended identifying racial prejudice among recruits, improved efforts to recruit more minority ethnic officers, improving community relations and better training provision to focus on community and race relations and better management of stop and search operations. Scarman (1981) rejected positive discrimination in the form of quotas into the police and dismissed institutional racism but did advocate positive action to engage minority ethnic communities to join the police service. Scarman (1981) adopted a narrow definition of institutional racism, in that it could only exist if, as a
deliberate policy, institutions intended to discriminate on a basis of race (Rowe, 2004 p. 11). Keith (1993) argues that this narrow definition failed to understand the origins of the concept which had developed along the Black Power movement in the United States in the late 1960s and 1970s. The term described by Carmichael & Hamilton (1967) contrasted individual racism with that of unintended racism caused through institutional policies and procedures. The definition according to Solomos (1999, p. 284) was broadly similar to indirect discrimination which was outlawed by the Race Relations Act, 1976. Although racism according to Scarman (1981, para.6.35) could be ‘often hidden and unconscious’ a key factor that dissuaded him from accepting the concept was that he rejected that senior officers consciously ascribed racist policies, stating: ‘bias is not to be found amongst senior officers.’ (Scarman 1981, para. 4.63).

This view would be challenged by another landmark inquiry (Macpherson 1999) discussed later on in the chapter which would accept institutional racism existed and that senior officers might share racist attitudes.

**Causes of the Disturbances**

How the police have dealt with the disturbances has changed over time according to Bowling and Phillips (2002, p. 2) cited in (Newburn, 2003) as direct conflict to perhaps typifying a newer challenge where clashes occurred not just police and BME communities but now interracially between communities. Whilst the Scarman (1981) and Macpherson (1999) inquiries focused on the actual events and the triggers, Cantle (2001, p. 79) started to emerge with the concept of community cohesion that portrayed the disturbances in Bradford as an event that was inevitable as there were symptoms of deeper-lying problems existing in the UK’s multicultural towns and cities. The understanding of the deep-seated physical and cultural BME segregation resulted in the lack of shared values or mutual respect between ethnic groups. This analysis went further to suggest that the public policy applied for the last twenty years had encouraged and privileged separate identities, focusing on notions of equality for different ethnic groups whilst neglecting the need to promote respect for good relations between the different groups (Cantle, 2001). A conclusion that can be drawn is that ethnic segregation has polarised self-identity of both white and BME people and it therefore becomes the cause as much as the effect of racial conflict. This current situation offers
an explanation of a form of structural racism that can be exploited by far right racist groups and now also inter-racial communities themselves (Bagguley & Hussain, 2008).

One area of police practice that impacts significantly on the self-identity of the BME community is that of stop and search in the minority ethnic community. The tensions caused by this operational activity have been recorded as far back as Scarman (1981) where mis-use of the ‘sus’ laws sparked off riots. Since 1995, per head of population in England and Wales, recorded stops and searches of Asian people have remained between 1.5 and 2.5 times higher than rate for white people, and for black people between 4 to 8 times than the rates for white people (Equalities and Human Rights Commission, 2010 p. 9). The report added that:

The pattern of entrenched disproportionate use of stop and search powers on people from minority ethnic communities is consistent with the evidence on racial prejudice and stereotyping

(Equalities and Human Rights Commissions, 2010 p. 58)

Resultant inquires and reviews have consistently called for more recruitment and a more representative Police Service to tackle distrust between the police and the community to promote equality in service.
Appendix B

Consideration of a Philosophical Stance for this Thesis

Research philosophy is essential the selection, design and understanding of analytic procedures. The worldview of the researcher has an impact on the selection of the methodology. A worldview can be likened to the way a person views the world through a lens. A clear distinction in qualitative methodology is that the interview data contains what is perceived by participants to be important to them, the analysis and findings becoming interpretative of the researcher.

The approach of the postpositive world view is reductionist in nature, where ideas are reduced into small discrete sets of ideas to test. Phillips & Burbules (2000) argue that this world view favours starting with a theory and then collecting data that either supports or refutes that theory. The subject of progression and racism within the Police Service has had some research applied to the phenomena of progression but no theory. I had simple variables that I wanted to explore around the cause and effect i.e. racism restricts the progression of BME officers. However, the central question of why this occurs and subsequent theory was distinctly lacking. In addition, race cannot, in my view, be empirically observed and measured as it can be covert in nature and hidden amongst policy. For these reasons, I rejected the post-positivist world view.

Using a methodology of the constructivist world view may restrict my own views, values and experience to influence the research. In keeping the value of transparency I wanted to be sure my views were explicit and motives known by participants and those that would subsequently read this thesis. Slife & Williams (1995) argue that philosophical ideas remain hidden in research and, without making these explicit, questions remain about the influence of the researcher. Fay (1987) and Neuman & Lincoln (2006) felt that the constructivist standards did not go far enough in advocating an action agenda to help marginalised peoples. As a member of the NBPA working with the Home Office during the publication of the Macpherson (1999) report, I had witnessed the power of an action agenda that had successfully and dramatically changed the culture of the Police Service. This world view allows the interaction of the researcher with the process and individuals, known as an advocacy or participatory world view. This world view challenges the
postpositive assumption that imposes structural laws and theories did not fit marginalised individuals in our society nor issues of social justice that needed to be addressed. This world view seeks to use research study which has a political agenda with intent to reform institutions. Atweh, Kemmis & Weeks (1998) outline the key feature of this world view as being emancipatory and help people from the constraints and structures of existing organisations that limit self-development and self-determination. I was drawn to the advocacy world view; I still viewed this as still not involving my own cultural and policing experience to critically assist with the analysis. However, there is a challenge to the advocacy world view from those engaged with research with race, in particular, those that are from a different ethnicity. An emerging concept of the ‘treacherous bind’ (Radhakrishnan, 1996, p. 81) of researching race which challenges how we have researched race in the past as the ‘race has been the history of untruth, of an untruth that is unfortunately in our history’ Hall (1996, p. 1) extends this argument by stating that race cannot be thought of in ‘old ways’ representing essential, discrete differences between groups, but which still needs to be addressed and dismantled. In effect, this argument leads to the conclusion that the risks of essentialising race in research can actually re-affirm political processes and have implications for the research without uncovering the real impact of race on BME officers, in other words re-affirming existing concepts and ideology.

An extension of the advocacy world view is the feminist world view where feminist researchers such as Olesen (1994) as cited in Denzin & Lincoln (1994) regards the distinction between facts and values as a device that disguises the role of conservative values in social research. Blaikie (1993) argues that all science is based on a masculine way of viewing the world which is androcentric, and omits or distorts women’s experiences. This argument could be made to the Police Service where the world view and experience is based on a white population basis. If the experiences of BME officers have not been used to construct policy and procedure for progression this could be a large omission worthy of research. Harding & Hintikka (1983, p. 10) state:

Women’s experience systematically differs from the male experience on which the prevailing claims to social and natural knowledge are founded, first of all, only partial human experience only partially understood.
Feminism as a theoretical framework can be described as a mode of analysis involving certain ways of thinking and acting that are designed to eliminate the oppression of women (Jaggar, 1983, p. 77). As stated in chapter one the strategic aim of the British Government is to reduce and eliminate racism in the Police Service an alternative world view similar to the feminist theory would provide a new knowledge. This study sought to legitimise ‘situated voices’, which tie the experience of research participants and researchers as grounds for political action (Lewis, 2000, p. 175).

The author aimed to develop a parallel ‘BME world view’ that would incorporate the views of the BME officers and provide an alternative interpretative view of the phenomena of BME police progression.
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National Black Police Association Conference 2010

Workshop
A View on Workforce Planning, Modernisation and Culture and its effects on Officers and Staff

Facilitators
- Kul Verma – NPIA
- Pinder Gakhal - BTP

Objectives
- Provide a brief overview of workforce modernisation
- Explore the effects of a changing workforce on BME staff and officers
- Examine barriers and opportunities for recruitment, retention and progression
- Have fun

Structure
- Vision of the future 2015 – Group Exercise
- Knowledge session WFM and WFP
- Group work – informing the national debate/volunteering for a NPIA lead survey
- Feedback to plenary
- Q & A

Group Work
‘You are the executive decision making committee for police workforce planning/modernisation – fast forward to the next 2015 and provide a short summary of what you think the workforce will look like.’

Equality in Employment Report 2010-NPIA
- Proportion of ethnic minority officers - 4.4% in 2009
- Home Secretary’s 1999 target of 7% not met
- Increase in the number of BME applicants to the police from 8.4% in 2003/4 to 12.3% in 2007/8
- Success rate has increased from 6.3% to 10.7%
- Progression overall for BME officers within the police service has been slow to improve
- Resignation and dismissal rate for BME 6.1% (compared to 3.1 white officers)
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Equality in Employment Report 2010-NPIA - Cont

- Women have been in the police service for over 90 years but comprise 25% of officer strength
- Occupy 12% of senior roles above the rank of superintendent.
- 2033 to reach 35% for female officers
- 61.5% of police staff are women - 27.8% part-time
- Representation is not replicated at senior management or chief officer level

Group 1

- What are the barriers in recruiting BME staff
- What are the opportunities that could be used to recruit BME staff
- Name three things that key decision makers can do differently in terms of improving the Diversity Service

Group 2

- What are the issues facing BME staff in the retention of their posts
- What can be done to retain more BME staff by ACPO
- Name three things that key decision makers can do differently in terms of improving the Diversity Service

Group 3

- What the issues that face BME staff with regard to progression
- What can be done to improve progression for BME staff by ACPO
- Name three things that key decision makers can do differently in terms of improving the Diversity Service

Group 4

- What effect does workforce Modernisation have on BME staff
- Name three things that key decision makers can do differently in terms of improving the Diversity Service

It's QUESTION TIME!!
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Contact

• kul.verma@npia.pnn.police.uk
• bhupinder.gakhal@btp.pnn.police.uk
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Interview Schedule

Part One

Remind interviewee about the confidentiality and ethical agreement. Ensure that they have a letter provided.

1. Male/Female
2. Age
3. Job title
4. How many years have you been a police officer
5. After how many years did you get promoted to?
   a) Sergeant
   b) Inspector
   c) Chief Inspector
   d) Superintendent
   e) Chief Superintendent
6. Have you a coach/Mentor
7. Are you a member of the Black Police Association?
Part 2
Social Perspectives and Personal Background

1. “Britain used to be regarded as remarkably harmonious society”
2. What are the most important social divisions in our Society?
3. What year were you born?
4. Are you married?
5. How many children do you have?
6. How old are they?
7. What is the highest educational level you have achieved?
8. Where did you do it?
9. When was that?
10. What kind of schooling did you have?
11. What sort of work did your Father do?
12. Before that?
13. Where were your parents born in the U.K
14. If not born in the U.K when did they enter the U.K?
15. Overall are you satisfied with your career in the Police Service?
16. Would you re-join if you had your life over again?
17. Why did you join the Police?
18. If you had a choice, would you encourage people from a BME background to join the Police?
Part Three

1. What affect, if any, has institutional racism had on BME officers?

(Secondary Prompts)

Macpherson, W. (1999) in The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry described this as

‘It can be detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping which disadvantages minority ethnic people.’

Lack of interventions which attempt to remove the organisational and institutional barriers where these exist, Policing Minister’s Assessment of Minority Ethnic Recruitment, Retention and Progression in the Police Service (2008)

There is little research that examines the nature and dynamics of institutional racism within the police services, Sutton, Perry, John- Baptiste and Williams, (2006).

2. What, if any, are the organisational barriers to progression?

(Secondary Prompts)

Additional Organisational defined as process policy and procedure

3. What, if any, are the institutional barriers to progression?

(Secondary Prompts)

Institutional = cultural barriers
There is a recorded difference in the careers of BME Officers and white officers in recruitment, retention, promotion and selection of specialist posts, there is also a clear reluctance of link this with institutional racism, Bland, Mundy et al (1999).

4. Can you account for the differences in the careers of BME officers and white officers?

(Secondary Prompts)

Current statistics printed off if asked about numbers.

5. What factors, if any, do BME officers face during progression?
5(a) Do they differ from any factors faced by white officers?
6. How fair and equal is your promotion process?
7. What opportunities have you been provided to gain specialist experience?
8. What level of support do you/have received for progression?
9. What discrimination have you faced, if any, before, during or after any progression process?
10. What opportunities do you get to progress in your organization?
11. What differences have you noted about the knowledge, skills of attitude of White (if asking a BME interviewee) BME (if asking a white interviewee) senior officers
12. Do you have any life skills not used by the organization?
13. How are Ethnicity and culture valued in the police service?
14. Why do we need BME officers?
15. How do you identify yourself – provide choice between, - (BME) Black officer-officer that is black. (White) White officer or officer that is white

Brakewell social identity theory – a sense of belonging

Thank you for taking part.
Remind interviewee of confidentiality and ethical agreement.
Personal Guide to Interviewing

1. Allowing flexibility during the interview. If a question has been covered in one spontaneous dialogue move on to another question; in other words, do not labour the point and keep the interview lively and interesting.

2. The start of the interview included an easy settling-in part 1 and part 2 interview schedule, which was the biographical and sociological section respectively, giving time for the interviewee to relax.

3. Phasing questions in a non-threatening or judgemental way.

4. Being aware that some BME interviewees may recount difficult or sensitive accounts of their lives.
## Appendix F
Police Forces of England and Wales Against ACPO Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>East Midlands</th>
<th>West Midlands</th>
<th>North East</th>
<th>North West</th>
<th>South East</th>
<th>South West</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire Police</td>
<td>Derbyshire Constabulary</td>
<td>Staffordshire Police</td>
<td>Cleveland Police</td>
<td>Cheshire Constabulary</td>
<td>Hampshire Constabulary</td>
<td>Avon &amp; Somerset Constabulary</td>
<td>City of London Police</td>
<td>Dyfed-Powys Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire Constabulary</td>
<td>Leicestershire Constabulary</td>
<td>Warwickshire Police</td>
<td>Durham Constabulary</td>
<td>Cumbria Constabulary</td>
<td>Kent Police</td>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Constabulary</td>
<td>Metropolitan Police</td>
<td>Gwent Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex Police</td>
<td>Lincolnshire Police</td>
<td>West Mercia Constabulary</td>
<td>Humberside Police</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Police</td>
<td>Surrey Police</td>
<td>Dorset Police</td>
<td>North Wales Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire Constabulary</td>
<td>Northamptonshire Police</td>
<td>West Midlands Police</td>
<td>Northumbria Police</td>
<td>Lancashire Constabulary</td>
<td>Sussex Police</td>
<td>Gloucestershire Constabulary</td>
<td>South Wales Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Constabulary</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire Police</td>
<td>North Yorkshire Police</td>
<td>Merseyside Police</td>
<td>Thames Valley Police</td>
<td>Wiltshire Constabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk Constabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Yorkshire Police</td>
<td>Police Service of Northern Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |                               | West Yorkshire Police |
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Reflective Account of the Experience of Interviewing

The approach I took to the interviews consisted of providing prior information about the purpose of the interview by means of a letter containing the confidentiality agreement (Appendix H). This process confirmed agreed timeframes and also having a plan described above, which kept the interviewee focused. Prior to the interview, I contacted the interviewees by telephone confirming date, time and venue. The main issue that dominated most confirmation calls was that of confidentiality. The interview venues were planned initially to be away from police premises to provide an environment of confidentiality. Due to work pressures, a few participants asked to be interviewed at work, although it was interesting to note that timings of interviews occurred after normal office hours. This suggests a willingness to take part but that confidentiality remained a key factor for them. It was agreed that the only persons that would have access to the interviews would be the transcriber, the Professional Doctorate supervisor and myself. To keep to the confidentiality agreement I numbered the interviews T.1 to T. 22 and assured the interviewees that quotations would not be attributed or attributable to them.

During the interviews I asked open questions to probe what was being said but also gently keeping the interviewee focused on the subject matter, rather than being side tracked to general police matters. The additional questions were those subjects that were puzzlement to me as described by Lofland & Lofland (1994, p. 78) who suggest that the researcher should jot down the puzzlements of the subject matter and then tease out variances to produce probing questions to the main questions. Puzzlement also included observations of body language, expressions in tone of voice and sometimes hesitance in answering questions. I decided to probe only if I felt there was an ambiguity or if new progression-related themes were introduced by the interviewee’s accounts.

(King, 1994 cited in King & Wincup (2008, p. 15). states ‘there is no such thing as a relationship free’ interview. This implies the relationship is part of the overall process where the interviewee is a ‘participant’ (King, 1994, p. 15) in the research activity, shaping the course of the interview rather than passively responding to the researcher. In effect the verbal part of the interview is only part of the data gathering in qualitative
research, where an argument can be made for the researcher to consider elements, such as seating, non-verbal communication and the tone of the questioning which can influence the interviewee. This relationship was one that I needed to be aware of as BME interviewees would often say to me regarding the phenomenon of race ‘you know what *I mean*’! My non-directive response was to get interviewees to spell out what they meant rather than make an interpretation of what I thought they meant.

There was a key difference between the BME and white interviewees in that, for BME interviewees, the interview became an emotionally charged experience. A number of BME senior officers recounted events that had affected them and in some cases they were very upset. There seemed to be a cathartic release-taking place with some for the first time providing narratives on their own life experiences. Richardson, Dohrenwend and Klein (1999, p. 288) call this a psychotherapeutic aspect of the interview and is questionable on political and ethical grounds.

I would disagree on the grounds that in asking for realities of people on such emotive subject matter as race, it is highly likely that emotions, positive and negative, will be aroused. Although therapeutic measures are not the aim of the research, they are a product of the research and need to be acknowledged and dealt with. The effectiveness of how these measures are handles depends on competence and skill of the researcher. In my own case, I was a trained tutor and coach and had experienced emotional responses in a variety of situations and felt confident to deal with the situations presented. Where I would agree with Richardson, Dohrenwend and Klein, is that only suitably trained researchers should research subjects that would evoke strong emotional responses.

This returns to the problem of meaning from the interviews. To reduce any error in terms of influencing or biasing the meanings, I adopted a non-directive approach and allowed a free flow of conversation. In retrospect it seems clear that it is essential in the context of qualitative research for me to monitor my own behaviour and interaction in the research environment. Factors such as eye contact, seating position and so on could have serious effects on the research outcomes.
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Kuldeep Verma
Professional Doctorate in Criminal Justice
Institute of Criminal Justice Studies

REC reference number: 11/12:17
Please quote this number on all correspondence.

27th September 2012

Dear Mr Verma,

Different Ladders for Police Progression: Reviewing black and minority ethnic officers’ progression in the police service

Thank you for the email you sent yesterday. I understand that you are now ready to submit your thesis but it cannot be accepted because the ethical review of your study was not completed and the UPR 16 cannot be signed off. One of the reasons for this failure was administrative / procedural, which I acknowledged and apologised for at the time. It is not logically possible to undertake a retrospective ethical review but University policy allows Chairs of Ethics Committees to comment on the ethics of a study and for those comments (assuming that no significant ethical issue is raised) to be substituted for a favourable opinion letter which would normally accompany the thesis and address the requirements of the UPR 16. The Chair can also recommend any further action which might be deployed in responding to any concerns raised. I hope that this letter will be helpful in this respect.

When your study was initially reviewed the Committee identified the following issues:

1. You intended to conduct interviews in your own place of work – guidance was provided to you.

2. Your research had a clear aim to uncover barriers to progress for BME officers - if your aim was achieved you would uncover racism - how would you manage this?

3. You intended to conduct interviews – relevant templates (invitation letter, information sheet and consent form) were sent to you.

4. You intended to conduct a survey – a template was provided.

You have kindly responded to those issues as follows:

1. Conducting interviews at work- The interviews were not physically conducted in the workplace of most of the respondents. The 7 white officers were interviewed at NPIA
Ryton and Bramshill training centres. These officers were on training programmes and voluntarily took part in the interviews and were away from their own force area.

The 15 interviews with Black and Ethnic Minority officers were conducted in the main away from their place of work. The few (4) that wanted to be interviewed at the workplace - were seen after hours.

The respondents were equivalent superintendent ranks and I had no organisational line management or same organisational work connections with them. They freely participated and were not coerced by organisational pressures or owing me any duties, beyond contributing to the research.

The research was financially supported by the NPIA for a year but there was no sponsor appointed and the funding was one of entitlement of benefits that all NPIA employees get for self development. I do not report back to a board nor am I bound by any agreement with the NPIA. There was no vested interest from the NBPA.

At no time was the data or confidentiality of the respondents in jeopardy as I am the only person that had sight of names.

In summary this was un-coerced participation and un-biased research. There were no threats for the confidentiality of the respondents and they cannot be attributed to any comments in the findings.

2. Racism un-covered - It was expected that there would be subtle forms of racism through processes and systems reported by respondents as defined by MacPherson (1999). No overt acts other than recollections by a few officers were made regarding racism in the workplace. These recollection(s) were of incidents when they were junior ranks and the incidents had been dealt with. These were senior officers in the Police that would be expected through leadership standards and ethics to report and deal with racism. In the rank of superintendent it is highly unlikely that people would come out with overt racism, however this could not be discounted!

The contingency plans were first to have National Black Police Association mentors available to deal with any emotional issues bought about from the interview if racism had affected them. The second was that the Superintendents Association BME rep was also contacted and was at hand to assist dealing with any racism uncovered. The idea was to use this person rather like third part reporting and encourage them to do the right thing and report this formally with support. The plan would be to persuade the person to report the incident either to the force or the Superintendents Ass. Support to do the right thing was the ethical policy.

Also at the start of the interviews it was made clear that this was a sensitive issue and instances would need to be dealt with.

At the end of interviews there was a de-brief held with me to ensure there was a(n) assessment that there were no issues for referral for the respondents. For most it was a cathartic release and therapeutic.

- You provided the letter you sent regarding confidentiality – appended
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3. Templates - I am afraid I was not aware that I needed to use these templates so I have used my own letter head - attached. I can recover this and send out letters as a thank you with the UoP logo. I will be guided by David

4. Survey - The plan changed and no survey was conducted

Thank you for your responses. It is clear to me that you managed the concerns which normally arise when conducting research in your own workplace extremely well. The assurances you provided to participants regarding matters of confidentiality were appropriate and sound. Most significantly, albeit with the benefit of hindsight, no ethical issues arose in the course of your research. Your invitation letter was well constructed and took full account of the limits of confidentiality and the voluntary natures of participation.

I think that your suggestion of sending ‘thank you’ letters to participants is good; you might include the following elements:

- Thank you for participation
- Brief summary of results
- General debriefing statement reminding participants of the need to be vigilant with regard to institutional forms of racism which are typically deeply concealed
- Note to inform them that if they have any queries or concerns with regard to the conduct of the research, they should contact your supervisor in the first instance – hence the value of departmental headed paper

There is no need for me to see this letter before you submit the thesis – I will leave it to you and your supervisor to deal with the matter.

I sincerely hope that this exercise has been helpful; it looks to me as though you have been challenged to reflect on ethical issues in some depth and this could be very useful should ethical issues be raised in the course of your viva. I have looked at your account of ethical issues in your chapter 3; you might expand the discussion in the light of this experience but I leave that for you and your supervisor to decide.

I wish you every success in your forthcoming viva voce examination.

David Carpenter

Chair- Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences REC
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Dear ,

A request to assist in PhD research – Progression of BME senior officers

The Research

I am conducting research for a doctorate with Portsmouth University into the progression of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) senior officers in the British Police service and am seeking your assistance to take part and be interviewed by me. The research will be vital for the first time to obtain the narratives of senior BME officers to analyse key factors that help or hinder progression within the police service. The intention is to interview 15 BME officer and then a further 15 white officers and then to conduct a comparative analysis of the results.

The research title is:

Different Ladders for progression? A study of Black and Ethnic Minority officer’s perceptions of progression in the Police Service of the United Kingdom.

The objectives of the research are:

1. Identify factors that impact on Black and Ethnic Minority Officers progression in the police service
2. To provide analysis on how barriers affect the progression of BME officers.
3. To recommend effective change initiatives to improve career progression of BME officers in the Police Service
Confidentiality
Due to the subject matter it is important that you are open and free to speak about factors that have impacted on you during your service both positive and negative. To ensure confidentiality the following arrangements will be made by me overseen by Portsmouth University.

1. Your interview data will be sent to transcribers who will be subject to these confidentiality agreements and your transcript and data will be assigned a number prior to being sent. Only I will know what number has been allocated to which name. The data will be kept on a secure file which only I have access to.

2. No other person other than the university supervisors and I will have access to the transcript, data source or computer. The supervisors will be bound by this confidentiality agreement.

3. When the data source has been transcribed it will be wiped clean.

4. You will be offered a copy of your transcript if you so wish. This will be sent by me has I am the only one to be able to match the name to the number. The transcript sent will only be identified by a number - yours.

5. Your transcript with others will be analysed to reveal variation and similarities to report on your thoughts collectively of progression. The analysis will include extracts of quotes. No quote will be used if it appears to reveal, or tend to reveal the identity of the interviewee.

The next steps
My aim is to sample BME and white senior officers will be represented in all regions of the United Kingdom using the ACPO regional map. Initially this will be done using a random sampling technique any gaps will be filled by purposeful sampling – selecting individuals. BME officers will be randomly selected.

Through the sampling techniques you have been selected by me and I would be grateful if you would agree to take part in the research.

The next stage for you is to correspond directly with me to confirm that you are willing to take part in this research by emailing on kulastep@btinternet.com where I will then arrange a meeting at a place of your choice away from the workplace to conduct the
research. To ensure that the time is used productively the following information would be helpful:

1. Dates of promotions and any requests for promotions
2. Any reports following psychometric testing e.g. MBTI that you may have had conducted in the last 2 years

I will also be sending a pre interview questionnaire to collect data that will save interview time and also assist in providing areas to be explored during the interview.

You are under no obligation to take part in this study and you can withdraw from this research at any time.

I look forward to meeting you and thank you in advance for assistance in this important research.

KUL VERMA
Appendix J

The Experience of Transcription

The first two interviews were recorded on a digital recorder and given to the transcriber. Unfortunately this model of recorder had no USB lead to connect to a Personal Computer. This error became evident after the first meeting with the transcriber, who was proficient at word processing but not in transcribing. The lack of appropriate equipment combined with the skill level of the transcriber made the process laborious and stalled my progress in completing the transcription process. The transcripts were a wake up call to me to consider the timeframe of the interviews to manage time and cost during this research. I secured the services of a professional transcriber, who had access to a software programme that allowed a stop and start ability, whilst working on the screen of the computer. I also purchased another digital recorder and started to record the interviews onto a MP4 file on the computer. To reduce any security breach of the data I copied these files onto CDs and subsequently delivered these by hand to the transcriber who also signed a confidentiality clause identical to the participants of the research. I ensured that there was also a backup copy in case the media files got corrupted as the data was too precious to be lost. The typed transcript was returned by email to my secure police account at my workplace at Bramshill.

For each transcript I read and listened to the recording of the interview at the same time. These allowed me to check what was being said as well as make notes of emotions, tones and accented emphasis of language that was used by the participant. Another source of adding context to listening and reading the interviews was to triangulate thoughts and marginal notes I had made at the time of the interviews. The combination of notes, audio and reading triangulated into a better form of understanding holistically what was said allied to the emotions noted. I found that I was sometimes subtly drawn to one transcription over another; this could be due to the relationship formed with the participant or a fond memory of the encounter. I felt privileged to have collected the narratives of BME officers and faced a ‘duty’ to report what I had found. The main issue that concerned me at this time was the imperative of becoming even more aware of my own biases during the analytical process.
My duty now was to provide an account of what I had found, or as Hughes & Sharrock (1997) argue, the purpose of the interpretative paradigm is to attempt to provide a theoretical or descriptive account of social life.
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Cycles of Coding for NVivo 10

This memo sets out the cycles of analysis planned for this study. There will be eight discrete cycles of analyses. These cycles will involve three separate cycles of coding, two cycles of managing codes, one for initial categorisation of open codes and one for data reduction through consolidating codes into a more abstract theoretical framework and three which uses writing itself as a tool to prompt deeper thinking of the data (Bazeley, 2009) leading to findings from which conclusions may be drawn. Some of the managing coding cycles will also involve additional coding.

Characteristics / Defining Features of Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is based on a phenomenological position. It is a holistic approach which takes account of contexts within which human experiences occur and is thus concerned with learning from particular instances or cases. Qualitative research seeks to access the inner world of perception and meaning-making in order to understand, describe, and explain social process from the perspective of study participants. This approach does not commence with a prior hypothesis to be tested and proved but with a focus of inquiry that takes the researcher on a voyage of discovery as it takes an inductive approach to data analysis, and research outcomes are not broad generalisations but contextual findings; qualitative researchers tend to speak of ‘transferability’ (from context to context) rather than generalisability.

Methodology

The methodology adopted by this study is based on the constant comparative method according to Maykut and Morehouse (1994) who draw on the work of Glaser and Strauss (1967) and Lincoln and Guba (1985) in their development of this methodological framework.

As Maykut and Morehouse (1994) point out: "words are the way that most people come to understand their situations; we create our world with words; we explain ourselves with words; we defend and hide ourselves with words". Thus, in qualitative data analysis and presentation: "the task of the researcher is to find patterns within those words and to
present those patterns for others to inspect while at the same time staying as close to the construction of the world as the participants originally experienced it (p18).

**Constant Comparative Method: Overview of Process**

While qualitative research is not given to mathematical abstractions, it is nonetheless systematic in its approach to data collection and analysis. Framed by a focus of inquiry, whether data is collected through interviews or questionnaires, open-ended questioning allows study participants to articulate their perceptions and experiences freely and spontaneously. In analysing data generated in this format, responses are not grouped according to pre-defined categories, rather salient categories of meaning and relationships between categories are derived from the data itself through a process of inductive reasoning. The constant comparative method offers the means whereby the researcher may access and analyse these articulated perspectives so that they may be integrated in a model that seeks to explain the social processes under study.

The constant comparative method involves breaking down the data into discrete ‘incidents’ (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) or ‘units’ (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) and coding them to categories. Categories arising from this method generally take two forms: those that are derived from the participants’ customs and language, and those that the researcher identifies as significant to the project’s focus-of-inquiry; the goal of the former “is to reconstruct the categories used by subjects to conceptualise their own experiences and world view”, the goal of the latter is to assist the researcher in developing theoretical insights into the social processes operative in the site under study; thus: “the process of constant comparison stimulates thought that leads to both descriptive and explanatory categories” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, pp 334-341). Categories undergo content and definition changes as units and incidents are compared and categorised, and as understandings of the properties of categories and the relationships between categories are developed and refined over the course of the analytical process. As Taylor and Bogdan (1984) summarise: “in the constant comparative method the researcher simultaneously codes and analyses data in order to develop concepts; by continually comparing specific incidents in the data, the researcher refines these concepts, identifies their properties, explores their relationships to one another, and integrates them into a coherent explanatory model” (p126).
Using Qualitative Data Analysis Software

It must be stressed that in using qualitative data analysis software, the researcher does not capitate the hermeneutic task to the logic of the computer; rather the computer is used as a tool for efficiency and not as a tool which in and of itself conducts analysis and draws conclusions. As Fielding and Lee (1998) explain, qualitative researchers “want tools which support analysis, but leave the analyst firmly in charge” (p167). Importantly such software also serves a tool for transparency. Arguably, the production of an audit trail is the key most important criteria on which the trustworthiness and plausibility of a study can be established. Qualitative analysis software’s logging of data movements and coding patterns, and mapping of conceptual categories and thought progression, render all stages of the analytical process traceable and transparent, facilitating the researcher in producing a more detailed and comprehensive audit trail than manual mapping of this complicated process can allow.

Phase 1 – Open Coding will involve broad participant driven open coding of the chronological interview transcripts and, questionnaire returns from study participants supported with definitions so as to deconstruct the data into initial codes. These codes will have clear labels and definitions to serve as rules for inclusion (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994) of units of meaning (text segments) which will be coded from the transcripts (Maykut & Morehouse 1994, pp.126-149). The focus groups will be coded manually while the questionnaires will be initially grouped by question ready for further coding and analysis.

Phase 2 – Categorisation of codes will involve re-ordering themes identified and coded in phase 1 into categories of themes by grouping related themes under these categories and organising them into a framework that makes sense to further the analysis of the data. This phase also includes distilling, re-labelling & merging common codes from several open ended qualitative responses in the questionnaires and focus groups to ensure that labels and rules for inclusion accurately reflect coded content.

Phase 3 – ‘coding on’ will involve breaking down the now restructured themes into sub-themes to offer more in depth understanding of the highly qualitative aspects under scrutiny such as divergent views, negative cases, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours coded to these categories and to offer clearer insights into the meanings embedded therein.
Phase 4 – Documentation will involve writing *summary statements* against lower order codes so as to offer a synthesis of the content coded within the code.

Phase 5 – Data Reduction will involve consolidating codes from all three cycles into a more abstract and conceptual map of a final framework of codes for reporting purposes.

Phase 6 – writing *analytical memos* against the higher level codes to accurately summarise the content of each category and its codes and propose empirical findings against such categories. These memos will consider 5 key areas:

1. The content of the cluster of codes on which it is reporting
2. The patterns where relevant (levels of coding for example although this could be used to identify exceptional cases as well as shared experiences)
3. Situating the code(s) in the storyboard – meaning considering the relatedness of codes to each other, and their importance to addressing the research question and sequencing disparate codes and clusters of codes into a story or narrative which is structured and can be expressed in the form of a coherent and cohesive chapter
4. Considering background information recorded against participants and considering any patterns that may exist in relation to participants’ profiles
5. Considering primary sources in the context of relationships with the literature as well as identifying gaps in the literature

Phase 7 – Validation will involve testing, validating and revising analytical memos so as to self-audit proposed findings by seeking evidence in the data beyond textual quotes to support the stated findings and seeking to expand on deeper meanings embedded in the data. This process involves interrogation of data and forces the consideration of elements beyond the category itself; drawing on relationships across and between categories and cross tabulation with demographics, observations and literature. This phase will result in evidence based findings as each finding must be validated by being rooted in the data itself and will rely on the creation of reports from the data to substantiate findings.
**Phase 8** – synthesising analytical memos into a coherent, cohesive and well supported outcome statement or findings report. Finalising phase 8 will result in having produced two draft chapters; namely the findings and analysis and discussion chapters.

All the phases are shown in the example below.
Appendix L

Experience of Coding

Phase 1: Open Coding

In this phase line-by-line examination was conducted of the interview transcripts, field notes and personal documents to generate the first codes for analysis. The author resisted the temptation at this stage to apply any degree of interpretation to the meanings. Conceptual labels were assigned to the codes and used the interviewee’s own words, also known as *in vivo* codes or field-related concepts (Strauss and Corbin, 2007, p. 160). An example of this code was ‘proving myself’ which pinpointed for me exactly what was happening or what the meaning of a certain experience or event was.

These open codes were given clear labels and definitions as to serve as rules for inclusion (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). Open codes were derived from single words as well as text segments or as Maykut & Morehouse, describe as ‘units of meaning’ (1994, pp. 126-149). In addition definitions assisted in the process to deconstruct the data to develop concepts and established the start of the analytical process. The biographical responses by participants were grouped into questions to enable construction of descriptive tables and figures such as age, gender and length of service etc, whilst the analysis of open questions were coded manually. Tesh (1990, p. 116) describes this part of the analytical cycle as ‘comprehensible by itself and contained an idea or an episode, or a piece of information’, which provides for segments of data to develop open codes. Examples from the first phase included open codes such as ‘barriers’ and ‘unequal’. These open codes were based on the words and phrases used by the interviewee’s to describe the phenomena of progression. The NVivo software assisted in this process by providing the means to create queries to look for frequency of words used. This kind of interrogation of the data provided a better way of drawing out emergent codes than pen and paper and was less time intensive.
An example of how the textual segments were selected and lifted from the transcripts is shown in the figure below:

![Figure 3. Example of Textual Segments Selected to Suggest Open Codes](image)

The full list of codes are shown at Appendix M, showing the code name, description, the number of sources it was drawn from and how many times it was referenced.

**Phase 2: Categorisation of Codes before Merger and Re-labelling**

In this phase open codes from the first phase were grouped together where there seemed to be high correlation with each other. I introduced this extra phase to make sure the author had examined all the data and to also show progression towards the emergent thematic groups that would eventually develop emergent themes. The codes in this phase were not re-labelled or merged and still retain the pure essence of meaning from the interviewees responses. The categorisation of codes before merger and re-labelling is shown at Appendix M.

**Phase 3: Categorisation of Codes**

This phase reconstructed the codes into categories or units of meaning. Maykut describes this as ‘redefining categories’ (1994, p. 139 -143). Some of the original code names were changed to provide more interpretation of the themes being developed whilst others retained the labelling from open coding. This process required more interpretation.
and whilst the open codes were re-ordered into a framework, The author still tracked back to original codes and source data to check my thinking. This phase also includes distilling, re-labelling and merging common codes from several open-ended qualitative responses in the questionnaires and focus groups to ensure that labels and rules for inclusion accurately reflect coded content. At this stage the author referred back to the research objectives to guide my decision to include or exclude categories. Some of the categories retained the original configuration in earlier phases while others were merged and given different labels. The categorisation, re-labelling and on-coding final list of codes is shown at Appendix N.

**Phase 4: Coherence of Codes**

In this phase coding on involved breaking down the now categorised themes into sub-themes to offer more in depth understanding of the highly qualitative aspects under scrutiny such as divergent views, negative cases, attitudes, beliefs and behaviours to offer clearer insights into the meanings embedded within them. The ‘exploration of relationship and patterns across categories’ took place (Maykut, 1994, p. 143-145).

Some of the codes and concepts shared similar characteristics and were placed together to form abstract concepts. The author was searching for shared properties between the codes also known as *coherence*. Between the codes there was a lot of ‘local coherence’ (Agar, 1986) or linkages of the open codes such as utterances like ‘working harder’, ‘lack of confidence reported by BME officers’ and ‘making mistakes’ being grouped together to form a new sub-category called ‘BME officers proving capability’. At this stage my own interpretation was used to develop ideas and wider connections between themes. An example of how the sub-categories were developed is shown at Figure 4 shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Codes</th>
<th>Coherence Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making mistakes</td>
<td>BME officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Confidence</td>
<td>proving capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported by BME officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working harder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4. Coherence of Open Codes**
Phase 5: Summary Statements
This next stage involved writing summary statements against lower order codes so as to offer a synthesis of the content coded within the code. The codes ascribed were then given summary statements. The purpose of this was to clearly articulate what the codes meant to me. This became an interpretative descriptive framework that could be audited so ambiguity of meaning would be reduced.

Phase 6: Data reduction
This phase included data reduction, which meant affiliating codes against each other for similarities and differences all four cycles into a more abstract and conceptual map of a final framework of codes for reporting purposes. As Miles and Huberman (1994, p. 11) explain:

Data reduction is not something separate from analysis. It is part of analysis. The researcher’s decisions—which data chunks to code and which to pull out, which evolving story to tell—are all analytic choices. Data reduction is a form of analysis that sharpens, sorts, focuses, discards, and organizes data in such a way that ‘final’ conclusions can be drawn and verified.

This phase consolidated codes into themes, which were further informed by the literature review conducted in chapter two. Consistent comparison of the data and memo’s with in depth queries carried out with the NVivo 10 software provided the author an iterative thought process to develop the themes. These themes then provided the structure on which to present the findings and conclusion of the research. Data reduction codes are shown at Appendix N.

Phase 7: Analytical Memos
Analytical memos were produced committing my thoughts and ideas against the higher level codes to accurately summarise the content of each category and its codes. These were a development from phase 5 memos and were a synthesis of the lower order memos. The memos were also following a parallel process to the codes and being distilled for more clarity. This process was used as a regulatory tool to keep the analysis moving forward and provided intermittent reflection described by Charmaz (2014, p. 72) as a ‘pivotal intermediate step’.
Phase 8: Validating the Data
This phase provided a self-validation process of the data by testing and revising analytical memos so as to self-audit proposed findings by seeking evidence in the data beyond textual quotes to support the stated findings and seeking to expand on deeper meanings embedded in the data. Charmaz (2014, p. 14) describes this process as ‘You test the robustness of this category with other data’. This process involves interrogation of data and explores considerations of elements beyond the category itself testing the emerging propositions against the evidential data. This was achieved by drawing on relationships across and between categories of data, using cross-tabulation with demographics, observational field notes, literature reviews; the transcripts.

Phase 9: Developing Propositions
This phase produced six propositions derived from the data analysis. Each of this propositions drives from the evidence ‘drawn across the full range of available texts’ (Bazeley, 2009, p. 19). The method used here was a logical reduction process that produced interpretative propositions and not objective facts.

The conceptual map to organize and structure the findings reduced into the following five themes:

1. Institutional operation of racism in BME officers progression
2. Hidden barriers in promotion
3. Exclusion from Power
4. Social capital of BME officers
5. Support needed by BME Senior Officers
## Appendix M

### Phase 1 – Open Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Represent the Community</td>
<td>Why the police needs to be representative and diverse</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>What was done to level the playing field</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making mistakes</td>
<td>The consequences of a BME making a mistake</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>Support and expectation from Family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Skills that BME officers bring into the Police</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>Skills not used in the police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>Skills for promotion or not</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you define yourself</td>
<td>Self-reporting of how BME officers defined themselves</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Recruitment of BME officers – thoughts of BME officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td>Qualifications of BME officers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Provided support in the organisation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prove</td>
<td>Prove ability and deal with race issues internally and externally</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Agenda</td>
<td>Progression and the female agenda overtaking the race agenda.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudices</td>
<td>Prejudice affecting supporting officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Power</td>
<td>Power to influence change in the police</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME positive narratives</td>
<td>Positive stories and no barriers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage others to join the Police and progress within it</td>
<td>Personal view of other BME joining the police and encouragement within</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once you get to Superintendent it’s very much personal and you are seeking the support of one person, your Chief</td>
<td>Personal support from Senior Sponsors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Departments</td>
<td>Perceptions of BME officers are not in specialist departments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working harder</td>
<td>Perception that BME officers need to work harder</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>PDR does not reflect progression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Outcomes of race related issues for subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities – given</td>
<td>Opportunities and support in order to progress</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockage</td>
<td>Not being part of the decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities – not getting</td>
<td>Not being given the opportunity to develop or work closely with others that would aid promotion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation slow at celebrating BME colleagues</td>
<td>Not being given similar praise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Networks that people are associated with and belong to in and out of the workplace</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism treated by others</td>
<td>Narratives of racism real and perceived from others due to ethnicity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model</td>
<td>Lack of BME role models and when BME office do gain promotion the pressures of them being role models</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few black role models</td>
<td>Lack of BME role models exert influence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added value</td>
<td>Knowledge of culture, language, community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR off the agenda</td>
<td>IR raised by Lawrence Inquiry perceived to be off the agenda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support structures</td>
<td>Formal or informal support required for progression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt a little bit isolated</td>
<td>Feeling of an officer in the police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion process</td>
<td>Experiences of selection / promotion processes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity not valued by the Police</td>
<td>Ethnicity not values internally</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tick every box before progressing</td>
<td>Don’t feel ready for promotion until ticked every box of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle discrimination</td>
<td>Descriptions of subtle behaviours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination – glass ceiling</td>
<td>Description of being held back by an invisible, unsaid, procedure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwitting and unconscious</td>
<td>Descriptions of what unwitting things are happening to them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of the police</td>
<td>Culture of the police reports by resps</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Confidence of BME officers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications comparison BME and white</td>
<td>Comparing qualifications of BME and white officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping of BME officers</td>
<td>Categorisation of BME officers’ ability and how they are perceived – perceptions of BME officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reserved</td>
<td>BME reserved and not selling ourselves</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional racism</td>
<td>BME officers providing their view of IR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having enough operational skills</td>
<td>BME officers placed in non-operational roles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight for every position</td>
<td>BME officers fighting to gain recognition and promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market ourselves</td>
<td>BME officers do not market well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White supervisors fearing BME</td>
<td>BME making complaints against supervisors who fail to supervise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting into the organisation</td>
<td>BME being part of the organisation of the police</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA negative connotations</td>
<td>Belonging to the BPA perceived as negative by organisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenism</td>
<td>Being the only person in the department or team</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savvy</td>
<td>Being professional savvy about progression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football team</td>
<td>Being part of a network that got you promoted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached and mentored</td>
<td>Being offered coaching or mentoring to progress</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>Barriers faced by BME officers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities</td>
<td>Application of EO practically to progress</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist supervisors</td>
<td>Actions by supervisors of BME officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old boys club</td>
<td>A structure to get through promotion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix N

### Phase 2 – Open Code Groups Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abilities</strong></td>
<td>The abilities that BME bring in from their own background, culture and community and those abilities missing in BME Officers, namely confidence to be promoted.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life skills</td>
<td>Skills that offers have external to the police not being used in the police</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Skills that BME officers bring to the Police</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Perceptions that BME officers lack personal confidence to be promoted.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td>Perceptions that the qualifications of BME officers are better than white officers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities – Given</td>
<td>Opportunities and support in order to progress</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities – Not getting</td>
<td>Not being given the opportunity to develop or work closely with others that would aid promotion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications comparison BME and white</td>
<td>Comparing qualifications of BME and white officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reserved</td>
<td>BME reserved and not selling ourselves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not have enough operational skills</td>
<td>BME officers placed in non operational roles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market ourselves</td>
<td>BME officers do not market themselves internally for progression with wider police community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savvy</td>
<td>Being professionally savvy about progression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Agenda</strong></td>
<td>Progression and the female agenda over taking the race agenda. Effects on female officers.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Structures</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions that informal support required for individuals to be promoted. These included stated and non-stated rules, procedures and ways of assistance to the individual. Even where BME officers are on accelerated promotion programmes not given the same support</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support</td>
<td>Support and expectation from family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Provided support in the organisation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME positive narratives</td>
<td>Positive support in the organisation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once you get to Superintendent its very much personal and you are seeking the support of one person, your Chief</td>
<td>Personal support from Senior Sponsors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model</td>
<td>Lack of BME role models and when BME officer do gain promotion the pressures on them being role models</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few black role models</td>
<td>Lack of BME role model to exert influence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sponsors</td>
<td>Having senior sponsors to assist in progression</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached and mentored</td>
<td>Being offered coaching or mentoring to progress</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Added Value</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions of BME officers adding value by their knowledge of culture, language and links with community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Represent the community</strong></td>
<td>Why the police needs to be representative and diverse</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity not valued by the police</td>
<td>Ethnicity not valued internally</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion Processes</strong></td>
<td>How the promotion process is two tiered and how this impacts on both white BME officers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>PDR does not reflect progression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Outcomes of race related issues for subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networks</strong></td>
<td>Descriptions of how being in a network can assist in promotion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitting into the organisation</td>
<td>BME being part of the organisation of the Police</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football team</td>
<td>Being part of a network that got your promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Boys Club</td>
<td>A structure to get through promotion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Racism</strong></td>
<td>Description of what IR means to respondents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudices</td>
<td>Prejudice affecting supporting officers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism treated by others</td>
<td>Narratives of racism real and perceived from others due to ethnicity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR off the agenda</td>
<td>IR raised by Lawrence Inquiry perceived to be off the agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping of BME officers</td>
<td>Examples of stereotyping in the workplace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtle discriminations</td>
<td>Description of subtle behaviours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination – glass ceiling</td>
<td>Description of being held back by an invisible unsaid procedure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwitting and unconscious</td>
<td>Descriptions of what unwitting things are happening to them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist supervisors</td>
<td>Actions by supervisors of BME officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prove</strong></td>
<td>BME officers and white officers reporting that BME officers have to prove themselves capable and also they have gained progression through merit rather than race</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making mistakes</td>
<td>The consequences of a BME officer making a mistake</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working harder</td>
<td>Perception that BME officers need to work harder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tick every box before progressing</td>
<td>Don’t feel ready for promotion until ticked every book of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fight for every position</td>
<td>BME officers fighting to gain recognition and promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White supervisors fearing BME</td>
<td>BME making complaints against supervisors who then fail to supervise</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blockage</strong></td>
<td>Blockage for promotion, what is stopping the progression or what is required</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>What is holding the police back from changing culture or norms</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenism</td>
<td>Single person in a majority Used a representative of a wider group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage others to join the Police and progress within it</td>
<td>Personal view of other BME joining the police and encouragement within the Police. This node captures both the internal and external dynamics of encouragement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt a little bit isolated</td>
<td>Feeling of an officer in the police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of the police</td>
<td>Description of what constitutes culture and its effects on BME progression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA negative connotations</td>
<td>Belonging to the BPA perceived as negative by organisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equal Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive action</td>
<td>What was done to level the playing field</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political power</td>
<td>Power to influence change in the police</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation slow at celebrating BME colleagues</td>
<td>Not being given similar praise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix O**

**Phase 3 – Categorisation, Re-labelling and On coding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception of barriers for BME officers</strong></td>
<td>What is holding the police back from changing culture or norms</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokenism</td>
<td>Single person in a majority. Used a representative of a wider group</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME positive narratives</td>
<td>Positive stories and no barriers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities – Not getting</td>
<td>Not being given the opportunity to develop or work closely with other that would aid promotion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few black role models</td>
<td>Lack of BME role model to exert influence</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Departments difficult for BME officers to enter</td>
<td>How there was little attraction of BME getting into specialist departments due to culture and not fitting in</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity not valued by the Police</td>
<td>Ethnicity not valued internally</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture of the police</td>
<td>Description of what constitutes culture and its effects on BME progression</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA negative connotations</td>
<td>Belonging to the BPA perceived as negative by organisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional and life skills of BME officers</strong></td>
<td>The abilities that BME officers bring in from their own background, culture and community and those abilities in BME officers, namely confidence</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent the Community</td>
<td>Why the police needs to be presented and diverse workforce. All respondents BME and white officers concluding that this was necessary for the police to connect with the BME community</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you define yourself</td>
<td>Self-reporting of how BME officers defined themselves</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Value</td>
<td>Perceptions of BME officers adding value by their knowledge of culture, language and links with community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Qualification</td>
<td>Perceptions that the qualifications of BME officers are better than white officers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Structures for Progression</strong></td>
<td>Perceptions that informal support required for individuals to be promoted. These include stated and non-stated rules, procedures and ways of assistance to individuals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>Support and expectation from family</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Provided support in the organisation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities – given</td>
<td>Opportunities and support in order to progress</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior sponsors</td>
<td>Having senior sponsors in order to progress</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coached and mentored</td>
<td>Being offered coaching or mentoring to progress</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variations of the Promotion Process</strong></td>
<td>How the promotion process is two tiered and how this impacts on both white and BME officers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political power</td>
<td>Power to influence change in the police is not being shared and influence is white based rather than BME officer led. Feeling by BME officers that the status quo is being maintained</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>PDR does not reflect progression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>Outcomes of race related issues for subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Action</td>
<td>One person recording the action is to level the playing field – others that they have not been affected or assisted by positive action</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks providing benefits for white officers</td>
<td>Descriptions of how being in a network can assist in promotion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME officers fitting into the organization</td>
<td>BME being part of the organisation of the police</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Team</td>
<td>Being part of a network that got your promotion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Boys Club</td>
<td>A structure to get through promotion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Racism</td>
<td>Description of what IR means to the respondents.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism treated by others</td>
<td>Supportive treatment from others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Agenda politically overtaken race agenda</td>
<td>Progression and the female agenda overtaking the race agenda. Females being progressed at a higher rate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR off the agenda</td>
<td>IR raised by Lawrence Inquiry perceived to be off the agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotyping of BME officers</td>
<td>Examples of stereotypes in the workplace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discriminatory practice against BME officers</td>
<td>Description of being held back by an invisible unsaid procedure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racist supervisors</td>
<td>Actions by supervisors of BME officers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME officers proving capability</td>
<td>BME officers and white officers reporting that BME officers have to prove themselves capable and also they have gained progression through merit rather than race</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making mistakes</td>
<td>The consequences of a BME making a mistake</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of confidence reported by BME officers</td>
<td>Perceptions that BME officers lack personal confidence to be promoted</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working harder</td>
<td>Perception that BME need to work harder</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P

Phase 6 – Data Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional operation of racism in BME officers progression</td>
<td>Formal vision of fairness and equal opportunities, perceptions are that unwitting behaviour confirming IR.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Barriers in Promotion</td>
<td>Formal practices mask cultural ways of doing things. Difference in how BME officers operated and view organisational culture</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from Power</td>
<td>Sub-culture of BME officers being excluded; forms of racism now subtle and networks operate. ‘Old boys’ networks and benefits identified</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital of BME Senior officers</td>
<td>BME officers have to prove themselves capable, and they have gained progression through merit rather than race. Outcomes of lack of confidence and working harder</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Positive Action</td>
<td>Two tiered approach to promotion, overt and covert connected with hierarchical sponsors</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Needed by BME Senior Officers</td>
<td>Development opportunities different to white officers, lack of access to sponsors- coaches and mentors used</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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