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Abstract

This thesis investigates police officers’ professional practice and learning with the aim of disrupting and deconstructing pedagogies as they (re)produce and regulate power-knowledge relations in the era of the ‘professionalisation’ of policing. The backdrop to this research is the dynamic epistemological space of policing where enduring traditional notions of police identity, purpose, and policing practices are under erasure. The contemporary condition of policing, which has given rise to increased complexities, diversities and uncertainties confronting police demand more than a technical rationalist response. Police are working across professional boundaries, establishing partnerships and engaging in inter-professional practices. The need for new and different perspectives, possibilities and new learning is imperative and might well be timely as policing works towards becoming a new and emerging profession.

The research design encompasses qualitative and narrative methodology. Thirty-six police officers participated in semi-structured interviews, eliciting narratives and micro-narratives of individual’s perceptions and experiences of learning and engaging in practice. I situate myself within the research as an outsider-insider, or part insider, working in the agency. I was a civilian employee advising on education, professional development and training and worked within and against social, cultural, institutional and other constraints.

Three thematic frameworks of power and knowledge, gender and (dis)embodied practice, and practice and knowledge were used to present police officers’ narratives. Multiple theoretical lenses – deconstructive, poststructural, and critical – were applied to the narratives. Each harboured a number of aporias (i.e., doubtful matters) and lacunae (i.e., ambiguities, blind spots) the effects of which include, but are not limited to: the predominance of technical rationalist thinking, policing as a craft or trade rather than a profession, reliance on the production and reproduction of practice-based knowledge as opposed to theory and contestation
of knowledge claims, notions of work as rational rather than emotional, and power relations that establish and regulate internal relationships around gender and other differences, and finally, external relationships that maintain the binary of us (police) versus them (the public).

The potential for change and the possibility of different perspectives and new learning is evident in many of the police officers’ narratives. The strength and resilience of social, cultural, institutional, and occupational practices and discourses constrains and, to a significant degree, prevents the acknowledgement and realisation of the potential for different identities, purposes, professional relationships and practice. Radical change involving paradigmatic shifts in thinking and learning (unlearning, relearning) is needed for police to develop a reflexive professional practice that is social, relational, agential and embodied.
Acknowledgements

I have received support and words of encouragement from many people throughout my doctoral journey.
To the Commissioner of Police, ex-colleagues, and to the police officers who volunteered to reveal so much of themselves through their stories of learning and experiences of policing, my sincere thanks and gratitude to you all. I feel very privileged to have come to know you and to share this research with you. This would not have been possible without your participation and openness.
To my supervisors, Dr Jennifer Angwin and Dr Tracey Ollis, my biggest thanks to each of you for being who you are and making my doctoral journey a collegial, intellectually demanding and rewarding experience. I have appreciated your critical feedback, our conversations, and your willingness to allow me to take theoretical detours in order to find my own voice. I look forward to our ongoing friendship.
To my critical friends Dr Paul Levett and Barbara Holgate, each of you has been beside me throughout this journey. Paul, I thank you so much for many years of professional supervision. Your sharp wit and keen intellect guided me through many challenging practice issues. And Barb, my dear friend with a critical gaze, I thank you for travelling to review and edit my thesis when I was feeling overwhelmed.
To Michael Ryan thank you for your love, support, encouragement, astute intellect and humour. You have been there and done this, so your advice and support was spot on. I could not have achieved this without you. You have kept me sane, on track, and centred. Love you lots. And I cannot forget Foucault (our Labradoodle with attitude and altitude) who has been my constant companion: sleeping on the floor beside me as I write and sending me subliminal messages (positive ones, of course).
Papers, Presentations and Publications

Ryan, C M. 2014, ‘Deconstructing pedagogies of professional practice, learning and subjectivities’, Presentation of methodology, methods, and preliminary findings of doctoral research at the 2nd CAPEU-Deakin (Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities) Symposium, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPS), Shah Campus, Tanjung Malim, Malaysia, 30th October to 1st November, 2014.

Ryan, C M. 2013, ‘Deconstructing boundaries and meaning within/across professional learning’, Refereed paper presented as part of a symposium at the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE) Annual Conference, Hilton Adelaide Hotel, 1st to 5th December 2013.


Ryan, C M 2007, ‘Eliciting personal constructs to distinguish prevailing D/discourses in police training’, Refereed paper presented at the Australian
Association for Research in Education (AARE) Annual Conference, Notre Dame University, Fremantle, 2nd to 6th December 2007.


# Table of Contents

Deconstructing pedagogies of professional practice and learning for police officers ................................................................. 1
Candidate Declaration ................................................................................................................................................. 2
Abstract ..................................................................................................................................................................... 3
Acknowledgements ......................................................................................................................................................... 5
Papers, Presentations and Publications ......................................................................................................................... 6
Abbreviations and Acronyms .......................................................................................................................................... 12
Chapter 1 ...................................................................................................................................................................... 13
Beginning Otherwise ..................................................................................................................................................... 13
  In the Middle of a Fix ................................................................................................................................................. 13
    A Moment ................................................................................................................................................................. 13
    Aim of the Research and My Motivation .................................................................................................................. 14
The Research Puzzle: In the Swampy Lowland .................................................................................................................. 15
  Image and Reputation .................................................................................................................................................. 15
  Modernist Conceptions of Policing .............................................................................................................................. 16
  Police Training and Education ..................................................................................................................................... 19
  Police Culture(s) ........................................................................................................................................................... 21
  Police Research ............................................................................................................................................................ 23
  Policing Now ............................................................................................................................................................... 24
Taking a Postmodern Turn ............................................................................................................................................... 25
  A Pause ....................................................................................................................................................................... 26
D/discourses and Subcultures ............................................................................................................................................ 28
  Warrior D/discourse ..................................................................................................................................................... 28
  Tough-love family D/discourse ................................................................................................................................... 28
  Perfect-self D/discourse .............................................................................................................................................. 29
The site of Conundrum ...................................................................................................................................................... 29
Situating Myself ............................................................................................................................................................... 30
  My Research Environment ........................................................................................................................................ 30
  A Pause ....................................................................................................................................................................... 31
Methodology .................................................................................................................................................................... 32
Police Officers’ Voices ...................................................................................................................................................... 34
  A Moment ................................................................................................................................................................. 35
Where to from here ......................................................................................................................................................... 36
Chapter 2 ...................................................................................................................................................................... 38
Discovering Otherwise ...................................................................................................................................................... 38
  Discerning Concepts and Perspectives .......................................................................................................................... 38
    A Moment ................................................................................................................................................................. 38
  Police Research ............................................................................................................................................................ 39
Practice and Professional Practice ........................................................................................................................................ 40
  Practice ...................................................................................................................................................................... 40
  Professional Practice .................................................................................................................................................... 44
  Professional Learning, Practice and Work-Based Learning .......................................................................................... 46
  Common Sense and Practice ......................................................................................................................................... 48
Discretion and Practice.................................................................................................................. 50

Policing as a Profession .............................................................................................................. 53
Professionalising Policing ........................................................................................................... 55
Evidence-Based Policing ............................................................................................................ 57

Police Education and Training .................................................................................................... 59
Socialisation of Police Recruits .................................................................................................. 61

Policing and Conundrum ............................................................................................................ 62
The Changing Landscape of Policing .......................................................................................... 62
The Need for Change .................................................................................................................. 65
Police Culture(s) .......................................................................................................................... 66
Models of Policing ...................................................................................................................... 68
Police Leadership and Management ............................................................................................ 69

Women in Policing ...................................................................................................................... 73
Modernist Policing and the Postmodern Turn ............................................................................ 76
Neoliberal and Managerial Regimen ......................................................................................... 79

The Mandate of Policing ............................................................................................................ 81
Police Force / Police Service ....................................................................................................... 82
The Old-New Blue/Black ............................................................................................................. 84
Militarisation of Police ............................................................................................................... 85

Conclusion: Discerning Concepts and Perspectives .................................................................. 86
Where to Next ............................................................................................................................. 88

Chapter 3 ..................................................................................................................................... 89

Thinking Otherwise .................................................................................................................. 89

An Assemblage of Methodology and Theory ........................................................................... 89

A Pause ........................................................................................................................................ 89

Methodology: Qualitative and Narrative ................................................................................... 89
Qualitative Research .................................................................................................................... 89
Narrative ....................................................................................................................................... 91
Postmodern Narrative and Experience-Centred Narrative ....................................................... 93

Methods, Data Collection and Analysis .................................................................................... 95
Semi-Structured Interviews ....................................................................................................... 95
Data Collection ............................................................................................................................. 95
Analysis ....................................................................................................................................... 98
Ethical Considerations ................................................................................................................. 99
A Moment ..................................................................................................................................... 99

The Value of Theory .................................................................................................................. 101
“Unthought” Data ....................................................................................................................... 102

Theories and Theorists: Looking over my shoulder ................................................................. 105

Habitus, Field and Doxa: Bourdieu | Maton ............................................................................ 105
Forms of Capital: Bourdieu .......................................................................................................... 108

Deconstruction: Derrida | Biesta | Caputo | Johnson .................................................................... 109
Mimesis: Derrida | Schweiker ......................................................................................................... 112
Sous Rature: Derrida ................................................................................................................... 113

Power Relations and Power-Knowledge: Foucault | Gore | McNay ............................................ 114
Postmodern Self and Subjectivity: Biehl et al | Hall | Haraway | Deleuze ........................................... 116

The Body and Perception: Merleau-Ponty | O’Loughlin | Csordas ........................................... 117
Embodiment and Emotions: Hochschild | Barber et al | O’Loughlin | Bendelow and Williams ....... 122

Gender, Sexuality and Masculinities: Butler | Connell | McNay | Foucault ............................................ 125
Masculinities: Connell | Irigaray ........................................................................................................ 127
Gendered Substructures: Acker ................................................................................................. 128

Aporias and Lacunae .................................................................................................................. 129
### Conclusion: Methodology and Theory

Where to next

---

### Chapter 4

Finding Otherwise

---

### Power and Knowledge: Aporias and Lacunae

Aporias Relations and Knowledge

Aporias and Lacunae

The Practice of Policing

Moulding versus Qualifying

Treading a Thin Line

What’s in a Name?

Hard versus Soft Policing: Losing our Way

Being Measured

Discourses of Policing

Looking Good is Being Good

Status and Symbolism of Policing

The “Professional” Artisan

The Public Gaze

Power through Wisdom

Common Sense: Goes Without Saying

Conclusion: Power and Knowledge

Where to Next

---

### Chapter 5

Finding Otherwise

---

### Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice: Aporias and Lacunae

A Moment

Aporias and Lacunae

Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice

Sexual Harassment

The Invisible, “Unknowable”, Un-Said

Power Struggles

Tacit Acceptance

Gender Roles, Styles, and Subjectivities

V8s, Football, and Racing

Rational Work versus Emotional Work

A Moment

Policing Emotion Work

Touchy-Feely

Empathy

Learning with Feeling

Conclusion: Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice

Where to Next

---

### Chapter 6

Finding Otherwise

---

### Practice and Knowledge: Aporias and Lacunae

Practice and Knowledge

Aporias and Lacunae

Ways of Knowing: Sit and Get

Knowing What: Simple as That
## Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbr</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABF</td>
<td>Australian Border Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZPAA</td>
<td>Australia New Zealand Policing Advisory Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBL</td>
<td>Course-based Learning Pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIB</td>
<td>Criminal Investigation Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISM</td>
<td>Critical Incident Stress Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>General duties policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPM</td>
<td>New Public Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTPFES</td>
<td>Northern Territory Police, Fire and Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPOL</td>
<td>Queensland Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPOL</td>
<td>South Australia Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TasPOL</td>
<td>Tasmania Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEOHRC</td>
<td>Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VicPOL</td>
<td>Victoria Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAPOl</td>
<td>Western Australia Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>Workshop-based Learning Pathway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

Beginning Otherwise

In the Middle of a Fix

We’re social workers ... society’s parents ... the odd job man of problems (Edward, Sergeant).

A Moment ...

Derrida advises us to begin wherever we are, in the middle of the fix we find ourselves in, in the middle of a text ... with the smallest bit or piece. That at least will enable [us] to get started, not at the beginning, which is to ask too much, but wherever [we are] (Caputo 1993, p.21, emphasis in original).

I found myself in the middle of a fix, working in an Australian police agency. I was immersed in the agency for 10 years and my role and responsibilities in training, education and professional development gave me access to all the facets of policing from the everyday operational aspects, to intelligence, to specialist groups and covert areas of policing. I was a civilian (“unsworn”) employee advising on education, training, and professional development, but the role occupied a liminal space. I described myself as a ‘token insider – different, partly accepted, yet tolerated’ (Ryan 2009, p.7). My advice represented ‘outsider views’ and was judged as the antithesis of insider knowledge and regularly dismissed (Klein 2004, p.173). The functionalist, technical rationalist and gendered nature of the police agency posed many hard and puzzling questions for me and provided impetus for my research. For the purposes of this thesis, and to respect the agency’s anonymity, I will refer to the site as Conundrum.
Aim of the Research and My Motivation

My research investigates police officers’ professional practice and learning with the aim of disrupting and deconstructing pedagogies (Foucault 1980; Gore 1993) using multiple theoretical lenses – deconstructive, post-structural and critical. Central to this investigation of pedagogies is how power-knowledge relations are produced and reproduced, how meaning is formed and shared, how subjectivities and identities of ‘self’ and others are constructed (Foucault 1980; Giroux 2011), and whose interests are served (Foucault 1980; Freire 1973; Giroux 1988, 2006, 2011; Gore 1993). One primary source of my motivation is my ontological stance comprising scepticism towards existing meta-narratives, embedded in the pedagogies at play in Conundrum.

My scepticism is informed by an ‘affirmative’ (Biesta 2001, p.33, emphasis in original) or optimistic intent, the very essence of which is ‘not [to] affirm what is’ or to accept ‘what is present’ (Caputo 1997, p.41, emphasis in original). Instead, my intent is to open up to something different or otherwise, to new and different perspectives and possibilities with the potential for new learning; what Derrida referred to as the ‘l’invention de l’autre, the in-coming of the other’ (Derrida 1997, p.42; Lovlie 1992; Usher & Edwards 1994). To achieve this, I will pay attention to the ‘aporias’ and ‘lacunae’. I distinguish dual representations of aporias in my thesis. From one perspective, aporias raise doubt or doubtful matters, create uncertainty, pose further questions, or highlight contradictions in meaning and


2 Different definitions or interpretations of lacunae are evident: in law they are generally depicted as ‘vacuums’ or ‘gaps’ (Perrin 2012, p.213), ‘ambiguities’ and ‘gaps’ (Delmas-Marty 2013, p.553), ‘omissions’, ‘blind spots’ (Delamont 1987, p.163).
experience. From another perspective, they have the potential to move towards something different, to new understandings with the potential for new learning. As Burbules points to, ‘doubt’ has ‘educational potential’ (2000, p.183, emphasis in original). I perceive lacunae as gaps in meaning and experience, blind spots, or that which is ‘invisible’, unspoken, and ‘excluded by what is present’ (Biesta 2013, p.38). The confluence of my experiences in Conundrum and the context of policing are pivotal to the approach I have taken to my research and thesis.

The Research Puzzle: In the Swampy Lowland

The present finds police organisations and police officers in the middle of a fix as they attempt to comprehend and respond to the ‘indeterminate, swampy zones of practice’ (Schön 1987, p.3). The epistemological space of policing is in a state of flux. Relevant to this instability is the concept of risk in the risk society of the 21st century, which Beck (2000, p.213) describes as an ‘intermediate state between security and destruction, where the perception of threatening risks determines thought and action’. As a consequence, enduring traditional notions of police identity, purpose, and policing practices are under erasure (Lanyon 2007, 2009; Ransley & Mazerolle 2009; Reiner 2003; Wakefield & Fleming 2009), and ‘in the swampy lowland, messy, confusing problems defy technical solution’ (Schön 1987, p.3). Overlying this are national and international agendas driving the professionalisation of policing (Burgess, Fleming & Marks 2006; FYFE 2013; Lanyon 2007, 2009a,b; Murray 2006; Ransley & Mazerolle 2009; Rowe 2008; Stone & Travis 2013). A plethora of contradictions and tensions, denoting aporias and lacunae, simultaneously contaminate and construct this space and the site and topics of my research.

Image and Reputation

An examination of past and more recent literature revealed no fixed or precise definition of policing and police work (Bayley 1994; Bittner 1974; Klockars 1985; McLaughlin 2006; Mawby 2003; Reiner 2000, 2003; Rowe 2009). Instead, a popular and enduring image of police, perpetuated by media (fictional and non-
fictional), is that of law enforcers exercising their state-sanctioned authority to deprive citizens of their liberty and to use force (Fleming & Wakefield 2009; Rowe 2009). This aligns with the assertion that police represent images of power and influence with legitimate, state-authorised power to engage in social control (Silvestri 2003). They take control of situations, or they are expected to do so. They are described as acting:


authoritatively; they structure conversation around their concerns; they are expected to display certainty and not to equivocate; they find it difficult to apologise, since this is tantamount to demeaning themselves; and most of all they demand deference (Waddington 1999a, p.20, emphasis in original).

This authoritative, self-assured image is integral to police identity, purpose and practice. Yet, it is under erasure as police engage in ‘community-oriented’ approaches to policing that encompass partnerships and collaborative responses to social and judicial issues, crossing professional boundaries, and attempting to balance social control with greater social responsibility (Lewis 2007; Murray 2002, 2005, pp.348-349). Such an approach is in direct contrast to the ‘traditional’, ‘command and control’ model of policing, suited to managing the current political agendas of terrorism and fear of the “Other” and difference (Lewis 2007; Murray 2002, 2005, pp.348-349). Compounding and confusing this are persistent and seemingly steadfast modernist conceptions of policing, in part maintained by Neoliberal ideologies and the demands of the Managerial regimen³.

**Modernist Conceptions of Policing**

Modernist concepts resting on institutionalised truths in the form of rules, procedures, legislation, and political and ideological agendas prevail in policing (Clark 2005; McLaughlin & Murji 1999; Waters 2007; Reiner 1992b). Modernist language and methods include dualities of ‘right/wrong, guilt/not guilty, good/bad’ (Waters 2007, p.268) and a focus on rational, scientific, evidence-based approaches to policing (Waters 2007). The language of criminology and policing represents modernist concepts aimed at predicting criminal behaviour and controlling social behaviour (Moyer 2001; Reiner 1992b; Vold, Bernard & Snipes ³ See chapter 2 for more details of the definitions and impact of Managerial and Neoliberal regimes on policing

---

³ See chapter 2 for more details of the definitions and impact of Managerial and Neoliberal regimes on policing
1998; Waters 2007). Political agendas of law and order, the strength of the
government-police nexus, underscored by Neoliberal and Managerial regimen,
promote and sustain these modernist agendas (Punch 2010). The Australian
federal government and more recently the Government of New South Wales have
sought to assert greater control of social and criminal behaviour by introducing a
range of new laws with the potential to impinge on the liberties of all citizens and
further extend police powers⁴.

Others, however, have argued that modernist conceptions of policing are
antiquated in today’s global, pluralised society and reform is needed (Clark 2005;
Fleming & Wakefield 2009; McLaughlin 2006; O’Malley 2005; Reiner 2005; Waters
2007). Cox (2011) argues that the context and nature of police work is far more
complex and demanding, and cautions that hierarchical and procedurally driven
police organisations do not adapt to and cope with indeterminacy and
unpredictability, thereby limiting or resisting efforts to change. This was
particularly evident in Conundrum.

Efforts to move from the twentieth century conceptions of policing as a ‘craft or
trade’, featuring a ‘command and control’ approach to enforcing law and fighting
crime, to a ‘community-oriented’ professionalism concerned with collaborative,
inclusive and less authoritative practices have met with resistance from Neoliberal
and Managerial regimes focused on outcomes, performance measurement, audit
and control have complicated any change (Fyfe 2013, p.409; Murray 2005, pp.348-
349; Stone & Travis 2013). Edwards (2010) has argued that an emphasis on

⁴ Marr (2016) reported that Bret Walker, a barrister and previously an independent monitor of
national security laws, described Australia’s tendency to ‘throw a law at [a problem], or 53 laws at
it’ and that Australia had a surfeit of anti-terrorism laws, ‘more ... laws than any other country on
earth’. These laws have the potential to impact on people who have not committed a crime but
who happen to be in a place where terrorism is being planned and enacted (Australian
Broadcasting Corporation 2014). New South Wales provides such an example of this with new
legislation where ‘control orders’ can be applied not only to terrorists to:
all citizens in NSW who are alleged to have some proximity or involvement to a serious
crime, without a person ever being found guilty of an offence ... restricting [a person’s]
movement, who they associate with, who they work for and whether they can access the
internet (Ackland 2016).
accountability restricts service delivery to tightly controlled targets and outcomes (in keeping with the managerial agendas), resulting in a prescriptive, procedurally driven service as opposed to a more flexible and responsive delivery of service. Evidence-based policing with its ‘what works’ remedy to practice issues (Kvernbeek 2015, p.3, emphasis in original) also results in less flexible and more formulaic service delivery and is the very antithesis of what is needed to respond to the complex exigencies of the twenty-first century society (Clark 2005; O’Malley 2005; Waters 2007). These regimes tend to undermine professional practice and professional discretion (Edwards 2010, p.2). In order for practice to meet the diverse and complex needs of individuals and communities in today’s society, Edwards (2010, p.3) maintained:

... they cannot be led by the needs, histories and intentions of organisations whether their raisons d’être are the stability and routine of bureaucracy or the accountability and targets of NPM.

Fyfe joined other commentators (Balko 2014; Greenwald 2014; Murray 2005) in questioning the extent of a transition to ‘new professionalism’ in the face of enduring interest in crime-fighting and law enforcement. Another example of resistance to change is the militarisation of policing in the USA and Australia (see Chapter 2), post 9/11 and promulgated by prevailing discourses of terrorism and concerns for national security (Murray 2005).

A more nuanced and sophisticated approach is needed, one that identifies and considers all values, such as, equity, social justice, natural justice, due process, rights and responsibilities (Thacher 2001). Edwards (2010, p.3) proposed a different professionalism for the twenty-first century, one that is considered, informed, purposeful and reflexive to support crossing disciplinary boundaries to work alongside and interact with other professions. This form of professionalism demands a reflexive police practitioner with a heightened self- and other-awareness and a capacity to develop expertise that is ‘relational’ and interdependent as opposed to autonomous and independent (Billett, Gruber & Harteis 2010, pp.v-vi; Edwards 2010). Cox (2011, p.4) asserted: ‘... as society changes so must police practice. Supporting that change must be a flexible and
relevant program of practitioner learning and development’. Current police training and education, however, is highly inadequate to prepare police officers for the twenty-first century and the changing nature of policing (Bradley 2009a).

**Police Training and Education**

Conceptions of policing as a craft or trade dominate police training with a focus on the ‘micro-objectives’ of learning (i.e., content and behaviour), perpetuated by a behaviouristic approach and intent involving imitation and reproduction with little if any need for comprehension (Birzer 2003; Beckett 2001; Beckett & Hager 2000; McLaren 2009, p.62, emphasis in original). Despite assertions and efforts to professionalise policing, many police continue to portray and describe policing as a craft or trade, best learned on-the-job (Bayley & Bittner 2001; Steinheider, Wuestewald, Boyatzis, & Kroutter 2012).

In Australia, each police organisation is responsible for the recruitment, training and qualification of its own police officers. Recruit training programs range from 25 weeks duration in Queensland (QPOL 2014), 33 weeks in Victoria (VicPOL 2015) and 52 weeks in South Australia (SAPOL 2013). Significantly, the recruits are paid employees, and as such are subject to the organisation’s authority, standards, and sanctions, and their behaviour and progress is under constant surveillance and assessment (Conti & Nolan 2005). Training represents a fundamental means of socialisation and managerial control (Bradley 2009a; Conti & Nolan 2005). It is highly prescriptive with an emphasis on group learning activities (2005), with the individual being fashioned into the ideal employee for a regimented, efficient law enforcement practice and occupation (Bradley 2009a). It is interesting to note that despite the variation in the length of training across the states, all recruits graduate with comparable powers and are expected to perform as a fully-fledged police officer.
The limited and prescriptive scope of the recruit curricula supports the reproduction of practice-based knowledge. This correlates with the time devoted to particular aspects of policing. For instance, Bradley (2009a, pp.100-101) found that up to ‘50 per cent’ of time is allocated to active or ‘hard’ elements of policing (e.g., defensive tactics, deployment of firearms and other accoutrements, the use of vehicles, ‘drill marching’) with the remainder spread thinly across a wide range of important and complex theoretical areas, described as ‘softer’ elements of policing (e.g., communication skills, dealing with vulnerable and at risk groups, youth justice, domestic violence, administrative procedures, legislation).

Cox (2011, p.4) described the approach to police training and education in Australia as ‘intellectually redundant’, based on ‘behaviouralist-orientated competency-based training’. Learning in the academy involves the socialisation of recruits to policing as a craft or trade (Bradley 2009a), as opposed to an opportunity for deep learning to equip recruits for the exigencies and uncertainties of police work in the twenty-first century. Bradley (2009a, p.101) noted:

The absence of deeper forms of learning based on reading and reflection is not usually a cause for concern for either recruits or trainers. Book-based knowledge is not highly valued in police academies where the pressure is on ensuring that recruits acquire a survival kit of necessary legal knowledge and technical skills before their all too soon immersion into police work.

Bradley (2009, p.102) was adamant that, in the twenty-first century, current training and education practices ‘have clearly run past their used-by dates’ and major shifts in thinking and practice are needed. His argument is bolstered by the fact that 25 years have past since the Fitzgerald (1989) Royal Commission of Inquiry commented on the inadequacy of police training. Later Royal Commissions – Wood (1997) and Kennedy (2004) – reinforced Fitzgerald’s observations.

The lack of deep learning is at least in part due to the reproduction of practice-based knowledge by and through trainers who tend to have little if any formal qualifications in training and/or education and base their instruction on their
experience of a didactic, teacher-centred approach. Their ability as operational police officers is the true measure of their value as trainers (McCoy 2006). Ironically, despite its powerful role socialising and disciplining recruits, police training and education sit in a liminal space in police organisations with trainers in recruit training mainly coming from the lower ranks of constable and sergeant (Bradley 2009a).

In *Conundrum*, training and education were subordinate to operational policing, taken for granted as adequate, and treated as a process, akin to administrative, technical matters, rather than an opportunity for deep and transformative learning. This typifies notions of learning embedded in the assumptions of socialisation where an attitude of conformity and compliance is valued and expected rather than one of critical thinking and questioning. The latter is antithetical to hierarchical structures where ownership of decision-making rests with a limited number of people, practice is routine and process-driven, scholarship and critical reflection devalued, and status quo is ‘actively or passively’ maintained (Cressey, Boud & Docherty 2006, p.23). The consequences of posing questions (particularly ‘why-questions’) include, but are not limited to, being labelled as ‘troublesome’ and excluded (Høyrup & Elkjaer 2006, p.36) and seen as not ‘having a feel for the game’ (the *illusio*)⁵ (Bourdieu 1990, p.66).

**Police Culture(s)**

Further sources of resistance emanate from persistent and challenging aspects of the police culture (Loftus 2012). Rather than a homogeneous, static culture, research has revealed a plurality of cultures based on rank, department, organisation, ‘rural and urban’, ‘local and international’ (Chan 1997; Loftus 2012, p.15). Particular elements of the police cultures, however, have hegemonic status. For example, an enduring focus on fighting crime, underscored by notions of risk, action and excitement supporting an attitude and expectation of police as ‘physically, emotionally tough, aggressive and engage[d] in traditionally

---

⁵ See Chapter 3 for detailed discussion of Bourdieu’s (1990) concept of ‘illusio’ and having ‘a feel for the game’.
masculine activities’ (Loftus 2012; Waddington 1999b, p. 99). Such an attitude and set of expectations is perpetuated by the ‘attitudes, values and experiences’ of the police officers themselves (Kennedy 2004, p. 34) and was evident in the findings of the recent review of sexual harassment, discrimination and predatory behaviour in Victoria Police by the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission (2015). (See Chapter 2.)

In light of the complexity, uncertainty, and fluidity of today’s police work (Fleming & Wakefield 2009; Lanyon 2007, 2009; Murray 2000; Ransley & Mazerolle 2009; Waters 2007), culture creates coherence, certainty and clarity (Bauman 1999). It provides structure, meaning, and control by safeguarding existing thinking and practice and counteracting resistance or efforts to disrupt the current state of equilibrium (Bauman 2005). Culture comprises a repertoire of beliefs, practices, habits, myths or misconceptions, and D/discourses (i.e., words, deeds, tools, symbols) (Gee 2005, p. 7), that construct ‘ways of talking’, ‘ways of seeing’, thinking and being that are resistant to challenge and change (Bauman 2005, 2006; Fairclough 1995, p. 41). Worthy of note is a Face Book post by the Oklahoma Highway Patrol (2016) outlining the importance of command presence. It patently illustrates the commonality of police culture.⁶

Other layers of police culture stem from the genesis of policing – ‘largely white, male and heterosexual’, ‘lower-socio-economic’ backgrounds with limited or average level of education – engendering bias and a lack of tolerance and

---

⁶ The post depicts a photograph of two heavily muscled male police officers in skin-tight shirts and the accompanying text reads: Why is it [command presence] so important in our line of work? Maybe because it is the first impression someone will have about you as soon as you step out of your vehicle. If you show up to a scene looking squared away, you will come off as professional, respectful, and confident. Speaking well, acting right, and looking good will deescalate more situations then you could ever imagine. It’ll help you come off as a confident individual who knows what they are doing. Which people would most likely feel more confident in trusting and respecting. But if you show up looking like a hot piece of salami then you are already in a disadvantage. You are starting off with no respect or confidence from those you are trying to help or investigate. That’s just not a good look and it could do more damage then good. Take pride in yourself and your job. Everyone be safe. PC: Oklahoma Highway Patrol.
acceptance of difference based on gender, sexuality, race, and class (Fitzgerald 1989, p.225; Foster 2003, p.213; Loftus 2012). Other pervasive and lasting features include a camaraderie that is élite, exclusive and isolative, producing suspicion of others and difference, and a degree of cynicism (Loftus 2012, pp.8-14). Assertions of the inexorable and problematic features of police cultures have been emphasised by the three Australian Royal Commissions of Inquiry: Fitzgerald (1989), Wood (1997), and Kennedy (2004). For example, negative impacts of the culture that engendered a sense of isolation and separation from the community police serve, developed an intolerance of difference and disdain for outsiders, and promoted and permitted ‘personal misconduct’ (Kennedy 2004; Wood 1997, p.214). Similar concerns were evidenced in the findings of the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission’s (2015) inquiry into sexual harassment, discrimination and predatory behaviour in Victoria Police. The chronological span of the inquiries points to the tenacity of police culture.

**Police Research**

Fundamental to the agenda of change is a paucity of research in policing of non-operational practices (Mazeika, Bartholomew, Distler, Thomas, Greenman & Pratt 2010) (see Chapter 2.) Police research tends towards a tradition of ‘normative research’ focused on police procedures, tactics, and strategies (Crank 2003, p.188), producing ‘instrumental knowledge’ that supports ‘technical rationality’ (Schön 1983, p.21; Thacher 2001, p.389). Such a limited scope of research has contributed to the lack of an identified body of knowledge to underpin police practice and has compounded an enduring disregard by police of theory-based knowledge (Steinheider, Wuestewald, Boyatzis & Kroutter 2012). Practice-based knowledge combined with technical rationality and instrumental knowledge has prevailed and has legitimacy (Green & Gates 2014).

A normative research focus, however, has the potential to overlook the effects of context (i.e., organisation, occupation, individual self-interest), including the social, relational and embodied nature of practice (Crank 2003, p.196; Edwards 2010; Hutchings & Jarvis 2012). Commentators have argued that a technical
A rationalist response is no longer adequate (Cox 2011; Fyfe 2013; Lanyon 2007, 2009a, b) for the ‘messy, confusing problems’ of today’s society (Fay 1987; Kemmis 2012; Schön 1987, p. 3). As Thacher (2001, p. 395) asserted:

... the core uncertainty in policing is not about which means best realize a clear and given end but about how exactly each of many ambiguous ends is relevant in a particular situation and which end deserves how much priority over the others.

**Policing Now**

In the globalised, differentiated, risk society of the twenty-first century people are confronted with a very different set of ‘mutually contradictory, global and personal risks’ (Beck, Giddens & Lash 1994, p. 7). Police also confront a set of new and different challenges, crimes and demands – domestic terrorism and resultant fear, international peace-keeping, advances in technological crimes, complex domestic social problems – while maintaining their focus on long-standing traditional crimes against property and person, drugs, and general public order and safety.

Contemporary policing therefore ‘is marked by diversification and uncertainty of crime control problems’ (Ransley & Mazerolle 2009, p. 365). Becoming less relevant are the traditional, tried and true police responses and strategies based on what was known and what had previously worked because what was previously understood and dealt with as ‘problems of order’ requiring technical rational responses are now understood as ‘problems of risk’, the features of which are ‘complexity’, ‘uncertainty’, and ‘ambiguity’ (Ransley & Mazerolle 2009; Rosa, Renn & McCright 2014, pp. 131-136). Efforts to increase control in response to problems of risk do not necessarily result in increased control. Instead, the results can be a lack of or loss of control and greater uncertainty (Beck, Giddens & Lash 1994, p. 9). As previously noted, the increased militarisation of police (Balko 2014) and the expansion of legislation and police powers by state and federal governments in Australia (Ackland 2016) represent efforts to reclaim control and a sense of certainty. Appendix A outlines two vignettes to illustrate these issues.
In summary, the swampy zones of practice, policies and discourses significantly affect police and policing. There is greater public scrutiny and representation of police practices through social and commercial media channels (Manning 2005) and formal ‘civilian oversight’ processes (Lewis 2007; Prenzler & den Heyer 2013, p.90). Changes to expectations of the role and responsibilities of police by the public and governments are profound, influential and ongoing (Burgess et al 2006). The Managerial policies and practices with an emphasis on measuring performance – individual and organisational – and outcomes are a further source of influence and control (Burgess et al 2006), which add to the tension that police experience in carrying out their traditional role. Essentially, these discourses, policies and practices operate as a form of increased surveillance of police, their interactions with the public, and their policing practices.

**Taking a Postmodern Turn**

The features documented throughout the preceding discussion underline the hallmarks of truth, knowing and certainty juxtaposed with shifts towards uncertainty, indeterminacy, and not knowing. I am reminded of Nietzsche’s question:

*What really is this “Will to Truth” in us? ... [sic] ... why not rather untruth? And uncertainty? Even ignorance?* (1997, p.1, emphasis in original)

During my 10 years with *Conundrum*, I became profoundly cognisant of the repetition of pedagogies comprised of discourses, ideas and practices that signified the ‘reproduction’ of ways of knowing as opposed to evidence of contestation (Giroux 2006, pp.4-5). Such a context offers little if any prospect of naming, confronting and challenging ambiguities and tensions within existing power-knowledge relations. There is an analogous relationship between reproduction and tradition and modernist notions of policing with the latter acting as glue, holding steadfast to the *logos*⁷ (Spitzer 2011, p.24) that engenders familiarity, a degree of comfort, certainty, and security.

---

⁷ See chapter 3 for the definition and explanation of *logos*. 
Through my research and having more time to reflect on my experiences of working with *Conundrum*, I believe police policies and practices would benefit from a measure of ‘postmodern scepticism’ and ‘postmodern sensibilities’, thereby positioning police to better respond to the ambiguities, uncertainties and diversities of twenty-first century society (Clark 2005; Waters 2007, pp.258-259). Giroux’s (2006, p.47) assertions of what postmodernism can offer aptly reflects the nature of contemporary policing:

> Postmodernism not only makes visible the ways in which domination is being prefigured and redrawn, it also points to the shifting configurations of power, knowledge, space, and time that characterize a world that is at once more global and more differentiated.

Guided by my scepticism towards meta-narratives and with an optimistic intent, I believe postmodern concepts of ‘discontinuity, rupture, and difference’ (Giroux 2006, p.47) have much to offer to policing in the form of alternative orientations to understanding, challenging, and transforming existing modernist concepts, discourses and practices.

*A Pause* ...

Central to everything I did at the academy and throughout *Conundrum* was gaining trust and building relationships: following through on what I said, being congruent with my words and actions, maintaining confidentiality, assisting individuals with their learning and professional development, taking time to learn the what, why, how of various practices, and endeavouring to establish a common language. For the first few years, my efforts were met with a degree of suspicion and, on occasions, hostility. I recall many occasions when I had to justify my advice, existence, and involvement. For example, when I gave advice, the response I regularly received was, ‘Well, that’s your opinion.’ To which I would reply, ‘No, this is not my personal opinion, this is based on many years of educational research, and is supported by a body of evidence.’ I recall being told by a male sergeant that ‘You’re only an adviser, so you can wait to be asked’.
It was common for police officers to give opinions, based on their personal experience, but not founded in theory, or based on any research and literature. The lack of an underpinning theoretical framework was starkly evident. Instead, knowledge gained from practice and experience predominated and constructed what was known, understood, done, and conversely what was not known, not understood, nor enacted.

I experienced ‘difference against’ (Burbules 1997, p.108). As I embraced my work with an educative and transformative intent I felt the pressure to accept and validate current thinking and practice. My words, actions and presence represented ‘difference’ that was ‘beyond’ the comprehension of the dominant and perceived as a threat to the status quo and a personal threat (Burbules 1997, p.106). My frustration grew as I attempted to ‘name and reframe everyday experiences’ (Ryan 2009, p.1). To deal with this, I commenced regular external professional supervision and enrolled in post-graduate studies.

Over time, my words, actions, and the relationships I established produced a level of respect and a degree of acceptance, to the point where individuals initiated contact and actively sought support and guidance with their work in training, their learning and professional development. I recall the day I became a verb. A constable at the academy who had sought my advice, said to his inspector of a document he had prepared and was submitting, ‘It’s OK Boss, it’s been Cherylised.’

My Master’s research was the start of my quest for understanding the fix I found myself in at Conundrum. My findings distinguished prevailing D/discourses (i.e., tools, beliefs, symbols, words) (Gee 2005, p.7) and subcultures in police recruit training (Ryan 2008a). A brief review of these findings is relevant to the current program.
D/discourses and Subcultures

The Central focus of my Master’s research was the identification of the founding D/discourses and subcultures of policing: Warrior, Tough-love Family, and Perfect Self D/discourses and command and control, family-relationships, and “real” police work subcultures (Ryan 2008a,b,c, emphasis in original) These provide insights to their nature and relationships, and need to be read and understood as inter-related cultural effects representing the habitus of the field of policing (Bourdieu 1977, 1990a,b; emphasis in original).

Warrior D/discourse

The Warrior D/discourse and the command and control and “real” police work subcultures coalesce to emphasise policing as an essentially masculine enterprise with gender and the body as capital (Foucault 1977; Ryan 2008a,b,c, emphasis in original; Westmarland 2001). Predominant features include physical strength, power, authority, and compliance. The cultural capital of the Warrior D/discourse is the result of concentrated reinforcement (Bourdieu 1977, 1990a,b; Grenfell 2008; Moore 2008) of the paramilitary ethos, notions of crime fighting, legitimate use of force and the ability to take rapid and decisive control. Instead, to take time to reflect and think critically is likely to be ‘judged as a weakness and potentially punishable’ (Bonifacio 1991; Ryan 2008a, p.32).

Tough-love family D/discourse

The Tough-love family D/discourse and the family-relationships subculture are characterised by solidarity (Bonifacio 1991; Fielding 1994; Neyroud & Beckley 2001; Prenzler 1998; Reiner 2000; Ryan 2008a,b,c emphasis in original; Shanahan 2000; Waddington 1999b), reliability, conformity, and membership, arbitrated by support and/or punishment (Bonifacio 1991). It circumscribes an individual’s subjectivity and agency.

---

8 See Chapter 3 for details of Bourdieu’s (1977, 1990a,b) conterminous concepts of ‘habitus’ and ‘field’ as they relate to the policing context.
Perfect-self D/discourse

Avoidance of, or lack of admission of, mistakes is a central feature of the Perfect-self D/discourse underscored by the “real” police work and the family-relationships subcultures (Ryan 2008a,b,c emphasis in original). The very essence of this D/discourse is the need to maintain reputation in keeping with the élitist identity (Adlam 2002, pp.27-28), which endorses the binary of us (police) / them (public). Further to this, a commitment to establishing and nurturing a particular image and ‘look[ing] the part’ (Frewin & Tuffin, 1998, p.178): the capable, competent, authoritative police officer.

The site of Conundrum

Conundrum (re)presents a complex set of ‘power relations’, evidenced in a number of features (Foucault 1978, p.94). First and foremost are the enduring traditional structures, beliefs and practices echoing the paramilitary model and the traditional model of policing (Lewis 2007; Murray 2002, 2005). The recent critiques of the militarisation of policing in the USA and Australia strengthen concerns about such models of policing (Balko 2014; McCulloch 2014; Peak 2015). Central to these traditions is the strength of the rhetorical production of police culture or cultures through humour, repartée and ‘war stories’ (Cochran & Bromley 2003; Cockcroft 2007; Shearing & Ericson 1991; Skolnick 2008; Rose & Unnithan 2015; Waddington 1999b, p.302). Complicating such a milieu are multiple masculinities that construct and amplify gender and other differences (Brown 2007; Connell 2005; Garcia 2003; Lonsway, Paynich & Hall 2013; McCarthy 2013; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Schulz 2009; Somvadee & Morash 2008, 2009; Silvestri 2003; Westmarland 2001). Superimposing and sustaining the features evident in Conundrum is the symbiotic relationship between the prevailing D/discourses and dominant subcultures evident in the police recruit training in Conundrum.
Situating Myself

My Research Environment

I was immersed in my research environment. On a daily basis I was starkly aware of the numerous and potentially conflicting, overarching agendas impacting on individual police officers as well as the broader organisation (i.e., Conundrum). I saw, heard and sensed how traditional conceptions of policing were becoming less relevant, being simultaneously erased and reconfigured. Yet there is a dearth of research of traditionally trained police officers’ lived experiences in this ever-changing landscape of policing in the twenty-first century. I developed a personal belief in the relevance of fleshing out how these agendas impacted on police officers in their daily practice, as they dealt with new challenges and demands while endeavouring to maintain their focus on long-standing traditional crimes against property and person and public order and safety. These challenges impacting on police officers’ lived experiences need to be acknowledged as a critical feature of modern policing as it drives towards professionalisation.

Central to any discussion of police cultures and subcultures is the need for change. Police culture can be understood as the product of the relationship between the ‘habitus’ (i.e., ‘cultural knowledge’ and ‘dispositions’) and the ‘field’ (i.e., organisational, historical, legal, social, political, economic structures and conditions) (Bourdieu 1977, p.72; Chan 1997, p.71). For genuine change to occur, both the habitus and the field need to change. Integral to this relationship, however, is the individual (the police officer), who is an active participant in the development and maintenance of the cultural knowledge (habitus) and police practices (field). Chan asserted that:

... structural conditions do not completely determine cultural knowledge, and cultural knowledge does not totally dictate practice. Working within the structural conditions of policing, members have an active role to play in developing, reinforcing, resisting or transforming cultural knowledge. They are not passive carriers of police culture ... Whether a structural change results in any change in cultural knowledge or institutional practice depends on the nature of the change and the capacity of the officers to adapt to the change (1997, pp.73-74).
My own experience in working with police officers and with *Conundrum* prompted me to investigate police officers dealing with issues on a day-to-day basis and reconciling their practices and their perceptions of the complexities of their practice as professionals or technicians, and learning.

*A Pause …*

I saw much commonality across the different areas of policing in terms of how education and training was understood, designed, and conducted. The strength of the glue surrounding traditional pedagogical or doctrinal approaches to training and education was evident and underscored many managers’ resistance to even entertaining and let alone initiating change. There was an attitude of ‘if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it’ approach compounded by a lack of knowledge of and interest in current literature and debate. Reinforcing these obstructions was the sanctity of perceived traditions and dominant masculine discourses.

My interest in pedagogies includes the ways in which cultures and subcultures are produced and reproduced by and through individuals, occupations, and organisations. In terms of professional practice, I have had a long-standing interest in professional development and practice, and professionalism beginning in the discipline of community services and community development, then with policing and the agenda to professionalise policing, and more recently a return to teaching and education. In previous years, as a teacher in Community Services Work, the curriculum included four units of professional development wherein models of social work theory and practice were taught, not to constrain students’ practice but to encourage and support their critical understanding and interrogation of practice, services and systems through ‘functionalist’, ‘interpretivist’, ‘radical humanist’, and ‘radical structuralist’ paradigms (Howe 1987, p.47). The integration of professional placements, self-assessment, reflective journaling, and regular critical conversations with teachers assisted students to develop reflective and reflexive practice. There was a blend and
balance of theory- and practice-based knowledge production. I did not see anything like this in the education and training of police.

It took quite some time, commitment and a high degree of persistence to encourage and support changes that reflected an educative intent as opposed to a doctrinal intent. Instrumental in achieving change was “Elizabeth”, a female police officer and newly promoted manager of the academy. Elizabeth demonstrated leadership, being inclusive, collaborative, encouraging, willing to delegate with a focus on the development of individuals. Her approach engendered trust, respect and a positive atmosphere with police officers feeling valued and able to contribute, regardless of rank.

Significant curricula changes, along with teaching practices, were made in an effort to shift thinking and practice about learning. In particular, emphasising reflective, ‘relational’, agential, embodied notions of learning (Morris & Beckett 2003; Edwards 2010, p.2; McLaughlin 2006). Elizabeth’s approach was in direct contrast to the management style of previous and subsequent managers – all male police officers – whose approach was exclusive, domineering, autocratic, controlling, and risk averse when it came to making changes to training and education. The difficulty of delivering enduring change was exacerbated by the organisation’s reluctance to incorporate education and professional development within an organisationally generated and supported strategic policy framework. Consequently, these changes were not sustained under the administration of a new manager (male police officer.) The changes to curricula and notions of learning instigated by Elizabeth and me are in Appendix B.

**Methodology**

My research design encompasses qualitative and narrative methodology. My reasons for adopting this methodology and multiple theoretical lenses are numerous. Theoretically, I have drawn inspiration from the work of others – Maclure (2010), Lather (2006), Jackson and Mazzei (2012) to name a few – who
advocate the value of theory and ‘epistemological diversity’ to disrupt and challenge what is known or presented (Lather 2006, p.35). As mentioned earlier, the use of different theoretical lenses simultaneously facilitates the disruption and deconstruction of the phenomena of pedagogies while enabling an emancipative focus to open up to different perspectives and possibilities with the potential for new learning (Lather 2006). My research illustrates the current dynamic epistemology of policing.

My choice of qualitative methodology is also in response to the character of policing, which is steeped in modernist conceptions of law and order that has a strong commitment to rational thinking, scientific, evidence-based approaches (Waters 2007). To apply a positivist, interpretivist, or quantitative methodology, and to limit or contain the scope of theoretical analysis, would essentially keep the research and findings within present modernist boundaries thus keeping it within the limits of intelligibility: ‘where thought stops what it cannot bear to know, what it must shut out to think as it does’ (Britzman 1995, p.156). A closure of thinking and practice, reflected in resistance to change, was a constant feature of my professional experience of working in Conundrum and is at the very heart of the meta-narratives of practice and professional practice and learning in Conundrum.

The use of narrative, with particular attention to postmodern and ‘experience-centred’ narrative, is intrinsic to the context of Conundrum and policing (Conle 2007; Clandinin & Connelly 2000; Josselson 2004; Josselson & Lieblich 1995; Squire 2008, p.43). It is in direct response to police culture with its robust oral tradition and history (Chan 2003; Shearing & Ericson 1991). Storytelling, or ‘war stories’, are an essential source of the production and reproduction of practice-based knowledge generated from experience. There is evidence of this in everyday policing practices and in police training and education (Chan 2003; Waddington 1999b, p.302).
I also situate myself within the research as an outsider-insider, or part insider, working in *Conundrum*. I constantly engaged in ‘identity work’ (Alvesson & Wilmott 2002, p.622) through actions and words, compromise but also challenge. This placed me in an invidious position. At the same time that I was constrained by the dominant discourses, subcultures and practices, I was also operating in opposition to them (Klein 2004; Ryan 2009). My narrative contributes to and has the potential to counter the micro- and meta-narratives of others.

Throughout my thesis, my voice is positioned as *A Pause* ... and *A Moment* ... This has enabled me to disclose the tensions I felt with being simultaneously an outsider and insider to my research. Of significance has been my struggle to find my own meta-learning and voice (or authorship) because of the marginalisation and invisibility assigned to my role in *Conundrum*. Further to this, I have grappled with collecting my thoughts and writing about gender in my thesis. All too often, I have felt blocked. On reflection, the ways in which gender was played out on a daily and moment-by-moment basis in *Conundrum* for others and myself had a greater affect on me than I had realised.

**Police Officers’ Voices**

The police officers I interviewed for my research had participated in both the CBL and WBL pathways instigated by Elizabeth (see Appendix B.) Four police officers were directly involved in the design of both pathways and two of the four facilitated workshops for learning pathways.

The police officers’ narratives represent rich and textured data. Despite the culture of distance and difference from others (e.g., outsiders, non-police), I felt very privileged listening to them sharing their achievements, vulnerabilities, aspirations, certainties and uncertainties with me. I sent a handwritten note to each participant expressing my thanks for their participation and acknowledging the respect I would afford the narratives of their experiences. Trust was central to police officers volunteering to be interviewed. For me to build trust in *Conundrum*
necessitated a consistent, authentic approach to communication over considerable time. The fragility of that trust was in the forefront of my mind during each interview.

Thirty-six police officers – constables, sergeants, inspectors, and senior police officers in corporate management – participated in semi-structured interviews. Details of the interview structure are in Chapter 3 (also see Appendix C.) In all, I interviewed 13 female police officers and 23 male officers. Many of the police officers had more than 10 years in policing and now find their identities and the purpose of policing under erasure. All are highly respected police officers with successful careers. They are not exceptions to the rule.

There was much repetition in the data. From a deconstructive perspective, while repetition presents ‘sameness’, it also opens towards ‘otherness’, something different or otherwise (Spitzer 2011, p.31). See Appendix C for a list of the 36 police officers in my thesis including their pseudonym, their current rank, years in Conundrum, and their age at the time of joining as a recruit. Their narratives, and voices, can be read and ‘heard’, throughout chapters 4, 5, and 6.

**A Moment …**

As I draw this introductory chapter to a close, I recall Bonifacio’s (1991) Disclaimer for his book on the psychology of policing:

> It is somewhat unusual to begin a book by declaring what it is not, but the topic of police behavior is so complex that it requires the writer to state as early as possible the limits of what he has written here to describe and explain a police officers’ experience.

I too acknowledge the complexities of police officers’ professional practice and learning and the impact of the pedagogies. While I present my deconstruction of these, I am conscious of the potential for different readings of the data that might impact others’ thinking and practice. I therefore invite readers to become caught ‘up in the movements of the text [narratives]’, to be open to multiple readings and different interpretations of the data (Maclure 2003, p.118).
Where to from here

In chapter 2, I identify and review key concepts and perspectives from a range of literatures relating to the status of police research, professional practice and learning generally. Reference is made to policing, discretion and common sense, professionalising policing, police education and training, culture and subcultures, models of policing, leadership and management, women in policing, the changing landscape and mandate of policing. These concepts and perspectives establish the context for my thesis while also forecasting the need for a new pedagogy and practice. While one might expect to the inclusion of key theorists and their theories in this chapter, I have placed them in Chapter 3 as they form part of the methodological and analytical framework used to deconstruct the data.

In chapter 3, I present the qualitative epistemological framework for my research. Central to my choice of a qualitative approach is the application of multiple theoretical lenses – deconstructive, poststructural, and critical – to the complex, multifaceted context of police officers’ policing in the twenty-first century. The narrative methodology allows the police officers’ stories to be told. This chapter also outlines my ontological stance, which is informed by multiple theoretical lenses and the work of relevant theorists. As mentioned above, these theorists and theories represent the methodological and analytical framework for deconstructing the data.

Chapter 4 is the first of three data and discussion chapters in my thesis. I apply multiple theoretical lenses and an attitude of doubt to the data to identify a number of *aporias* and lacunae. These represent power relations and knowledge claims that construct and perpetuate dominant notions of the practice of policing, focusing on how meaning is formed through discourses of policing, how the preferred status and symbolism of policing produces police officers’ identities and subjectivities, and the value afforded to the vernacular wisdom that fixes policing as a craft or trade. The disruption of these *aporias* and lacunae reveals contradictions and tensions that result in conflicting perspectives and confusion of
the purpose of policing and the role and identity of police officers in the twenty-first century.

In chapter 5, I focus on women’s foray into the masculine domain of policing and how knowledge and power relations construct and reproduce knowledge and experience of gender and difference. The narratives of women police officers in Conundrum make visible and heard the tensions surrounding complex sets of gender-power relations and experiences in policing. It also explores contradictions in how practice is understood and enacted and how pedagogies of learned disembodied practice impacts on police officers’ professional practice and learning and their sense of self as a police practitioner.

In chapter 6, I concentrate on the very functions of pedagogies and in doing so I identify a number of aporias and lacunae in the data that establish the conterminous relationship between knowledge and practice, where knowledge is predominantly (re)constructed through practice and practice (re)constructs knowledge. Significantly, policing is portrayed as a craft or trade and police officers as artisans, not as professionals. Formal learning (within the academy) focuses on content and behaviour – what and some how – but without addressing why and the possibilities of deep learning. Practice-based knowledge, intuition and gut reaction dominate and establish an enduring commitment to the reproduction of knowledge and replication of practice rather than contestation to enable deep and transformative learning to occur.

In chapter 7, I briefly revisit the aporias and lacunae revealed in the three data chapters. I disrupt them paying attention to their implications for role, agency, knowledge, training, learning, practice, gender and power relations. Moving and looking beyond what is to what could be otherwise, I offer alternative interpretations and suggestions for further research.
Chapter 2

Discovering Otherwise

Discerning Concepts and Perspectives

... crossing borders and ‘enter[ing] ... occupied territory’ (Kamler & Thomson 2006, p.29)

A Moment ...

... literature reviews are the quintessential site of identity work, where the novice researcher enters what we call occupied territory – with all the immanent danger and quiet dread that this metaphor implies – including possible ambushes, barbed wire fences, and unknown academics who patrol the boundaries of already occupied territories (Kamler & Thomson p.29, emphasis in original).

It seems metaphorically apt to refer to ‘enter[ing] occupied territory’, given the paramilitary or militarised nature of policing, its tendency towards suspicion and isolation (Loftus 2010), and the experiences of outsiders, myself included. I am also reminded of Vickers’s (2000, p.506) reference to Plato’s (1997) “cave” as she reflects on entering occupied territory as an academic providing management education and research practices to a cohort of Australian police officers:

The difficulty arises when an “outsider” (in this case an academic) enters the cave and sees that the shadows believed by the inhabitants to be “truth” and “reality” are just reflections of a more complex reality, and that the knowledge and perceptions of the cave dwellers are distorted and flawed. Apart from the difficulties an outsider might undoubtedly face with any lengthy confinement within the cave, if one were to try and share one’s knowledge with others in the cave, one is likely to be ridiculed for one’s views.
Police Research

It also seems apposite for me to begin this chapter with an overview of police research. An examination of the literatures on police research revealed a somewhat contested and confused field. The relationship between researchers (academia) and police (practitioners) is constrained and fraught with suspicion and tension (Buerger 2010; Laycock 2001; Rosenbaum 2010; Steinheider et al 2012). Observers of police research are critical of the lack of impact of research to inform or change police practice, emphasising the tension and lack of common language and understanding between police practitioners and researchers (Buerger 2010; Rosenbaum 2010). One fundamental basis for such criticisms is that the majority of researchers lack inside-knowledge and appreciation of policing, its unique organisational and occupational characteristics (Rosenbaum 2010).

Historically, police research began in the 1960s in the USA and UK with a focus on contemporary issues. Prior to this, studies depicted historical, autobiographical and journalistic accounts of policing and police (Reiner 1992a; Thomas 2014). The early 1970s saw the beginnings of a small amount of sociological research centred on operational policing, organisational and occupational culture. In the UK in the 1980s, new qualifications in criminal justice and police studies saw the advent of doctoral research in these disciplines (Reiner 1992a; Thomas 2014).

The most comprehensive and current review of police research from 2000 to 2007 revealed a continued, predominant focus on operational policing (i.e., tactics, strategies, key areas of policing such as domestic violence, terrorism, drugs, alcohol, etc). A shift in emphasis from community policing to ‘targeted groups’ was evident in the research (Mazeika et al 2010, p. 520), but it essentially remained focused on instrumental knowledge relevant to operational policing practices. Research of the values, thinking styles and actions of police and ethical practice received very little attention. In fact, a ‘26.8% decrease’ in research of police
‘accountability and misconduct’ is evident from 2006 to 2007 (Mazeika et al, p.523).

The body of research shows that four key methodologies were employed. The most common approach was correlative research, comparing similar categories with an emphasis on ‘survey or secondary data analysis’. Followed by ‘descriptive research’, typically describing processes but ‘not supported by primary research’ (Mazeika et al 2010, p.521, emphasis in original). Next was discussion-based research involving broad discussion of policing ‘issues or theories’ without analysis. Finally, research focused on outcome with analysis and evaluation of specific programs, tactics and policies in keeping with relevant operational policing practices (2010). Noteworthy was a significant increase in descriptive research – ‘48.1% ... from 2006 to 2007’ – with an even more substantial increase of ‘122.5%’ from 2000 (p.521).

This narrowness of research scope in policing has been compounded by the desire of governments to maintain a relationship of servitude and mendicancy with police organisations (Punch 2010). Such a relationship is severely limiting in the twenty-first century where police confront a pluralism of values, giving rise to ambiguities and uncertainties; often underscored by conflicting interests and priorities (Thacher 2001). This leads to key concepts and perspectives of practice.

**Practice and Professional Practice**

**Practice**

The concept of practice has been influenced by numerous theories and imbued with multiple meanings and applications (Dall’Alba & Sandberg 2010; Hager 2013).

It is often presented as straightforward and uncomplicated, denoting, for instance, what people do (Hager 2013). Such a pragmatic focus on ‘activity, performance, and work’, has the potential to construct practice as a process grounded in routine: “the way things are done” (Nicolini 2012, p.3). Further to
this, there is the potential to accept, without critical consideration, the learning generated from practice (Dall’Alba & Sandberg 2010). More critical perspectives explore meaning, identity, agency, and power-knowledge relations associated with practice (Hutchings & Jarvis 2012; Nicolini 2012; Schwandt 2005). While practice can represent specific daily occupational activities, drawing on relevant ‘conceptual, procedural, and dispositional knowledge’ (Billett 2010, p. 2), it is far more complex and nuanced involving contextual, temporal, social, symbolic and ritualistic dimensions (Bourdieu 1990). Moving beyond notions of practice specifically related to occupations, routine work activities, Nicolini (p.3) identifies ‘[g]endering and ... discrimination’ that can be normalised and accepted. The resilience of these practices will be discussed with reference to my data in Chapter 5.

Hutchings and Jarvis (2012, p.176, emphasis in original) outlined four conceptions of practice as: ‘technique’ (routine, stable), ‘occupation or profession’ (codified knowledge and practice), ‘accountable’ (rules, regulations, audit processes), ‘social’ (‘relational, situated’). Practice as technique presents challenges and limitations for learning. It focuses predominantly on action rather than thought and with little regard for the social context. As such, it tends to concentrate on ‘training or rote learning’ and on ‘psychomotor skill’ rather than a cognitive, emotional, social and embodied experience. It is essentially about conforming to routine, regular activities (Hutchings & Jarvis 2012, p.178). This is revealed in Bradley’s (2009a, p.100) critique of police recruit training with an emphasis on rote learning (e.g., legislation and administrative procedures and ‘core police powers’) and assessment of this knowledge in written examinations (discussed later in this chapter).

Neoliberal and managerial regimen establish practice that is accountable, and this has been the experience of police. The effects are numerous and significant to practice. Accountability establishes rules and standards that regulate practice (i.e., setting targets and outcomes). It functions as an instrument of surveillance, with the power and potential to reprioritise as well as ‘de-prioritise’ practice,
undermining a professional's independent practice, responsiveness, judgement and discretion; placing greater importance on meeting the State’s rules, standards and targets as opposed to society’s needs, in fact confusing the two as interchangeable (Hutchings & Jarvis 2012, p.179).

Practice that is aimed at enhancing or augmenting performance, knowledge and skills through critical reflection however represents practice as occupation or profession (Hutchings & Jarvis 2012, p.178). This leads to considering an important and relevant feature of the social and relational nature practice. Hutchings and Jarvis (p.180) argued that:

> Practice starts from practical activity, not narrowly defined as practising a skill, but actions, practice, doing, in which agents operate holistically with their senses, emotion, and cognition intertwined and interacting with objects in the world, to interpret and make sense of their experiences as they engage in different practices. It is more than the ability to reflect on one’s practice and thinking, “How can I improve my performance?”

Practice therefore is more than technique and technical knowledge: it is relational, social, agential, and embodied (Edwards 2010; Hutchings & Jarvis 2012). Adding to this holistic, social, sense-making notion of practice, Scwandt (2005, p.327) describes it as ‘purposeful, intentional, and goal-directed’ ... [and] ‘situated within a larger network of relations with others’. Therefore, instead of being ‘passive accommodating individuals that things happen to’, practitioners need to be active and agentic with the aim of transforming their practice drawing on ethical and moral standpoints (p.180). Schatzki (2012, p.14) described practice as ‘an open-ended, spatially-temporally dispersed nexus of doings and sayings’ and Higgs (2012, p.3) referred to practice as ‘embodied, agential, and socially-historically constructed’.

This aligned with Bourdieu’s (1977, p.72, 1987, p.11, emphasis in original) ‘habitus’ and to what Bourdieu and Passeron referred to as ‘pedagogic work’ (1977, p.31, emphasis in original). The work (e.g., of families and education) involves the inscription and habituation of practice on the body (Nicolini 2012), establishing what is “‘sensible” and “reasonable’” or competent practice (Bourdieu 1987, p.79).
Contrasting the inscribed notion of practice is the recognition of agency, enabling the individual to purposefully acquire and adapt practice in response to dynamic contexts (Nicolini 2012). Building on the notion of agency, practice also be seen as the integrated application of knowledge, thought, action, discourse, emotions, and values (2012). Overlaying and influencing these different perceptions of practice is the existence and function of ‘power, conflict, and politics’ (Nicolini 2012, p.6) evident in practice-based approaches. In this regard, history and context are important, for example highlighting how inequalities and differences might be perceived, framed, and practised (Nicolini 2012).

Bourdieu’s (1990a, p.54) concepts of ‘habitus’ and the ‘logic of practice’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.86) are relevant to this discussion. Habitus is established in practice (Bourdieu 1990a, p.52), functioning as an historical construct that ‘produces individual and collective practices’ based on historical constructs. The ‘logic of practice’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.86), paradoxically ‘defies logic’, but is evidenced in systems and structures of habitus that are constituted simultaneously by regularities (practical coherence) and irregularities (practical incoherence). Both coherence and incoherence are inscribed and necessary. In fulfilling practical functions of coherence, or what appears to be coherent, the ‘economy of logic’ is ever-present, ‘sacrific[ing] rigour’ for ‘simplicity and generality’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.86), thereby ensuring convenience or a practice that is ‘easy to master and use’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.86). Through ‘mimesis’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.92) and repetition, ‘ritual practices’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.90) can be achieved. Ritualistic practice forms habitual practice that can be performed without awareness of and ability to perceive cultural, structural, ideological influences of habitus (Bourdieu 1990a, pp.90-91). This aptly describes the ways in which the prevailing D/discourses and dominant subcultures within Conundrum establish conditions that are logical, institutionalised, and seductive, and act as glue (Ryan 2008).

From the perspective of my thesis, I am drawn to the notion of practices being saturated with knowledge and, importantly, infused with socio-cultural ideals, unquestioningly accepted, sanctioned, perpetuated and reproduced (Edwards
Professional Practice

I am aware of the dynamic nature of the epistemology of professional practice (Green 2009). The notion of professional practice and its separate entities of “professional” and “practice” are simultaneously ubiquitous and contested terms (2009, p.1). Teaching, nursing, and now policing become the ‘new and emerging professions’, in contrast to traditional professions of medicine and law (2009, p.2). Concepts of professional and professionalism, as with notions of practice, are similarly confounded by ambiguities (2009, p.2). Two philosophical lenses – ‘neo-Aristotelianism and post-Cartesianism’ (2009, p.5, emphasis in original) – provide helpful distinctions. The former rests on practice having an ethical or a political quality, while the latter offers a postmodern critique and troubling of modernity and notions of the subject, subjectivity, knowledge, and practice (2009, p.5). The postmodern critique of practice resonates with my concerns for practice and professional practice and learning for police in the twenty-first century.

In today’s society, agendas of Managerialism and the ‘rise of ... “science-based” or “evidence-based” practice and policy’ (Green 2009, p.3), are the new, dominant discourses in professions (Hutchings & Jarvis 2012, p.180). Science- and evidence-based practice is confounded by ‘accountability ... regulation and risk-management’ of Neoliberal ideologies (Green 2009, p.3), and gives rise to what Green refers to as a ‘bureaucratic professionalism’ (Green 2009, p.4, emphasis in original). The type of knowledge valued by these discourses and agendas is ‘objectivity and detachment, suppressing the context-dependence of first-person experience in favour of third-person perspective (Dunne 2005, p.373) and findings
and outcomes being well-defined, if not constrained and somewhat generalist (2012). Knowledge that guides practice however is different, described as the enactment of ‘personal practical wisdom’ formed by previous experiences and formal learning ... ‘it is both praxis and reflexivity guided by phronesis’ (2012, p.180).


In addition to and alongside or coalescing with phronesis are praxis and aporia (Green 2009, p.9, emphasis in original). Praxis encapsulates an ‘ethical’ (2009, p.10) or a ‘moral-political’ dimension (Schwandt 2005, p.330). I am especially drawn to ‘the Freirian notion of praxis as action-full-of-thought and thought-full-of-action’ (Evans 2007, p.554).

The aporia (Green 2009, p.11), which I define and think of in terms of ‘doubtful matters’ (noted in chapter 1), are relevant to the twenty-first century forms of practice and professional practice and especially so in policing where the increased complexities, diversities and uncertainties confronting police demand more than a technical practice response. Instead, the literature highlights changes to professional practice in the twenty-first century with practitioners working across professional boundaries, establishing partnerships and engaging in interprofessional practices (Evetts 2014). Police are regularly crossing professional boundaries, working with and alongside other professions. Crossing professional boundaries necessitates practitioners to have a heightened degree of self- and other-awareness, being responsive to others’ perspectives: essentially, a considered, critically informed and purposive practice (Billett, Harteis & Gruber
2010; Edwards 2010). Inter-professional practice has the potential to expose and present different or doubtful matters to determine, assess through ethical and political lenses, to consider options, and make decisions to aim to resolve matters. Practice will always throw up something different and unexpected. How professionals deal with these is at the heart of aporetic practice (Green 2009).

Bourdieu’s (1977, emphasis in original) ‘habitus’, field, capital, doxa, and ‘pedagogic work’ (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977, p.31, emphasis in original) provide perspectives to critique and trouble existing notions of practice and learning in Conundrum. The prevailing D/discourses and dominant subcultures (outlined in Chapter 1) represent the habitus within the field of policing in Conundrum. The pedagogic work of this habitus and field involves the inscription and habituation of practice on the body (Nicolini 2012), determining what is rational and logical or competent practice (Bourdieu 1977). These conditions are logical, institutionalised, and seductive, and act as glue. Tensions may well exist between agentic action and institutionalised systems and practices (Bourdieu 1990a).

Professional Learning, Practice and Work-Based Learning

Research distinguishes professional development from professional learning. The former is prescriptive, imposed, and “delivered” (i.e., passive process of ‘sit and get’) (Timperley 2011). In contrast, professional learning is understood as an active process working within the nexus of developing the individual practitioner’s identity and the outcomes of their practice (Collinson & Cook 2007; Hunzicker 2011; Opfer & Pedder 2011; Timperley 2011). In police organisations the predominant conception – purpose and outcome – of professional learning had been developing the ‘[g]ood [e]mployee’ equipped to uphold ‘prevailing norms’ of the organisation and occupation of policing (Doyle 1990, p.5). Learning is ‘experiential’ with a focus on the ‘technical’ aspects of practice, and the assessment of competence is the remit of experienced police officers (1990, p.5). This reinforces the reproduction of practice-based knowledge and compliant ‘technicians’ (Timperley 2011, p.8). Billett (2010, p.1) examines the relationship of learning and practice pointing to the historical value given to the workplace
experience in the development of occupational knowledge. He argued that practice-based learning should be seen as more than an adjunct to organised education, but ‘essential for developing the knowledge required to effectively practice occupations’.

The changes to curricula and education programs (outlined in Chapter 1) were attempts to achieve a paradigm shift to the notion of professional learning that produces a ‘[r]eflective [p]rofessional’ practitioner able to draw on a fusion of knowledge (e.g., ‘personal’, ‘craft’, ‘propositional’) in order to respond to practice issues (Doyle 1990, p.6). It was aimed at developing the capacity of police officers to apply skills within a ‘conceptual framework’ that supported a discerning and differentiated approach to their practice (p.6). These distinctions and concerns about professional development and professional learning were key drivers for the redesign of curricula and the development of a whole of organisation learning pathway blending formal and informal professional learning in *Conundrum*.

Hager (2013) critiqued various theories of practice as it related to learning generally and learning in the workplace. A number of theoretical standpoints are relevant to my research. To begin with, and fitting with the idea of practice as *technique*, learning can be understood as a process of ‘acquisition and transfer’ of knowledge and learning is the product. Teaching is a straightforward process of transferring learning to the learner: the recipient, the vessel (2013, p.87). It is assumed that everyone will learn in the same way at the same pace and to the same degree. Importantly, and problematically, the context (i.e., social, organisational, cultural) has little relevance. Green (2009, p.8, emphasis in original) contested this claim, arguing that all too often practice is understood simply as what people ‘do, with context added on’, or taken for granted. However, context is always within practice, never outside or alongside. It needs to be recognised and interrogated because it is in a state of flux: ‘blurred, indistinct, shifting’ (2009, pp.8-9). This superficial, ‘unreflective’ approach to practice and learning is grounded in ‘common sense’: the ‘vernacular wisdom or ‘of course’ matters of everyday. Bourdieu’s (1977) ‘doxa’ – ‘everyday opinions’ – coalesce with
notions of common sense, establishing and limiting shared knowledge and the product of learning (Rosenfeld 2011).

A socio-cultural perspective of practice which acknowledges communities of practice and social, relational aspects of learning can easily overlook the individual and their agency; the individual becomes invisible in the community of practice, is subsumed by the community of practice (Hager 2013). Hager (2013) also argued that the socio-cultural perspective sits within modernist notions of work and workplaces where work-based learning is structured, purposeful, and assumed to be meaningful.

The postmodern perspective acknowledges the dynamic nature of work and workplaces, reflecting volatility and uncertainty rather than inevitability and certainty: to think of learning as a sequence of ‘engagement, (re)construction, emergence or becoming (Hager 2013, p.93, emphasis in original). In today’s pluralised risk society, police need to be constantly adapting, unlearning and relearning, moving beyond traditional modernist notions of practice and learning.

**Common Sense and Practice**

Common sense is a ubiquitous term, the meaning readily assumed and accepted (Geertz 1973; Rescher 2005; Rosenfeld 2011). It has been referred to as ‘good sense’ (Rescher 2005, p.37) that every ‘reasonable person’ (Geertz 1973, p.772) ‘should know’ (Rescher p.23, emphasis in original). In contrast, labels of deficient or incompetent are assigned to those who are judged as lacking common sense (1973, p.773). Following the historical traditions of Scottish philosophers, common sense can also be understood in terms of a logical cognitive reasoning and judgement; a capacity to accept things without question (Rescher 2005, p.14). Common sense is therefore concerned with everyday matters in everyday life: what is obvious, natural, and beyond doubt and question (Geertz p.782). Bourdieu (1977, p.167, emphasis in original) writes of the way in which common sense ‘goes without saying because it comes without saying’.
A sense of comfort, certainty and closure surround notions of common sense (Geertz 1973; Rescher 2005; Rosenfeld 2011). It is ‘ad hoc’ in nature, grounded in ‘jokes, anecdotes’ as opposed to formal theories and could be seen as ‘vernacular wisdom’ (Geertz 1973, p.787). This aligns well with the rhetorical, metaphorical nature of police culture and the ‘canteen subculture’ and ‘war stories’ (Shearing & Ericson 1991; Waddington 1999b, p.302). The doctrinal and pragmatic wisdom of common sense is simultaneously persuasive and pervasive. Common sense prefers ‘experience’ and ‘practical sense’ or wisdom to specialist and intellectual knowledge (Bourdieu 1990a, p.69; Geertz p.788; Rescher 2005; Rosenfeld 2011). Practice can therefore become an automatic, unquestioned response, involving little if any critique (1990a, p.69). Common sense attempts to keep things simple and accessible, and anything requiring complex thought and inquiry is viewed as antithetical to common sense (Rescher 2005, p.26).

The very simple, practical nature of common sense and its accessibility to every reasonable person through everyday experience underscores its capacity to influence decision-making, guide practices beyond rules and procedures, and to enable management of personal and professional actions and image (Beckett 2008; Geertz 1973). The facts or truths of common sense beliefs are formed through experience and become universal or ‘consensual’: accepted on face value, without hesitation, without argument or justification, without reflection (Geertz 1973; Rescher 2005, p.12, emphasis in original; Rosenfeld 2011).

A ‘collective belief’ (‘doxa’) forms as discourses, practices, social, symbolic and cultural capitals are universally accepted, produced and reproduced (Bourdieu 1977, p.167, emphasis in original). The Achilles’ heel of common sense is its limited purview and supporting this, is its resistance to denial, different interpretations and debate, which further restricts its scope of attention and comment beyond the superficial (Rescher 2005, p.31). In essence, common sense constructs a shared language but limits what can be spoken, heard and who can speak (Rosenfeld 2011, p.256).
While police officers in my research emphasise common sense as an intrinsic quality of policing, contradictions are evident in the efforts of police to maintain a degree of secrecy and a resistance to sharing information or knowledge of policing (Green & Gates 2014). This could be justified and understood on one hand because making public particular policing practices (e.g., specialist police groups) has the potential to undermine the integrity of police interventions and actions. It might also put police in danger and give criminals and offenders opportunities to avoid capture and arrest. On another hand, it might well demystify policing, while being unlikely to impact negatively on national security or everyday police practice (Carlan & Lewis 2009; Foster 2003). Throughout my years working in Conundrum, on numerous occasions, police officers declared that police work wasn’t ‘rocket science’ and ‘didn’t need to be overanalysed’.

An interesting contradiction exists that constructs a tension between the value and influence of vernacular wisdom and specialist knowledge, especially when policing does not have an identified, agreed upon body of knowledge, unlike teaching and nursing (Green & Gates 2014). How this plays out in the context of increasing militarisation of policing and a resurgence of the traditional model of policing (command and control) alongside efforts to professionalise policing is still unfolding and the outcome is still to be realised. However, the associated confusion and frustration in response to the changing nature and scope of policing (discussed in this chapter) is evocative of how this is likely to continue to play out.

Discretion and Practice

Policing, discretion, and professional judgement and practice represent distinct yet integrated concepts. Some of the literature questions the efficacy of police training in equipping police to apply discretion (Kleinig 1996; Rowe 2008). In particular, how traditional approaches to training (i.e., didactic, transmission of information) support rule- and procedural-based practices as opposed to developing independent judgement, problem-solving, and critical thinking (Birzer 2003; McCoy 2006; Marenin 2004; White 2006) are significant issues.
Discretion within the context of established professions is based on society’s acknowledgement of the service they provide, their commitment, exclusive knowledge and capabilities, and the permission or authorisation given to them to apply discretionary decision-making in the provision of service (Kleinig 1996). It has been argued that discretion in policing is not an exemplary approach to practice, and is essentially ‘a power that police have to exercise their own judgment’ (Doyle 2006; Kleinig 1996, p. 82, emphasis in original). Further to this, police discretion can be seen not so much as a right, but a privilege, an indulgence for an officer to use her/his own judgement. Significantly, there is an underlying presumption and an unquestioning acceptance of competence to apply one’s judgement (Doyle 2006; Kleinig 1996). Bronitt and Stenning (2011, p. 319) described the challenges police face: ‘on the one hand to enforce the law fairly and impartially, on the other hand to temper law enforcement for sound policy and operational reasons’.

In considering competence as it relates to practice and discretion, I draw on an epistemology of practice involving the ‘hot action’ of work (i.e., decisions made in the moment or “on the run”, with a degree of doubt surrounding actions and decisions) and ‘inferential understanding’ guiding practical judgment (Beckett 2001, p. 74, 2008, p. 23; Beckett & Hager 2000, 2002). This is an embodied and reflexive practice. It involves the synthesis of the “know how” and “know why” of practice in response to the dynamic context (Beckett 2001, p. 83).

In a postmodern world and the risk society, greater uncertainty is a feature of the hot action of work, and alongside this is the changing nature of workplace learning, which has moved from ‘filling up the empty vessels with knowledge’ to ‘reflective practices’ and mentoring and coaching (Beckett 2001, p. 73). The sources of deep learning or transformative learning are those experiences that are complex and different from previous experiences and challenge existing thought and practice. Such experiences are characterised by ‘pressure ... to perform’ and the need to get things right (2001, p. 74). The ‘performative element’ is highly
relevant to police as most of their duties are conducted in public and with members of the public.

Whilst police work comprises its share of routine activities, it also presents ‘new situations’, those unexpected, uncertain moments, from which ‘new possibilities, new purposes’, new understandings can emerge (Beckett 2001, p.78). It is through ‘acting anticipatively’ through a process of ‘feedforward’ – looking and thinking forward towards the means and end of what one is accomplishing – that new and different thinking and practice develops (2001, p.77). In essence, a form of double loop learning can be achieved with both feedforward and feedback processes (2001, p.77).

It has been argued that the interpretation and application of legislation in policing practice necessitates ‘a degree of subjectivity on the part of the officer’ (Rowe 2008, p.99). While many other professions use discretion in their practice, there is evidence that discretion applied by police is different. One reason for this claim of difference is that police regularly work at a distance from, and independently of, their supervisors (Kleinig 1996; Rowe 2008). Another reason relates to a potential tension or contradiction in the notion and application of discretion for police because police officers are not independent practitioners as are other traditional professionals. Instead, they are employees of hierarchical organisations with established rules and expectations of behaviour and practice. In addition, they represent state power with legitimacy to use force, unlike other professions (Doyle 2006; Kleinig 1996; Rowe 2008). A belief in and reliance upon rules and standards guiding decisions and actions combined with ‘personal and unexamined morality’ are inadequate in equipping police officers to use discretion, make ‘moral choices’ and to ‘account for others’ needs and expectations’ (White 2006, p.400).
Policing as a Profession

What constitutes a profession in the twenty-first century is under debate, with transnational mobility, global markets, the crossing of professional boundaries, and the advent of new and emerging occupations and professions (Carr 2014; Edwards 2010; Evetts 2014; O’Gorman 2007; Saks 2012). Evetts (2014, p.33) believed professions could be best understood as:

... structural, occupational and institutional arrangements for work associated with the uncertainties of modern lives in risk societies ... [they] are extensively engaged in dealing with risk, risk assessment and, through the use of expert knowledge, enabling customers and clients to deal with uncertainty.

While literature highlighted the need for policing to change from an artisan status to that of a profession, there was still conjecture amongst commentators and practitioners as to what it might mean and how it could be achieved (Green & Gates 2014). It was interesting to note that the debate for police has been ongoing for the past 20 years punctuated by resistance and issues, in part stemming from a lack of action by police leadership which has dampened motivation to progress the agenda (Green & Gates 2014). Loss of power, control, flexibility with recruitment, training, discipline and service delivery and an enduring lack of belief in the potential realisation and formalisation of a body of knowledge, beyond that generated by and from practice, are at the heart of this resistance and these issues (Green & Gates 2014).

There are arguments for a major restructure away from the paramilitary (command and control) model of policing to a structure that supports practitioner ‘freedom, individual accountability and autonomy’ (Lanyon, 2009b, p.249). Historically however, the inception of police in Australia, as distinct from some other countries, has seen them as a state-sanctioned authority, as opposed to a community initiative (Finnane 2005). The changing nature of professional work has also seen many independent professions employed in organisations and the military and police are among those whose work and identities, including discretionary powers, are being restricted, reconfigured and controlled (Evetts
The police–government nexus has been ‘resilient’ and influential in establishing directions and, as mentioned previously, it has been constrained by governments’ efforts to maintain a relationship of servitude (Punch 2010, p.53). Today’s political discourse and legislative agendas in response to terrorism emphasise the power of this relationship even more.

Police and police agencies have not been immune to the influences of Managerial and Neoliberal agendas. Three forms of professional regulation are evident in understanding the concept of a profession. The first is ‘governmental regulation’, which replaces market regulation and is wrapped up in the myth of ‘deregulation’. The next is ‘bureaucratic regulation’ with a strong focus on audit, accountability, and standards for the measurement of performance. Lastly is ‘mandated collegial regulation, or peer review’, which is underscored by notions of self-regulation, self-monitoring (Freidson 1983, pp.280-281, emphasis in original). Police, as employees of state (or territory) and federal hierarchical organisations, experience tensions between bureaucratic or organisational regulation and a desire to be autonomous and self-regulating.

It is more challenging for professions to remain neutral in the face of conflicting ideologies of ‘market control consumerism’ and ‘bureaucratic control managerialism’ (Freidson 2001, p.106, emphasis in original). As more professions are employed in organisations, the less control they will have of their practices, judgement and discretionary powers (Evetts 2014). The result of these ideologies is the manifestation of ‘bureaucratic professionalism’ (Green 2009, p.4, emphasis in original). Questions arise as to the bureaucratic professional’s sense and realisation of agency in a context that prescribes how practitioners will see, think, and act. The agency of police officers as professionals is further complicated because, unlike other occupations and disciplines, they are not independent practitioners. They are servants of the state, authorised to enact a range of legislative powers (Doyle 2006; Kleinig 1996; Rowe 2008).
Professionalising Policing

The agenda to professionalise policing is an initiative of The Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management (SCPEM), comprising Australian and New Zealand Ministers for police and emergency services (as part of the Council of Australian Governments - COAG), and the ANZPAA (SCPEM 2012, p.14). The achievement of professionalisation of policing is reported to encompass high standards of integrity, organisationally and individually, shared ‘standards of education and training’, and an emphasis on abolishing corruption.

The achievement of professional status through a process of professionalisation can be seen as a means of:

maintain[ing] the closure of the occupational group, in order to maintain practitioners’ own occupational self-interests in terms of their salary, status and power, as well as the monopoly protection of the occupational jurisdiction (Lanyon 2009a, p.34).

The process of professionalisation has been important for those new and emerging professions (i.e., teaching, nursing) bolstering their professional standing and the value of their work (Green & Gates 2014; Lanyon 2009a, p.34).

As one of the burgeoning professions, the professionalisation of policing will provide formal justification of the role and work of police and an opportunity to raise the profile of the occupation publically and within (Green 2009; Green & Gates 2014). It is essentially about credentialing current police practices.

In 2006, six objectives to professionalise police and policing were identified by police commissioners from New Zealand and Australia. These were:

(1) Develop a definition of the profession of policing;
(2) Implement university-based education for policing;
(3) Develop a body of knowledge;
(4) Propose ongoing professional development;
(5) Develop registration and standards for policing; and
(6) Establish a professional body for policing (Green & Gates 2014, p. 81; Lanyon 2009b, p.249).
These align in some way with characteristics of a profession identified by Freidson (1983, 2001), O’Gorman (2007), and Saks (2012), which include: provision of a service, specialised body of knowledge, extensive tertiary and further education, training and experience, autonomy and independent judgment, focus on others (i.e., public or specific client groups) not self, code of ethics, and commitment to advancing professional knowledge and practice. It is interesting to note the third item – ‘develop a body of knowledge’ – because at present the knowledge of policing is very much founded on instrumental knowledge and the (re)production of practice-based knowledge, with limited evidence of critical research to develop an identifiable, valid body of knowledge (Green & Gates 2014).

Also of interest is that tertiary education was one of the features of the professionalisation process, albeit slowly implemented (Lanyon 2009b). There still exists little agreement or appreciation of the role of and need for tertiary education in policing at the recruit level and in continuous professional development and learning (Green & Gates 2014). It is argued that ‘police professionalism will only exist when policing is primarily knowledge driven ...’ (Lanyon 2009b, p.249). Professionalism cannot be separated from the bureaucratic ideal epitomized in modern police practice because police are entrenched in bureaucratic settings and influenced by their individual and cultural notions and the impositions of the bureaucracy (e.g., rules, regulations, standards, targets) (Manning 2005, p.204, p.210). As has been noted, police training, and the socialisation of recruits, is an organisational, academy-based responsibility (Green & Gates 2014), which positions professionalism ‘as an occupational or normative value’ (Evetts 2014, p.34). Increasingly, it has become a regular discourse in management and training: a slogan for marketing, an instrument for practitioners and managers constructing careers, identities and subjectivities (Evetts 2014, p.34). However, professionalism as a value system is being re-evaluated in terms of a number of elements – ‘trust’, ‘discretion’, ‘analysis of risk’, ‘expert judgement’ ... ‘quality of service and of professional performance’ – from the public’s (customers’) perspective and the ‘practitioners’ perspective’ (Manning 2005, p.40).
Research of the practice of police officers with tertiary education has revealed less frequent use of force and ‘fewer complaints’ (Bradley 2009a; Lanyon 2009b, p.249). While there is consensus that the behaviour of police needs to be professional (i.e., looking good, be efficient, be on time), behaviour is but one of a number of elements that coalesce to contribute to notions and demonstrations of a profession (Green & Gates 2014). For some, being a professional and member of a profession is seen as an advanced standing or status (Carr 2014). A salient point was made by Fitzgerald (1989) and Green and Gates (2014) that if and when police achieve the status of professional with the accompanying élite standing there will be a need for the sensitive management of perception and relationships with the community police serve because police are both members of the community and servants of the community.

**Evidence-Based Policing**

A paradigm worthy of attention for policing as a profession is evidence-based policing, also known in other professional domains as evidence-based practice. The literature presented wide-ranging debates and critiques of evidence-based practice across numerous professions, including education, social services and police (Biesta 2010; Hutschemaekers & Tiemens 2006; Kvernbeck 2015; Sherman & Eck 2002; Welsh 2006). Efforts to describe evidence-based practice commonly refer to the strength of its scientific rigour and validity and notions of a ‘what works’ remedy to practice issues (Hutschemaekers & Tiemens 2006; Kvernbeck 2015, p.3, emphasis in original; Sherman & Eck 2002; Welsh 2006). In some respects it appears to resemble a positivist, empirical research agenda, emphasising its scientific superiority over everyday practice and experience and demands stringent application of ‘scientific rules and conventions’ (Hutschemaekers & Tiemens 2006; Welsh, p.308).

Authors such as Biesta (2010), Kvernbeck (2015) and Hutschemaekers & Tiemens (2006) provided rounded critiques of evidence-based practice in professions of education and social services. In the context of police, a number of authors support evidence-based policing as a mechanism for fighting, preventing and
reducing crime (Braga 2001; Petrosino 2000; Sherman 1998; Sherman & Eck 2002; Weisburd, Lum & Petrosino 2003; Welsh & Farrington 2001). It is described as an antidote for policing practices based on everyday experience, habits, cultural customs and beliefs. Instead of subjective opinions, practice requires the logical application of scientific evidence (Petrosino 2000; Sherman 1998). Its benefits to policing are framed in language reflective of Neoliberal and NPM agendas: expanding efficiencies, working with identifiable risks, improving effectiveness through more focused and appropriate deployment of resources, while concentrating on the ‘bottom line’: crime prevention (Welsh 2006, p.318). There is a sense of certainty and confidence in being able to determine risks and apply scientifically sound strategies to ameliorate and even eliminate risks.

A number of common concerns are raised in critiques of evidence-based practice. Of relevance to my research and context are implications for practice for individual practitioners and, within and alongside this, how knowledge and evidence are produced and which is afforded greater value (Biesta 2010; Hutschemaekers & Tiemens 2006). As mentioned previously, more professionals are working in organisations and are experiencing constraints on their professional discretion (Edwards 2010). Evidence-based practice has the potential to regulate or prescribe practice, thereby counteracting the competence and independent judgement of professionals. It is argued that professionals could become ‘robot-like implementers’ of strategies (Biesta; Hutschemaekers & Tiemens, p.35). Implied in such strategies is a sense of control and predictability underscored by an expectation of ‘reproducibility’: that consistent results will be achieved (Kvernbekk 2015, p.97). This sits comfortably within and augments technical, rationalist thinking and rule-based, procedural approaches to policing.

Practice can be ‘messy’ (Schön 1987, p.3). The organic and textured nature of practice is seen to be inadequate and problematic when compared with the scientific rigour of an evidence-based practice (Biesta 2010). The conflation of evidence and knowledge produces truth claims and positions knowledge very much in the cognitive domain. Add to this, notions of scientific knowledge and
truth claims are strengthened as evidence resulting from rigorous research establishes and affirms ‘what works’ (Biesta; Hutschemaekers & Tiemens 2006). Again, this reinforces expectations of predictability, certainty, and reproducibility.

**Police Education and Training**

As mentioned in the previous chapter, there is a dearth of research and literature critiquing police education and training (Bradley 2005, 2009a). Noteworthy is the lack of research of the efficacy or otherwise of emergency service training in general and more specifically for police trainers and learners (Tyler & McKenzie 2014). The dearth of research is further evidence of the reproduction of the knowledge and practice of police training and education, leaving little or no opportunity for contestation and change (Giroux 2006; Schein 2004). Yet, current police education and training is out of date and major shifts in thinking and practice are needed for education and training to be efficacious for police and policing in the twenty-first century and the risk society (Bradley 2005, 2009a).

Historically, policing has been learned on the job; it has been ad hoc and has done little to prepare police for their work and role (Chappell 2008). To varying degrees, the value of learning on the job prevails and contributes to the devaluing of theory and learning in the academy. Yet the literature asserts that the success of community-oriented policing rests very much on training curricula and practices that support effective engagement with communities in a pluralist society (Chappell 2008; King & Lab 2000; Senna & Siegal 2002), and therefore, reflexive, agential professional police practitioners (Edwards 2010).

Critiques of recruit curricula reveal that greater attention is devoted to the ‘hard’ elements of police training (e.g., defensive tactics, less than lethal force, firearms, etc), with less attention given to the ‘soft’ elements of communication, administration, diversity, at risk and/or vulnerable communities, and problem solving beyond the strict application of rules and procedures (Bradley 2005, 2009a, p.100; Chappell 2008, p.38). This emphasises the need for changes to
conceptions and practices of police training to better equip police officers’ work in the twenty-first century. An international study of police training identified a predominant focus on fighting crime at the expense of conceptual skills, theory and critical thinking, and traditional, pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning (Kratcoski 2004). In his report, Fitzgerald (1989, p.249) claimed that many national and international surveys show that tasks related to law enforcement account for 20 per cent of police work. Fitzgerald’s (1989) claims remain valid and his views have been supported by a number of authors’ studies over recent years (Birzer 2003; Birzer & Tannehill 2001; Marenin 2004; McCoy 2006; Vickers 2000; White 2006).

In all, the three Royal Commissions of Inquiry – Fitzgerald (1989), Wood (1997), Kennedy (2004) – noted a long-standing attitude and practice of police education ‘by police for police’ with recommendation for improvements, including greater involvement of outside educators and the need to augment the education levels of all police officers (Wood 1997, p.210). A further recommendation centred on the need for police officers to be educated in the disciplines of sociology, psychology, communication and values and ethics, and preferably in education settings other than police academies (i.e., tertiary education). The aim of such a move was to broaden their thinking and practice and better equip police to employ ‘sociological and psychological skills’ when responding to diverse community and social problems (Fitzgerald 1989, p.249). Similar recommendations have been made in more recent times, especially with the advent of tertiary qualifications (Green & Gates 2014).

A number of common themes are evident in studies of police training. Firstly, the vocational focus of training with an emphasis on rational technical reasoning and the practice-based production of knowledge (Birzer 2003; Birzer & Tannehill 2001; Bradley 2005, 2009a; McCoy 2006). Secondly, and related to the first, is a resistance to and avoidance of theory and research, resulting in a lack of critical thinking and reflexivity (Vickers 2000; White 2006). A further issue is a lack of distinction between curriculum and syllabus. Instead, the two are conflated in
police training, which translates to less predictable teaching and learning practices and outcomes (White 2006).

What is “taught” (‘behavioural objectives’) therefore and what ‘values’ and ‘social responsibilities’ are “caught” are less likely to coalesce (White 2006, p.387). Ultimately, a hidden curriculum is produced that supports what Adlam (2002) referred to as the ‘socio-biological élitist governmental rationality’ and a commitment to a ‘technical-rational model’ (White 2006, p.388). Training is valued over notions of education in the police context: sitting comfortably with a strong focus on vocational learning underscored by teacher-centred (or practitioner-led) didactic delivery methods (Birzer 2003; Birzer & Tannehill 2001; Marinen 2004; McCoy 2006). Significantly, police recruits are paid employees. An underlying assumption of such a status is the “right” of the organisation to mould recruits’ behaviour (Conti & Nolan 2005; Schein 2004); to create conforming, performing, obedient and disciplined employees.

**Socialisation of Police Recruits**

As mentioned in chapter 1, police recruit training operates as a program of socialisation (or re-socialisation) and institutional or organisational control; an intense transformation from civilian to police officer with resulting changes in thinking and sense of identity (Conti & Nolan 2005, p.167). Key characteristics of recruit training that impact a recruit’s individual identity and subjectivity were identified in a study by Conti and Nolan, with reference to the work of Goffman (1961) and McNamara (1999).

The first of these characteristics was the training, which takes place in what is essentially a contained, closed, and controlled setting (i.e., the police academy). The recruits are immersed in the academy / recruit mode which is subjected to ‘physical conditioning’ and study demands (Conti & Nolan 2005, pp.170-171). Secondly, the recruits become commodities of the organisation, subjected to the organisation’s ‘governmental authority’ (2005, p.171). Compounding this, is their status as paid employees, albeit with limited authority and power. Their behaviour
and actions within the academy and beyond (outside its confines) are under surveillance and a high standard of judgement. This process reinforces the significance of the public’s gaze and judgement as much as that of the organisation, and starts to embed notions of separation and “difference” from the public (2005, p.171). Separation and difference are central to the construction and maintenance of a police identity, one defined and framed by difference from the other (i.e., the public), understood in terms of – *uniqueness-as-difference* – denoting a pragmatic means to an end, an ‘instrumental’ as opposed to a moral, principled ‘relation with the other’ (Biesta 2013, p.21, emphasis in original).

Another feature is the emphasis on group-oriented values and activities, as opposed to those of the individual. This reinforces values of being a member of the “police family” (Bonifacio 1991), watching each other’s back. It creates a degree of homogeneity in thinking and practice highlighting notions of solidarity, unity, and conformity from an organisational and individual or peer perspective, and consolidates the police identity (Conti & Nolan 2005, p.172). It simultaneously establishes boundaries that determine inclusion and exclusion.

The majority of recruit qualifying programs throughout Australian police jurisdictions function as instruments of socialisation, requiring recruits to commit to intensive, demanding training regimes ranging on average from 25 weeks to 29 weeks, followed by additional phases of socialisation as they enter the workplace. Essentially, police recruits enter a program that constructs them as ‘ideal product[s]’ of a police organisation and policing generally (Conti & Nolan 2005, p.173).

**Policing and *Conundrum***

**The Changing Landscape of Policing**

Variations and contradictions of what is police work are evident. A common image of police depicted in the media is that of fighting and controlling crime, which reinforces their status as heroic, capable protectors of public safety and
order (Reiner 2003, p.269). Such images and representations offer a narrow, albeit valorised, conception of police work, and construct a compelling identity embedded in conceptions of ‘power, authority, and superiority’ (Silvestri 2003, p.11): an image police are keen to maintain (Reiner 2003).

The nature, scope, and complexity of police work are changing (ANZPAA 2013; Burgess et al 2006). One such change hinges on today’s society demanding more intellectual and sophisticated responses from police (ANZPAA 2013; Burgess et al 2006; Lanyon 2007, 2009a,b; Murray 2006; Ransley & Mazerolle 2009; Rowe 2008), heralding a move from ‘the artisan status of police’ (Lanyon 2007, p.107; Lanyon 2009a), hence the current agenda to professionalise policing (Burgess et al 2006; Lanyon 2007, 2009a,b). Yet debates have continued throughout the literature and amongst practitioners as to the appropriate model of policing with the ‘traditional’ or ‘command and control’ model framing ‘policing as a craft/trade’ in direct contrast to the ‘contemporary’ or ‘community policing’ model defining policing as a profession (Lewis 2007, p.149; Murray 2002, pp.57-58, 2005, pp.348-349). The jurisdictions’ commitment to a contemporary model of policing has been questioned based on suggestions that a traditional model has been ever-present, resurfacing with legitimacy post-9/11 and maintained by prevailing national and international discourses of terrorism (Murray 2005).

Another change has involved the emergence of private, non-state authorised providers of security and other “policing” services, operating alongside the state-authorised ‘public police’ (McLaughlin 2006; Fleming & Wakefield 2009, p.232). A primary focus of much of state-authorised police work continues to be ‘social regulation’ under the banner of community policing: maintaining order, reassuring communities, protecting public safety and security. Tasks can be seen as ‘mundane’ or routine (e.g., general duties, traffic, community liaison, public order, emergency and other incidents, paperwork). The remit of policing now extends to inter-jurisdictional and transnational responses to crime and security matters (Fleming & Wakefield 2009, p.233), creating tension between community policing and command and control.
A further change to police work for individual officers is the burgeoning demands of administration (or paperwork), which is at odds with images and notions of an active, exciting career, with little time spent behind a desk, pushing pen and paper (Rowe 2009a, p.13). Research in 2001 by the British Home Office revealed ‘43 per cent of officer time was spent inside police stations … devoted to custody process … [with an] average 3.5 hours per prisoner, or … completing paperwork’ (Rowe 2009, p.14). In Australia, the South Australian (SAPOL) and Western Australian (WAPOL) Police Associations have reported increased paperwork for police (Australian Broadcasting Corporation 2011; Hunt 2013). SAPOL is ‘bogged down’ in paperwork, given the increase in legislation and regulations (more than 30 pieces) over the past 10 years. It is claimed that police can spend at least two hours charging someone (2013). The WAPOL Commissioner Karl O’Callaghan acknowledged similar concerns for police officers’ time. He noted that officers had approximately ‘40 minutes of extra paperwork [and data entry] … per shift’ (2011).

In part, administrative requirements can be seen as a means of ensuring legal procedures and powers are enacted appropriately (Rowe 2009). This perhaps underscores the changing nature of policing in response to the diverse communities of the twenty-first century combined with processes of accountability, scrutiny and oversight of police decisions and actions. The latter, sometimes referred to in terms of ‘civilian oversight’ is a controversial matter (Prenzler & den Heyer 2013, p.90). Traditionally, police have had a degree of autonomy and distance from public and governmental gazes (Lewis 2007, 2009a,b; Prenzler & den Heyer 2013). However, given the history of Royal Commissions of Inquiry in Australia (Fitzgerald 1989; Wood 1997; Kennedy 2004), the current climate demands greater transparency, accountability, and independent (non-police) investigation (Lewis 2007, 2009a,b). This tends to be seen by police as a ‘threat’, with many officers preferring to face internal (organisation-based) disciplinary systems as opposed to external processes (Prenzler & den Heyer 2013, p.90).
The Need for Change

The milieu of policing generally, with its agendas and debates, is one of contradictions and tensions as police and the practice of policing attempt to comprehend and adapt to NPM and neoliberal political agendas and keep pace with the uncertainties, changing social problems, and increased concerns about safety and security in diverse twenty-first century communities and societies (Shearing & Marks 2011, p.217). One of the essential barriers for policing is the tension between the need for a complete overhaul, a major shift in thinking, practice and learning, and the current modernist notions of law, order, policing and criminology that engender certainty and a desire to maintain the existing sense of purpose and control (Bradley 2005, 2009a; Waters 2007). *Conundrum* is not immune to these tensions and the need for change.

A further concern and consideration for the emerging profession of policing is the value placed on practice over theory as the source of knowledge production (Green 2009, p.3). This is underscored by pragmatism of rational-technical thinking and practice and an anti-intellectual stance (Bradley 2005, 2009a; Reiner 2000; Steinheider et al 2012). Whilst practice-based knowledge has relevance, in isolation of theoretical frameworks, questions might be asked as to the capacity of individual practitioners to interrogate and critique practice (Bayley & Bittner 2001).

These matters within the practice field of policing and *Conundrum*, along with the agenda to professionalise policing, and the nature of police training coalesce and provoke the need for changes to police education and training (Bradley 2005, 2009a). Despite assertions and efforts to professionalise policing, many police continue to portray and describe policing as a craft or trade, learned on-the-job (Bayley & Bittner 2001; Steinheider et al 2012). In order to move beyond this impediment, policing and, in particular, *Conundrum* needs to identify, understand and confront the contradictions, doubtful matters (*aporias*), and blind spots (*lacunae*) of their current thinking and practice. As noted in Chapter 1, police
policies and practices would benefit from an injection of ‘postmodern scepticism’ and ‘postmodern sensibilities’, thereby positioning police to better respond to the ambiguities, uncertainties and diversities of twenty-first century society (Waters 2007, pp.258-259). Postmodern concepts of ‘discontinuity, rupture, and difference’ (Giroux 2006, p.47) have much to offer to policing in the form of alternative orientations to understanding, challenging, and transforming existing modernist concepts and practices.

**Police Culture(s)**

Schein’s (2004, p.17) definition of culture resonates with my research:

> ... a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems.

The literature on police culture supports the notion of multiple cultures or subcultures within policing, as opposed to a homogeneous culture (Chan 1997; Chan with Devery & Doran 2003; Cochran & Bromley 2003; Cockcroft 2007; Shanahan 2000; Reiner 2000; Sklansky 2007; Waddington 1999b). Interestingly, while the literature offers a multiplicity of notions of police culture, there is ample commonality to consider police cultures as a single entity (Loftus 2010). Common themes include a preference and desire for crime-related work that is perceived as risky and exciting and in keeping with ‘masculine exploits’ (i.e., use of force and authority); a degree of suspicion, ‘cynicism and pessimism’; a tendency to isolate socially; and generally ‘conservative in politics and morality’ (Loftus 2010, pp.1-2).

Police culture as ‘figurative logic’ resonated with my experiences of working in *Conundrum* (Shearing & Ericson 1991, p.487). A product of oral communication that explains and justifies actions, it is symbolic, rhetorical, restorative, and the product of story-telling, or ‘war stories’ (Shearing & Ericson 1991; Waddington 1999b, p.302). In major part, the oral production and transmission of culture is nurtured by the ways in which learning occurs formally and incidentally in *Conundrum*, and the emphasis on the oral traditions of practice-based knowledge
production. Opinion based on experience is held in much greater regard than ‘book-based’ theory (Bradley 2005, 2009a, p.101). Instead, stories as a form of ‘cultural knowledge’, or ‘doxa’, represent a repertoire of responses and actions for individuals to readily draw upon and apply (Bourdieu 1977, p.164). The information or knowledge is organised thereby reducing efforts to take time to find information, and importantly, they provide justification for particular responses and actions: based on experience and practical wisdom (Chan 1997).

Complementary perspectives of culture were evident in Geertz’s (2003, p.174) work, where he described it as ‘webs of signification’, interpreted, understood, and performed by individuals in order to be accepted in the culture. This then leads to considerations of ‘interiority’ versus ‘exteriority’: who belongs and who is excluded, and how those boundaries are determined and judged. From a postmodern standpoint, culture represents values that are performed in a particular temporal space or context (Biehl, Good & Kleinman 2007). Further to this, it is noted that culture is also ‘relational’, it is ‘where individual and institutional social responsibility and ethical struggle take place’ (Fischer 2003, p.7). These values are constantly moving, shifting through histories, across boundaries, emerging, disappearing or fading, reemerging as narratives and “realities” change (Inglis 2004, pp.163-164, emphasis in original). It is always emerging from, or transforming through, social, ethical, political processes, which then impact conceptions of self, subjectivity and identity (Biehl et al 2007; Fischer 2003). In order to interpret culture within a particular temporal space, ‘look[ing] for the lived values and enshrined ideas …’ has merit (Ingliss 2004, p.166), albeit with an awareness of temporality and spatiality.

Through Bourdieu’s (1977) lens, belief systems in organisations and institutions are generated, authorised, and maintained through discourse, signs and symbols, habits, rules, practices. They are the products of the habitus and they determine what is speakable / unspeakable, what is knowable / unknowable, what is visible / invisible (Bourdieu 1977). As mentioned above, police culture(s) represent ‘doxa’: the normalisation of core underlying organisational and institutional assumptions
that establish habitual, ingrained ways of thinking, doing and being (Bourdieu 1977, p.164; Crank 2003). Included in the doxa is the ‘value work’ of policing, e.g., public safety, protecting life and property, fighting crime, following procedures (Crank p.196). It has been argued that values are fundamental to police because they provide a means of comprehending behaviour, actions, and thinking (Crank p.187). They represent the habitus of policing, becoming embodied and rarely critically analysed or questioned (Bourdieu 1977). Pedagogies such as the oral tradition of war stories in policing provide an ideal vehicle for the production and maintenance of cultures and subcultures. Less shift and movement or change is likely in systems or institutions that are protective and internally focused (Geertz 1973).

**Models of Policing**

Just as the personality and culture of an organisation and its senior leaders influence training, so too does the model of policing that exists to inform training, practice, and styles of leadership. As noted previously in this chapter, the debate as to a traditional (command and control) or contemporary (community policing) model of policing has been ongoing (Murray 2005).

The literature provides an insightful comparison of the two models. The traditional model represents policing as ‘a craft/trade’ whereas the contemporary model refers to policing as a profession. Authority and superiority are evident in the traditional model as opposed to a focus on ‘problem-solving’ in the contemporary model. Historically, policing has been characterised by a paramilitary style that is antithetical to a ‘democratic management style’ preferred by the contemporary model. The body and physical qualities are central to the traditional model while the contemporary model values intelligence or intellect. Finally, the traditional model is characterised by a closed and suspicious culture, unlike the contemporary model that advocating an inclusive, collaborative, consultative culture (Lewis 2007; Murray 2002, 2005).
The efficacy of the paramilitary model in policing has been challenged by others who argue that military leadership with a rigid and autocratic command and organisational structure is flawed; maintaining the status of police managers, stifling independent thinking and innovative practice, and limiting responses to the ever-changing imperatives of policing and community needs (Cowper 2000; Panzarella 2003).

Community-oriented policing represented a new and different paradigm of policing based on notions of forging a stronger nexus between police (officers, organisations and leaders) and members of the community collaborating to solve community problems (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux 1990). Within this context, there is a need for police leadership to change from transactional (positioned comfortably within command and control model) to transformational and adaptive leadership (Densten 1999; Murphy & Drodge 2004; Obolensky 2014).

**Police Leadership and Management**

Police organisations have been described as ‘artisan entities’ that exist in relative isolation from outside influences (Casey & Mitchell 2007, p.5). Police leaders (and managers) however are encountering an increasingly different political and economic landscape. They are subjected to Neoliberal and managerial agendas and regimen focused on measuring individual and organisational performance, outcomes and achieving efficiencies; the power and value of “the market” prevails (Fleming 2009, p.196; O’Malley & Hutchinson 2007). Service delivery, customer satisfaction, ‘accountability’, and ‘transparency’ are ever-present considerations and requirements (Casey & Mitchell 2007; Gillespie, Sicard & Gardner 2007, pp.167-168).

There is a dearth of research and literature on the behaviour of police leaders and managers, and what does exist tends to be based on surveys and interviews, rather than individual and institutional ethnographic studies (Bradley 2009b, p.187). In part, this can be attributed to the suspicion and exclusion of outsiders from the machinations of police organisations: the desire to maintain a level of
secrecy and intrigue. While police acknowledge the impact of leadership on the personality and performance of an organisation, the new Neoliberal, managerial regimen sees leadership as a tool and a means of achieving significant reform (Bradley 2009b, p.188). Another contributing factor is that, at least in Conundrum, all the senior police officers and a majority of inspectors have been promoted from within the organisation, and the majority have had lifelong careers as police in Conundrum.

In the late 1990s, however, studies of senior police leaders found evidence of ‘transactional leadership’, which included ‘management-by-exception’, featuring a lack of genuine engagement with and motivation of personnel, disciplining wrong-doings, rewarding acceptable behaviour: essentially maintaining the status quo (Bradley 2009b, p.188; Densten 1999). There was also evidence of attempts to instead activate ‘transformational leadership’, with a strong focus on motivating, inspiring, stimulating: engendering employees’ ‘intrinsic commitment’ to policing and the organisation (Bradley 2009b, p.188). The presence of conservative, cautious, authoritative behaviour and the poor interpersonal skills of police leaders have impacted on attempts to change leadership practices (Dellatre 2011; Densten 1999, p.46; Goldsmith 1990; Waters 1995). The conclusion is that a lack of creativity, critical thinking and practice can lead to simplistic and inadequate decision-making, and reinforce traditional and often inappropriate practices (Densten 1999; Lindberg, Rantatalo & Haake 2015).

Research conducted by Vickers (2000) and Adlam (2002) in relation to police management education provided further texture to these findings. Vickers (2000, p.508) found a ‘resistant anti-intellectual subculture’. Whilst features of police culture such as ‘solidarity…cynicism, isolation…and difficulty admitting weakness’ might function to protect police from the issues they confront in operational policing, they might also function to inhibit ‘learning through reflection and critique’ (Vickers 2000, pp.508-509; Ryan 2006, p.8). These findings were supported by an analysis of a failed police ethics education program in England. Adlam (2002) identified ‘unconscious and unchallengeable assumptions regarding
police work, conduct, and leadership’ that resulted in resistance to participation in the ethics program and to engaging in critical thinking (Adlam 2002; Ryan 2006, p.8).

Long (2003, p.642) argued that the current performance management approach, described as a 'rational-calculative model', will not deliver the reforms that are needed for policing in the twenty-first century. Instead, a ‘value-systems approach’ would enable police leaders and managers to move from a transactional style of leadership (or management-by-exception) to different styles of leadership such as transformational and adaptive. Both of these styles of leadership have the potential to encourage leaders to find and develop their ‘emotional intelligence’: a much needed element for a genuinely reflexive practitioner and leader (Bradley 2009a, p.189; Long 2003, p.642). Such a move is supported by recent investigations of UK police (Bradley 2009a).

Contemporary research of police leadership reveals trends that ‘embody [traditional] police organisational culture’ with police leaders demonstrating ‘suspicion and resistance’ towards reconfiguring leadership to better meet and represent managerial and contemporary agendas (Lindberg et al 2015, 114). The authors of this research claim police leaders are not effective ‘change agents’ at a time when the purpose, functions and practices of policing are in a state of flux (2015, p.114).

In the twenty-first century, police organisations and their respective leaders have undertaken various reforms in response to government demands. In reflecting on the findings of Commissions of Inquiry into three Australian police jurisdictions, it is argued that features of a traditional policing model – ‘authoritarian’, ‘command and control’, ‘them against us attitude’, ‘inward-looking leadership’, and ‘paramilitary nature of police organisations’ – have reinforced key aspects of police culture and have not enabled genuine reform to occur (Lewis 2007, p.137). Instead, the culture has allowed corruption to exist (Kennedy 2004). The notion and practice of reform needs to be examined from not only an organisational or
structural perspective, but also from the perspective of how an organisation facilitates and supports learning, innovation and change.

A review of police leadership programs within Australasian policing, and in comparison with international efforts, revealed a number of initiatives; the majority with specific police focus and postgraduate qualifications attached (Pierce 2007). Such initiatives were seen as contributing to the agenda for professionalising policing, and central to this was a concern for accredited courses to be ‘directly related to policing disciplines’ in order to construct and consolidate the discipline knowledge of policing (Pierce 2007, pp.134-135). Significantly, the results of a survey of international police jurisdictions as to the efficacy of tertiary education for police in non-policing disciplines found that the majority doubted and questioned the efficacy and relevance of such education (Pierce 2007, p.134). Arguments exist, however, for police leaders to have formal education along with internships or opportunities to experience work in agencies outside of policing (Pierce 2007). This is an imperative given the changing nature of police work and the need for inter-professional relationships and professional boundary crossing (Edwards 2010; Evetts 2014).

The effects of performance management (underscored by managerial values), the discourse on terrorism and national security, evidence-based policing, and recent concerns of the militarisation of police coalesce to justify adopting or reverting to transactional leadership, which accommodates rationalist, prescriptive solutions to problems (Balko 2014; Lewis 2007; Manning 2005; Murray 2002, 2005). As the literature suggested, this is antithetical to what is needed for and of police in the twenty-first century where events and situations are often ‘illogical, irrational and incoherent’ (Vickers 2000, p.516). Adding further weight to these challenges, police services (with the exception of the Australian Federal Police) still represent hierarchical, rank structured organisations, and discourage negative feedback, comment or questioning of what is (Vickers 2000, p.516). Leadership is integral to how an organisation looks, thinks, acts, and how it might or might not learn and adapt or change. Tension appears to exist, however, between what is being
espoused as preferred operational and leadership practices and the need for reform and transformation at the level of individuals and police organisations (Lindberg et al 2015).

**Women in Policing**

The introduction of women into policing in Australia and other Western police organisations revealed a long history, dating back to 1910 in the USA and 1915 in Australia and Britain (Harwood & McDermott 2014). New South Wales was the first state in Australia to employ policewomen and by 1917 five of the six states had women police (Prenzler 2002). The entry of women into Victoria Police in 1917 was described ‘as an experiment’ (Harwood & McDermott 2014). In 1924, the numbers of policewomen had risen, but were low with four in Victoria, eleven in South Australia, four in New South Wales, six in Western Australia and one in Tasmania. Queensland did not employ policewomen until 1931.

Law enforcement was ‘men’s work’ (Brown, Hazenburg & Ormiston 1999; Brown & Heidensohn 2000; Garcia 2003; Ryan 2006, p.6; Westmarland 2001). Women were deployed to areas of policing seen as inferior to the high risks and physical demands of fighting crime, dealing with moral and sexual matters: ‘custodial, welfare of women, children and juveniles’ (Boni 1998; Brown 1998; Brown, Hazenburg & Ormiston 1999; Brown & Heidensohn 2000; Fleming & Lafferty 2002, 2003; Garcia 2003; Heidensohn 1992; Nixon 1994; Ryan 2006, p.6; Schulz 2003; Westmarland 2001). Their conditions of employment included sixty-hour weeks, one week’s leave per annum, no access to police vehicles, reliance on public transport, little training, and in New South Wales, no uniform was issued and they ‘sign[ed] an indemnity clause absolving the Police Department of any responsibility for their safety’ (Harwood & McDermott 2014).

The ‘policewoman’ was seen as ‘the ultimate oxymoron’ (Brown & Heidensohn 2000, p.15; Ryan 2006, p.6) and as a threat to policemen and the reputation of policing. There was a raft of objections towards women being police officers. The
objections centred on matters of morality framed in terms of good and bad: decent women being exposed to atrocities and/or wayward women taking advantage of policemen (Brown & Heidensohn 2000, pp.15-16). Structures of prestige signify a set of beliefs and behaviours – reverence, disdain, order, authority, compliance – that become accepted, unquestioned and legitimated (Ortner & Whitehead 1981). Historically, the police organisation was described as ‘a masculine domain, where ... [c]ategories of prestige, power, and status are allocated to tough, manful acts of crime-fighting and thief-taking’ (Young 1991, p.191). Concerns have been raised as to the lack of consideration of gender and the gendered milieu in studies of police leadership (Silvestri 2003, p.3).

Authors studying women’s foray into policing have noted external or internal (organisational) controversy providing the impetus for women’s entry to policing (Fleming & Lafferty 2002; Heidensohn 1996; Silvestri 2003): with the addition of women viewed as an antidote and providing a façade of goodness. In Australia, Commissions of Inquiry (Fitzgerald 1989; Wood 1997; Kennedy 2004) have been precursors to women’s increased participation in policing (Fleming & Lafferty 2002). Women’s role and status in policing have been topics of debate over the years often focusing on their capacity to be authoritative and physically strong (Garcia 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008, 2009). Instead, as noted previously, women were assigned to doing ‘emotion work’ (Fleming & Lafferty 2002, 2003; Garcia 2003; Hochschild 2012, p.163). They were afforded a lower status to men, as Hochschild (p.173) asserts:

A person of lower status has a weaker claim to the right to define what is going on; less trust is placed in her judgments; and less respect is accorded to what she feels (p.173).

The dominant discourses and images of policing as masculine work provided fertile ground for constructing and promulgating gender and other differences (Brown & Heidensohn 2000; Fleming & Lafferty 2003; Garcia 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008, 2009; Silvestri 2003; Westmarland 2001). Significantly, research reveals that the majority of policewomen accepted their status as ‘a subordinate social stratum’ (Brown & Heidensohn 2000; Dick & Cassell 2004; Dick & Jankowicz 2001;
Hochschild 2012, p.163; Silvestri 2003). The policies that allowed for flexible employment for women were seen to imply: ‘part-time’, ‘part-able’, ‘part-committed’ (Etter & Adams 2001, p.9; Ryan 2006, p.6). Time has become a commodity for measuring and gauging someone’s commitment to work. In policing, working long hours (i.e., doing your time and more) is viewed as a positive quality. It has been argued however that such notions of time are wrapped up in the ‘smart macho’ culture of police (Silvestri 2003, p.174), therefore, part-time and other flexible work arrangements are not seen as relevant to real policing (2003).

A recent survey of police officers in Victoria Police revealed police officers’ concerns ‘about the feminising of the force’, which was perceived as ‘one of the three biggest problems facing Victoria Police’ (Moor 2008). In addition, research of female police officers revealed perceptions and practices that avow existing cultural schema and stereotypes that reinforce gender differences in policing and society generally (Rabe-Hemp 2009). It is claimed that police organisations are ‘deeply gendered’ and that efforts supporting equal opportunities simultaneously ‘embod[y] and disembod[y]’ (Silvestri 2003, p.172).

This thinking and these challenges for women in policing are reflected in women’s integration to other male-dominated occupations. Research has shown that as women enter arenas previously the domain of men they will experience uncertainty in constructing and reconstructing their gender identity and face a number of obstacles (McNay 2000). For example, women in Australian prisons and correction services, mining in Western Australia, and auto components industry in Argentina were regarded as ‘tokens, sex objects’, ‘inferior’, and ‘problematic’ being emotional and more likely to impact negatively on cohesion and mateship in the workplace (Eveline & Booth 2002; Hemmens, Stohr, Schoeler & Miller 2002, p.475; Ryan 2006, p.7; Stobbe 2005). Women in mining were ‘subjected to practical jokes and violence’ risking ‘safety, injury and life’, and incurring injury (Eveline & Booth 2002; Ryan 2006, p.7). Research of women’s experiences entering the military culture in Britain, USA and Australia revealed...
similar experiences for women entering policing (Burton 1996; Firestone & Harris 2003; Ryan 2006; Woodward & Winter 2006).

Research has also revealed that when women are represented in small numbers they become highly visible and under surveillance by other women and men (Silvestri 2003): placing women under greater pressure to perform according to the hegemonic masculine standards. Analysis of women’s ‘insert[ion]’ to policing has found that nothing substantial has occurred to ‘critically identify the structural arrangements of the organisation that enable the male model of policing to dominate and flourish’ (Silvestri 2003, p.150). Warnings have been noted in response to rhetoric that claims that ‘things are equal now’ (Silvestri 2003, p.171), when gender continues to be a source of inequalities in society. Policewomen in countries throughout the world experience resistance and discrimination and this will continue while it is perceived as the problem of particular individuals and the cultural and structural circumstances are ignored and not named (Silvestri 2003).

**Modernist Policing and the Postmodern Turn**

As discussed in Chapter 1, policing is steeped in modernist concepts that are inadequate for policing in the twenty-first century (Clark 2005; Fleming & Wakefield 2009; McLaughlin 2006; McLaughlin & Murji 1999; O’Malley 2005; Reiner 1992b, 2005; Waters 2007). Criminologists and those in police studies acknowledge ‘radically different forms of risk, uncertainty and instability’ in society and communities and resultant impacts on policing, prompting the need to review underlying assumptions and premises of policing and criminology (McLaughlin & Murji 1999, p.217). On the one hand police are responsible for law enforcement, crime prevention, management of individuals and communities in society, using force legitimately (McLaughlin 2006, p.103). On the other hand, police ‘patrol the facts’ of police work: the things that symbolise policing – the gloss, the perception which establishes and ensures that police have ‘a dominant place culturally ... socially, politically’ (McLaughlin 2006, p.103). Popular media (fiction and non-fiction) help police create and sustain their ‘symbolic capital’
(Bourdieu 1977) through their ‘status’ as ‘the disciplined ‘thin blue line’ standing between order and chaos’ (McLaughlin 2006, p.105; Manning 2005). In considering the search for a police identity, Bayley and Shearing (2005, p.717) commented on police in the USA, UK and Canada:

Police devote 60% of their resources to patrolling but complain about running from one emergency call to another, often involving noncriminal matters. The scarecrow has grown tattered in relation to the prevalence of crime. At the same time, regrettably few villains are caught in relation to crimes committed ...

Modernity’s capacity to respond to changes and efforts to restore order are accepted (McLaughlin & Murji 1999). Such a context raises questions of the validity of the grand narrative of the ‘bureaucratic policing model’, with its steadfast commitment to rules and regulations, and its capacity to survive and be effective in the heterogeneous postmodern society (Clark 2005, p.643). McLaughlin (2006, pp.102-103) asserted that policing is ‘a matter of symbolism as much as substance’. Now more than ever, police are going to have to recreate their image, brand and message because today’s society has greater ‘social divisions and a less deferential culture’.

Insufficient attention has been given to postmodernism and policing (Waters 2007). The reasons for the dearth of literature have been identified based on two assumptions. One that postmodernism is merely a buzzword, a notional caprice that will pass, and two that it represents ‘late modernity’, meaning that any critiques of changes to society and policing are viewed through a modernist lens and within the context of existing institutional and organisational structures (McLaughlin & Murji 1999, pp.221-222). The limited literature available reveals, on the one hand, contradictions, misunderstandings, and a general pessimism as to the changing nature of policing and its causality, while on the other hand, attempts were made to analyse the postmodern turn, its implications for policing, the need for and possibilities for change (McLaughlin 2006; Reiner 2005; Waters 2007). O’Malley (2005, p.698, emphasis in original) suggested ‘... the thesis advanced is that national police forces constitute a quintessentially modern form of institution and thus predictably are being changed by the impact of
postmodernity’. Reiner (2005, p.676) saw police as ‘the litmus-paper, reflecting sensitively the unfolding exigencies of a society’. These exigencies of the postmodern world include: ‘pluralism, contingency, the undermining of absolutes, ambivalence’ and major transformations of ‘society, culture, knowledge and morality’ (Reiner 2005, p.689).

Waters (2007, p.259) argued that notions of postmodernity feature in the work of only a ‘few police practitioners and academics within the police’, essentially remaining in the shadows. In policing, postmodernism has been seen as a whim, a passing trend, bothersome and undeserving of attention (McLaughlin & Murji 1999). Waters (2007, p.258) recommended instilling ‘a dose of postmodern scepticism’ and ‘heightened postmodern sensibilities’ to counter the continued focus / emphasis on modernist language and methods (Waters 2007, p.268). In addition to a degree of scepticism, postmodernism invites multiple perspectives (Leicester 2000) with which to (re)consider the modernist concepts of criminology and policing aimed at predicting criminal behaviour and controlling social behaviour (Moyer 2001; Vold et al 1998; Waters 2007).

Reiner (2005, p.689) claimed that a diverse society and lifestyles confront police today, and will be not appeased by different policies or changes to governments. Instead they are entrenched, enduring structural developments. The modernist notions of police as state-authorised regulators and enforcers can no longer drive policing today. Reiner (1992b, pp.778-779) viewed the adoption of ‘consumerism’ in policing and police organisations – (i.e., “crooks” and offenders to customers and customer service, ‘mission statements, codes of ethical service and the like’) – as a direction representing postmodernism. Alongside this are the vestiges of Neoliberalism and Managerialism with the introduction of services, accountability, performance indicators, and a search for efficiencies (Klikauer 2013; Reiner 2005). Instead of bolstering the substance of police work it has reinforced the symbolism of policing with its commitment to the ‘bureaucratic policing model’, rules and regulations (Clark 2005, p.643).
Reiner’s (2005, p.692) proposal for postmodern policing reconfigures current notions and images of police and policing. For instance, challenging conceptions of police as national heroes and instead seeing policing as a ‘public service’, albeit somewhat routine. Crucial to a postmodern police service that reflects today’s diverse society, the composition needs to have greater gender- and ethnic-balance. In terms of police practices, these need to better accommodate the multiplicity of today’s society.

**Neoliberal and Managerial Regimen**

Neoliberalism has a political mandate (Klikauer 2013, p.5). It has been described as a doctrinal premise whereby individual, as opposed to collective responsibility and survival, is paramount (Giroux 2015; Morley & Dunstan 2013; Wallace & Pease 2011) within the context of the ‘free market’ economy (Connell 2013). Its focus of attention includes agendas such as ‘privatisation, deregulation, annihilating welfare states, aggressive anti-unionism …’ (Klikauer 2013, p.5). Darder (2012, p.412) noted features of ‘greed’, ‘surveillance’ and ‘regulation and monitoring’ as corrosive impacts on ‘equality and public responsibility’. It has been argued that this individualism represented discursive notions of autonomy and freedom (Davies & Bansel 2007) because operating alongside individualism and survival is a ‘politics of disposability’ wherein those who are judged as disposable include, but are not limited to ‘students, unemployed youth, and members of the working poor … the voiceless and powerless …’ (Giroux 2015, p.196). It has been argued that:

> By individualizing the social, all social problems and their effects are coded as individual character flaws, a lack of individual responsibility, and often a form of pathology. Life is now a war zone … (p.195)

Further to this, and from the perspective of public services such as the police, the agenda of Neoliberalism has seen policing undergo fundamental changes with reviews to and re-prioritisation of core and non-core policing functions resulting in the outsourcing and privatisation of security and police-related services (Wakefield 2009). This has extended to include prison and detention services contracted to private providers (Wakefield & Prenzler 2009, p.244). The
contemporary context shows that policing is no longer the sole domain of state-based and authorised police services (Wakefield 2009). Instead, a new pluralised policing has emerged (Mclachlin 2006; Wakefield 2009) to support what Giroux (2015, pp.54-55) has described as the Neoliberal fixation with ‘security’, uncertainty, ‘fear’, and punishment.

The essence of Neoliberalism – ‘self-interest, privatization and commodification’ – underscores its ‘anti-intellectual’ stance (Giroux 2015, pp.20-21): nothing can get in the way of an expanding free-market economy. Such a stance is evident in its devaluing and disapproval of critical thinking and the distinction of theory from practice, in preference for technical rationalism. The implications of this include: favouring competency-based practice over theory-based practice; professional discretion has been eroded with professionals becoming uncritical ‘functionaries of the state’ (Morley & Dunstan 2013, p.142); procedural responses and solutions to problems; and a concern for outcomes and achieving ‘managerial goals’ (p.142).

While Neoliberalism and Managerialism are not one and the same, they have much in common in terms of their focus and intent. The Managerial mission involves directing and controlling ‘capitalism and society’, along the lines of business and corporate management (Klikauer 2013, p.100). Central to Managerialism is common sense, rationality and notions of ‘authority’ and ‘obedience’ to that authority. These are embedded in work-life discourse (e.g., manage your health, manage your life) and ‘rules, procedures, performance management’, measurement and audit processes, efficiency-drives, customer focus, and ‘marketization’ and corporatisation of public services including police (Fleming 2009, p.196; Klikauer 2013, p.100).
The Mandate of Policing

A challenging context for police in the twenty-first century is captured in this statement:

The police have trouble. Among the many occupations now in crisis, they best symbolize the shifts and strains in our changing socio-political order. They have been assigned the task of crime prevention, crime detection and apprehension of criminals. Based on their legal monopoly of violence, they have staked out a mandate that claims to include the efficient, apolitical, and professional enforcement of the law ... police have staked out a vast and unmanageable social domain. And ... as a result of their inability to accomplish their self-proclaimed mandate ... the police have resorted to the manipulation of appearances (Manning 2005, p.192, emphasis in original).

As mentioned previously, policing continues to occur in bureaucratic settings, unlike other traditional professions, such as law and medicine, which developed outside of bureaucracies. The landscape is changing, however, as more professions are employed in government and other organisations and bureaucracies (Evetts 2014).

Many professions, including police, are concerned with reputation and management of image (Manning 2005). It has been argued that police have maintained an idealized impression of policing to engender support and public confidence. Misconceptions of policing as exciting, action-packed, ‘dangerous and heroic ... crock-catching’ (Manning 2005, p.196) are fuelled by popular media and, in the main, go unchallenged by police. These impressions translate to the public’s perceptions of police as ‘crime-fighters’, proficient, competent, and well-organised to protect society from major disorder and dysfunction (Manning 2005, p.196). Yet, much of police work is mundane, boring, grubby, and often challenging, but not always dangerous (Bradley 2005, 2009a; Manning 2005, p.196). Some police officers find the realities of administrative work contrary to initial expectations (Bradley 2009a). To some degree, police could be seen as custodians of peace and order rather than enforcers of the law, as they devote considerable time to dealing with arguments, domestic quarrels and disagreements (Manning 2005).
Police Force / Police Service

Literature has affirmed the move in policing from ‘crime control and law enforcement’ (Stenning & Shearing 2005, p.167), prompting a change in nomenclature from ‘police forces’ to ‘police services’ (Avery 1981; Elliott 2013; Stenning & Shearing 2005, p.167). It seems this name change held expectations of differences in the practice of policing. Such a change symbolised a change in how policing was perceived and conducted, reducing the authoritarian label while still being authoritative in its duties (Edwards 2011, p.119). This raised questions, however, as to how that distinction might have been perceived by the public and the impact on police and the nature of their work given that ‘[t]he debate of Force vs Service usually reflects varying views on how the police ought to portray their role to the public …’ (Elliott 2013, p.115).

It is interesting to note the claim that the command and control style of management had ‘given way to managerialist approaches’ (Stenning and Shearing 2005, p.170, emphasis added), prompting questions about the extent the changes to managerialism, service provision, and name change willingly accepted and understood? The notion of service provision was wrapped up in notions of community policing, and it has been argued by that such notions construct conceited, idealistic and unrealistic notions of policing (Klockars 2005).

Implicated in the notion of service is a community-centred approach to policing; partnerships forged with community groups, businesses, other professions, and government departments. The concept of a police force presents a contradiction because it implies authoritative, paramilitary, command and control responses with an emphasis on law enforcement (Lewis 2007; Murray 2002, 2005). From its inception, there has been unconvincing commitment to community policing, which was seen as ‘soft’ (McCarthy 2013; Murray 2005), unlike ‘hard’ (real) police work, which concerned itself with law and order and fighting crime and now terrorism. Current national political and global discourse and responses to
terrorism validate and give legitimacy to the command and control model of policing. However, this has created tension between ‘the seemingly contradictory paradigms of community policing and national security; globalization and localism’ (Fleming & Wakefield 2009, p.234).

A number of authors have reiterated the changing nature of police work in response to ‘wicked’ problems\(^9\) resulting from social, global, political, technological changes and agendas of terrorism (Fleming & Wakefield 2009; Reiner 2000, 2003; Roberts 2000; Rowe 2008; Watts 2015). It has raised questions as to the implications for police work. For instance, the capacity of police agencies to respond to complex, wicked problems and the incongruity associated with policing local, community issues and national, global agendas. Alongside these, concerns have been raised as to how police have managed, and will continue to manage, the perceived increase in crime and concomitant enhanced levels of fear and lack of social standards in the community (Fleming & Wakefield 2009, p.234).

Police are political agents (Klockars 2005). The remit of police to prevent and fight crime places them in a difficult position: on the one hand they can be credited with reductions in crime, on the other hand, criticised or seen as ineffective when crime increases, or is perceived to increase. A sociological critique of crime highlights a set of socio-economic, political factors that contribute to fluctuating rates of crime (Haralambos, Krieken, Smith & Holborn 1996). As one author noted, police cannot be expected to alleviate and/or find remedies for community issues, nor are they likely to become ‘depoliticized into pure professionals’ (Klockars 2005, p.458). Over the years, the success of efforts by governments to use ‘law and order’ agendas to win votes by increasing police numbers,

---

\(^9\) Watts (2015, p.162) distinguish ‘tame problems’ from ‘wicked problems’. Tame problems are ‘well-defined and respond to ‘tame solutions’ (e.g., ‘laws, logical processes’).’ Whereas the characteristics of ‘wicked problems’ include: lack of clarity and agreement as to the nature or type problem; solutions are also unclear, open ended, and conflict can ensue amongst stakeholders seeking solutions; solving the problem is complicated by an ever-changing context (political, social, economic) and changes of focus, interests and commitment within and amongst stakeholders. Essentially, they are problems that pose barriers to solutions and/or resist efforts to resolve (Roberts 2000, p.1). There has been a tendency overtime to ‘treat wicked problems as if they are tame problems amenable to technical ... solutions’ (Watts 2015, pp.162-163).
introducing more legislation and extending police powers has been realised time and again (Haralambos et al 1996, p.567). As a result, police have acquired a vast and somewhat unmanageable mandate (Klockars 2005; Manning 2005).

**The Old-New Blue/Black**

The move to a service rather than a force was in contrast to the traditional model of policing preferring an ‘authoritarian’ rather than a ‘problem-solving’ approach to policing and an ‘insular, defensive culture’ versus an ‘open and consultative’ one (Lewis 2007, p.149; Murray 2002, 2005, pp.348-349). In Australia – South Australia Police (SAPOL), Victoria Police (VicPOL), and Northern Territory Police Force (NTPFES) – have created a different image by changing their uniforms from light blue (SAPOL, VicPOL), or light khaki (NTPFES), to dark blue/black (eDrum 2012a, 2012b; VicPOL 2014).

The police uniform has been described as conveying ‘power and authority’ (Johnson 2001, p.27), and ‘power, authority and culture’ (Camargo 2012, p.1). Various authors have each conducted research on corporate clothing and uniforms, revealing common themes including, but not limited to: setting first impressions; establishing expectations of the service and the wearer; and providing insights to the character and status of the wearer (Daniel, Johnson & Miller 1996; Dervis 2002; Johnson 2001). Daniel et al (1996, p.43) identified uniforms as ‘emblem[atic] of group membership’, inhibiting ‘individuality’, identifiers of status, and signifiers of legitimacy of role and organisation; hence the significance of the police uniform and its colour in terms of the public’s perceptions and the identity and behaviour of the wearer (Nickels 2008).

Police uniforms – their purpose, form, colour and meaning – represent an under-researched area of policing (Nickels 2008). To date, I have not located critiques of the uniform changes in the three Australian police jurisdictions. Instead, there is endorsement of the changes in the police magazines of NTPFES and SAPOL:

> The new uniform ‘is clearly recognizable as Police’ (NTPFES 2012a).
It’s often said that police are the fabric of society, and this is clearly evident with the introduction of a new modern and progressive uniform tailor-made for the frontline ... meet[ing] the functional and organisational needs of SAPOL now and into the future (SAPOL 2012, p.3).

Black has not been perceived as a ‘comfortable’ colour for a uniform (Dervis 2002, p.63), however, dark coloured uniforms ‘with a paramilitary appearance’ continue to be the preference of police agencies in the USA (Johnson 2001, p.28) and some Australian police jurisdictions are adopting that trend.

**Militarisation of Police**

The change of uniform leads the discussion to recent literature and media reports of the militarisation of police in the USA and Australia (ABC Radio National, Sunday Extra, Sunday 24 August 2014; Balko 2014; Greenwald 2014). In the USA, it began with the ‘drug war’ in the 1990s, and gained impetus in the 2000s with the war on terror (Balko 2014, p.177, p.242). It has been described as a ‘destructive by-product’ of counter-terrorism efforts in US post-9/11 (Greenwald 2014). Reports have highlighted the normalisation of paramilitary attitudes and the integration of paramilitary ‘tactics’ and weaponry into everyday policing. Some see the militarisation of policing in the USA as the logical development of the professionalisation of policing (Prenzler & den Heyer 2013, p.347). Others critique these assertions, claiming that the premise of risk, danger and fear has been conveniently used to mask changes to police powers and to suppress any questioning of hidden agendas (Kappeler & Kraska 2015, p.269).

Militarisation of police represents a ‘clash of values between policing, which deals with citizens who commit crime and pro-active military style tactics for dealing with enemies and eliminating them’ (McCulloch 2014). In considering the need for and likelihood of changing police culture in the USA, the words of a former Maryland police officer Neill Franklin are worthy of note:

> I think there are two critical components to policing that cops today have forgotten ... Number one, you’ve signed on to a dangerous job. That means that you’ve agreed to a certain amount of risk. You don’t get to start stepping on others’ rights to minimize that risk you agreed to take on. And number two, your
first priority is not to protect yourself, it’s to protect those you’ve sworn to protect. But I don’t know how you get police officers today to value those principles again. The ‘us and everybody else’ sentiment is strong today ... (Balko 2014, pp.325-326).

The current political discourse on terrorism and national security in Australia has the potential to bring back into focus the paradigm of command and control and a paramilitary ethos in policing, in which public scrutiny will be a necessary response (Lewis 2007, p.149; Murray 2002, 2005, pp.348-349). One product of the political discourse in Australia has been the integration of immigration and customs to form the Australian Border Force. The nomenclature – “force” – is significant in itself, and is compounded by the creation of ‘a new statute, a new [militaristic] uniform and a new oath binding its workers to the defence of the border as a “strategic national asset”‘. Of great concern now is the border has no bounds; it is everywhere (Finnane 2015). The responses of the people of Melbourne to the Australian Border Force’s (ABF) Operation Fortitude in 2015 highlighted the level of public scrutiny and concerns for the changing nature of policing, surveillance, and national security in Australia.

**Conclusion: Discerning Concepts and Perspectives**

Policing is in a state of flux and confusion. There is tension between the models of policing practice: on the one hand the traditional, command and control model, on the other hand the contemporary, community-oriented model. Each of these models represents different purpose, functions, and identities for police officers. The traditional, command and control model establishes perceptions of ‘hard’ or real police work (police force) whereas the community-oriented model, while acknowledging the place of hard policing, encompasses social responsibility working with and alongside communities and other professionals (police service). There has, however, been a resurgence of command and control, paramilitary policing in direct response to the threat of terrorism and fear. Another tension has involved the advent of private police services taking some of the roles traditionally the remit of public, state-based police. During my time working in *Conundrum* I found police expressed confusion over their role.
This flows onto the agenda to professionalise policing. There is a lack of clarity and agreement, by State and Federal police leaders, as to what it will mean and how it will be realised. To date, the proposal has reflected a form of credentialing of police. The process is confused because police officers are not independent practitioners but rather servants of the state with powers sanctioned by the State (or Federal) governments. Registered professionals such as nurses and allied health professionals can establish independent practice; police cannot. The agenda of professionalisation remains in the realm of the polemic.

Highly relevant to professionalisation is the lack of an identified body of knowledge for policing, a much-debated topic of commentators and operational police. Along side this is a dearth of research of police issues other than operational matters with findings relevant to instrumental knowledge for operational policing.

Police training and education in the police academy centres on instrumental knowledge (content and behaviour). Integral to this context are the police trainers whose value is assessed on their ability to be good police officers in the field. The didactic and trainer-centred approach to police training means that the oral traditions of police culture – war stories – prevail and simple training strategies such as observation, imitation, repetition, modelling of others’ behaviour are seen as legitimate. These features combine to translate to the reproduction of knowledge and the replication of practice, without contestation. The training is essentially about equipping police officers to be good, compliant, obedient, artisans of the craft or trade of policing. The place given to common sense as a critical quality of an operational police officer reinforces the focus away from theoretical foundations and onto practical solutions based on perceived wisdom.

The essentially masculine character of policing is problematic in establishing and maintaining gender power-relations that impact women’s participation in policing and the participation and acceptance of others (including men) who are deemed
not to fit in, not to belong. The hegemonic masculine standards determine what is normal, natural and what is abnormal or different and this can incorporate sexuality, ability, thinking and practice that is different from what is considered to be the norm.

Implicated in all of this is Neoliberal, Managerial regimen with measurement of performance and outcomes creating ‘bureaucratic professionalism’ that has the potential to undermine police officers’ discretionary practice and also pulls policing back into the traditional command and control mode of policing with attendant measuring of hard data (e.g., crime rates) but without regard to the less measurable police work such as quality of community interaction; police work is pulled back to basics of a limited doxa, revisiting the same concepts and practices.

**Where to Next**

In the next chapter I detail the qualitative and narrative methodology and the semi-structured interviews used in my research, including my reasons for adopting these. I also present the theoretical lenses that guide my analysis of data and the literature.
Chapter 3

Thinking Otherwise

An Assemblage of Methodology and Theory

... the value of theory lies in its power to get in the way: to offend and interrupt. We need theory to block the reproduction of the bleeding obvious, and ... open new possibilities for thinking and doing (Maclure 2010, p.277).

A Pause ...

Each time I have attempted to do theoretical work, it has been on the basis of elements from my experience – always in relation to processes that I saw taking place around me. It is in fact because I thought I recognized something cracked, dully jarring, or disfunctioning in things I saw in institutions with which I dealt, in my relations with others ... (Foucault, cited in Rajchman 1985, p.36).

Foucault’s words – ‘cracked, dully jarring or disfunctioning’ – resonated with my experiences of working in Conundrum. I regularly and deliberately applied theories in an effort to comprehend or reframe words, actions and events that were uncomfortable, incongruent, contradictory, and erroneous. My desire to research and critique what I saw, heard, and experienced on a daily basis was amplified because there was always another reading, or multiple readings or interpretations. In response to this, I have taken many theoretical and methodological journeys to extend my thinking and the possibilities for my research.

Methodology: Qualitative and Narrative

Qualitative Research

My ontological stance and the epistemological space of policing and Conundrum informed my choice of a qualitative methodological design (see also Chapter 1.)
As I mentioned in Chapter 1, I have included key theorists and their theories in this chapter as they form part of the methodological and analytical framework for deconstructing the data.

It was antithetical to my motivation and affirmative intentions to adopt a positivist approach – ‘assume[ing] that reality is “out there” and it is observable, stable, and measurable’ – which would have kept thought within the current modernist boundaries of policing (Merriam 2009, p.8). I also wanted to move beyond understanding (e.g., using an interpretive paradigm) the police officers’ stories of their experiences of the pedagogies of professional practice and learning and instead apply multiple theoretical lenses – deconstructive, poststructural, critical – to deconstruct and emancipate their stories of the pedagogies.

Fundamental to a qualitative approach is the ‘reflexive’ character of qualitative research and its capacity to produce ‘richly descriptive’ data (Merriam 2009; p.14; Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2006, p.5). The theoretical and methodological interchange and the interaction between the researcher and participants in qualitative and narrative research was also relevant to my research as it generated a richness of ‘culturally situated and theory-enmeshed knowledge’ (Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2006, p.5.), lending itself to multiple interpretations.

Lather’s (2006, pp.35-36) work on the proliferation of paradigms – ‘shift[ing] and collaps[ing] both within and between categories’ – affirmed my decision to use multiple paradigms enabling me to keep in play the multiple perspectives while disrupting the pedagogies. Foucault’s (1977) seminal work on power and regimes of truth that fix what Butler (1993, p.188) referred to as “inside thought” that produces a ‘constitutive outside’ encompassing what is unthinkable, unsayable, invisible, and unknowable. In Conundrum, the structures and ‘limits of intelligibility’ (Britzman 1995, p.155) are reproduced through the prevailing D/discourses and dominant subcultures, traditions, and modernist conceptions of law, order, and policing. The narratives of the police officers in my research
revealed limited and repetitive thinking that represented significant *aporias* and lacunae (see Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7.)

**Narrative**

My reasons for choosing narrative methodology were numerous. A significant feature of the methodology – engaging with ‘research puzzles’ rather than a research question and set of sub-questions – appealed to me on a personal level (Clandinin 2016, p.35). It resonated with my experience of working in *Conundrum* where so much of what I encountered on a daily basis created many tensions, contradictions, and personal and professional puzzles for me. This led me to engage in research that had the potential to influence, shift, or even change, thinking, practice and pedagogies of professional practice and learning to benefit police officers in *Conundrum*. From theoretical and social perspectives, I wanted to look beyond what is to what could be, to open the way to new knowledge, new learning. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, I was keen to research traditionally trained police officers’ lived experiences of the complex and ever-changing landscape of policing in the twenty-first century, and I saw narrative research providing ‘a way of thinking’ about and with data (Clandinin & Connelly 2000, p.43) that is ‘relational’ within and across three dimensions: ‘temporality’, ‘sociality’, and ‘place’ (Clandinin 2016, p.23). For example, thinking about police officers and their relationship to their work and occupation of policing, to place, to experiences and emotions, to cultural, social, and other narratives, and to time – past, present and future. This relational dimension is integral to my decision to use narrative methodology, as my narrative sits simultaneously alongside and within police officers’ narratives. Clandinin (2016, p.24) explains:

... as inquirers ... our lived and told stories are always in relation to, or with, those of participants and their, and our, landscapes ... we are part of the present landscape and the past landscape ...

The police culture and its robust oral history was another reason I chose to use narrative (Chan 2003; Shearing & Ericson 1991; Waddington 1999a,b). As mentioned in previous chapters, Shearing and Ericson (1991, p.487) defined police culture as ‘figurative logic’, where culture is symbolic, rhetorical, and
metaphorical, reproduced through storytelling. Police officers’ experiences can be understood as ‘storied phenomena’, shaped by numerous ‘cultural’, ‘institutional’, ‘personal’ stories of what constitutes police work and police culture (Clandinin 2016; Clandinin & Connelly 2000, p.43). These become the sources of ‘typical narrative meanings’ that produce and reproduce pedagogies of practice for police officers in Conundrum (Polkinghorne 1988, p.6). Narrative, or ‘thinking narratively’, gave me the means of challenging the dominant story of pedagogies of practice and learning as static and constant (Clandinin 2016, p.38).

The concepts of ‘continuity’ and ‘interaction’ are integral to the educational value and impact of experience (Clandinin & Connelly 2000; Dewey 1938, pp.37-42; Squire 2008). The ingredients of each of these include: ‘temporality, people, action, and certainty’ for continuity and ‘context, people, action, and certainty’ for interaction (Clandinin & Connelly 2000, p.21, emphasis in original). People, action, and context in experience and narrative gives some shape and understanding to what is happening, has happened, or is likely to happen. This encompasses reflection-in- and on-action (Schön 1987)

Temporality and certainty, however, are more complicated. Temporality is concerned with thinking about experience not in terms of now, the moment, but rather as something happening over time, on a ‘continuum’; as ‘something “in passing”, in a state of flux, changing over time (Clandinin & Connelly 2000, pp.19-20). For police, this could be understood in terms of the ‘hot action’ of work (Beckett 2001, p.74, 2008, p.23).

Certainty is not quite as it seems because in narrative, ‘interpretations of events can always be otherwise’ (Clandinin & Connelly 2000, p.31). They are elusive representations of experience (Conle 2007), or more profoundly they are ‘construct[ions], reconstruct[ions] … reinvent[ions]’ of what has happened and is anticipated (Bruner 2002, p.93). Narratives convey a degree of ‘tentativeness’ about the meaning of experiences or events (Clandinin & Connelly 2000, p.31). In
essence, ‘narratives are reflections on – not of – the world as it is known’ (Denzin 2004, p.xiii).

In thinking about temporality and certainty for police in *Conundrum*, the technical rationalist thinking and approach to learning and practice is preoccupied with certainty, supported by rules, regulations and procedures (Clandinin & Connelly 2000, p.35). Wrapped up in this notion of certainty is a focus on the here and now. Time is fixed; events or experiences happen and are dealt with, end of story. Oakeshott (1962) argued that in rationalist thinking, reason is found in technique and seeking certainty. This is contrary to notions of experience as educative, transformative and embodied.

Narrative methodology has enabled me to capture the texture of the experiences of the individual police officers. I have also placed myself within the research, as the ‘situated speaker’ of others’ narratives and my own narrative, which connects me to others and to the larger narrative of *Conundrum* (Denzin 2004; Richardson 1990, p.27). I also drew on postmodern narrative (Josselson 2004; Josselson & Leiblich 1995) and ‘experience-centred narrative’ (Conle 2007; Clandinin & Connelly 2000; Squire 2008, p.43).

**Postmodern Narrative and Experience-Centred Narrative**

These two forms of narrative are very much inter-related. A number of commonalities are evident. The human element is a fundamental feature of all narrative representing the ways in which narratives enable ‘sense-making’ (Squire 2008, p.43). Interpreting and making sense of experience, however, carries a caution based on the temporal and spatial qualities of narratives because meaning can be hidden ‘either unconscious[ly] or so embedded in cultural context to make [it] seem invisible’ (Josselson 2007, p.8). This was certainly the case with various *aporias* and lacunae evident in police officers’ narratives in my research. As a result, I was attentive to the police officers’ ‘social world’ (context) and how culture carves, moulds, and restricts or limits the narrative and how the narrator draws on ‘cultural resources’ and grapples with ‘cultural constraints’ (Chase 1995,
This contributes to the contestation of meaning in narratives that reflect inconsistencies, multiple, and at times, contradictory truths and meanings (McAllister 2001). The potential, however, for narratives to reveal ‘transformation and change’ must not be overlooked (Squire 2008, p.42). The narratives of the police officers in Conundrum revealed more inconsistencies and contradictions albeit with some potential for evident for transformation.

Interpretation and experience are ‘highly relative and contextual concepts’ (Josselson & Lieblich 1995, p.ix). Packwood and Sikes (1996, p.342) described the nature of experience as simultaneously fragmented, ‘chaotic and prone to fracturing’. Narratives are always in a state of flux and are reconstituted with each telling (Squire 2008), they are ‘situated representations’ (Josselson 2007, p.10) created through interaction and engagement between the researcher and narrator that extend beyond words, and include the context of the interaction (e.g., contradictions, gaps, pauses, laughter). This reinforces the significance of the co-construction of narratives by the narrator, the researcher, and subsequently by the reader (McAllister 2001). The reader is integral to the experience of making meaning or acknowledging a range of different interpretations and meanings. As McAllister (p.396) claimed:

> Attending to resistances, inconsistencies, silences and other motifs of the postmodern condition, may not lead to any new found certainty, but it can open up an event to expose complexity, trouble some taken-for-granted assumptions ... and open fresh approaches to difficult situations.

Following on from McAllister’s advice, postmodern investigation and analysis of narratives requires what Richardson (2001, p.35, emphasis in original) refers to as an attitude of ‘doubt’. Josselson (2007, p.8) draws on Ricoeur’s (1970) work in hermeneutics and proposes an attitude of ‘suspicion’. This notion of suspicion is expounded in radical hermeneutics (Caputo 2000), which aims to pursue detours and digressions because ‘[m]eaning is inexhaustible in the sense that there is always more to be said, and said differently, about what we encounter in interpretation’ (Fairfield 2011, p.200). Interrogating narratives through lenses of doubt and suspicion require researchers to be attuned to the multiplicity of
meanings and tensions evident in contradictions, inconsistencies, omissions, and repetition highlighting difference. Further to this, words or signifiers of things taken-for-granted, such as power, authority, and gender, are sources of further investigation and analysis (Josselson 2004). In essence, what researchers ‘inevitably do is to create signposts to guide [their] knowledge [or understanding] of another’ (Josselson 1995, p.36). The theories and theorists I draw upon are discussed later in this chapter.

Methods, Data Collection and Analysis

Semi-Structured Interviews

Thirty-six police officers – constables, sergeants, inspectors, and senior police officers in the corporate management team – participated in interviews. Refer to Appendices C and D for details of the cohort. Approval to conduct my research was granted by the Faculty of Arts and Education, Human Ethics Advisory Group (HEAG), Deakin University.

I used semi-structured interviews rather than structured ones. The latter is more controlled by the interviewer and has a degree of rigidity with the exact same series and order of questions being asked of each participant (Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2006). In contrast, the former affords some structure, while allowing a fluid and responsive approach that resembles a conversation. Semi-structured interviews provide opportunities to build trust and rapport between the interviewer and the participants, engaging in a more meaningful and authentic way, appropriate to narrative inquiry (Denzin 2004; Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2006).

Data Collection

The participants were recruited with the support and assistance of the office of Human Resources (HR) in Conundrum. A letter introducing my research, signed by the head of HR, was sent to a cohort of police officers who (as mentioned in Chapter 1) had engaged in both the CBL and WBL pathways and four of the police
officers had been directly involved with the facilitation of the WBL. It was left to individuals to contact me for more information and/or to participate, at which time I provided the plain language statement and consent forms. The participants were given the choice of one of two interviews or a written journal reflecting on their experiences and practice. Interviews were the preferred option. The interviews were conducted during work-hours, including shift work. Approval was given by the head of HR for participants to take time away from work to be interviewed. At no time did the interviews interrupt or hinder work priorities and responsibilities.

The two interviews were: (1) exploring participants’ perceptions of and preferences for learning, and (2) three approaches to reflecting on practice or experiences. Nineteen participants chose the first interview and 17 chose to reflect on their experiences in the second interview. The different foci for the interviews were based on my knowledge of police officers’ likely responses and reactions. On the one hand, some would be hesitant to participate in an interview that asked too much of them personally and professionally, or that might reveal what they perceived as a weakness or a lack of judgment in their practice. This was evident in the Perfect-Self Discourse (Ryan 2008a,b,c) (see Chapter 1). The first interview, therefore, seemed a safer, less intrusive or less confronting option for many of the participants.

The second interview required more effort and was potentially more intrusive and personally and professionally confronting. I was very mindful in planning and conducting this interview to avoid and/or ameliorate any concerns that arose from their reflections of their experiences. First and foremost, as part of their agreement to participate, they were reminded of the counselling and psychological services available to them in Conundrum. Then throughout each interview I was very conscious of a participant’s verbal and non-verbal communication and changed the focus of the interview to accommodate their responses and reactions. I recall guiding some participants to choose a different
situation to reflect upon, avoiding traumatic experiences that might have reignited concerns.

My reasons for adopting the second interview were three-fold. Firstly, reflective practice as a learning and professional development tool had been introduced in all of the education programs in Conundrum. There had been, however, significant suspicion, resistance, and some hostility towards such an approach, in part, based on the belief that thinking (critically or reflectively) was inappropriate when police need to take assertive control and action (Bonifacio 1991). This was evident in the Warrior Discourse and “real” police work subculture (Ryan 2008a, b, c) (see Chapter 1).

Secondly, attempts to focus reflection on the embodied experience of learning, connecting mind and body through the exploration of feelings and emotions, was met with criticism and resistance. This was based on the centrality of policing as practical with little or no scope for thinking or feeling (Bonifacio 1991). For example, a common response to my question, ‘How did you feel when that happened?’ was ‘It went OK’ (Bruce, constable). This signified a return to the practical and action-based perception of policing, and an essentially disembodied approach to practice and learning.

A semi-structured format created a setting in which participants had ‘some latitude and freedom to talk about what [was] of interest or important to them’ and ‘making room for the conversation to go in new and unexpected directions’ (Nagy Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2006, pp. 125-126). It was more conducive to participants telling their stories rather than answering questions, and I wanted the interview to be more personalised, adaptable, and, to a degree, a shared encounter: ‘a co-creation of meaning’ (Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2006 p.134, emphasis in original), or, I prefer, a co-creation of multiple meanings (Clandinin 2016). As an outsider-part insider, I was in a position to more quickly and easily build trust and rapport, and I had access to insider information that supported a common language and understanding.
The interviews could not be overly structured nor be viewed as an interrogation. On a number of occasions I was conscious of wanting to pursue issues in more detail, but I did not for fear of jeopardising the process. Police are sceptical about others’ questions and are cautious about revealing anything that might be construed as weakness. They do not readily engage in research and need to have a high degree of trust before they participate.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, changes had been made to the education programs to establish and engender a more positive, transformative notion and understanding of professional learning, development, and professional practice. This represented attempts to shift thinking and practice from producing compliant technicians to developing reflexive, critical thinking practitioners. In exploring and wishing to deconstruct the pedagogies of professional practice and learning, I chose the second interview with the aim of seeing how police understood and engaged with this key ingredient of professional learning and practice: reflecting on experiences, learning from them, and sharing that learning.

**Analysis**

I engaged in three different readings of the narratives (Stronach & Maclure 1997). The first reading involved a critical analysis of the discourse in the narratives to identify key concepts and themes. Throughout the first reading I concentrated on the three dimensions relevant to narrative inquiry – temporality, sociality and place – as they related to the pedagogies of professional practice and learning and police officers’ subjectivities. Applying these dimensions enabled me to layer and contextualise the data from the narratives. This stage of the analysis necessitated numerous readings of the data. A number of themes emerged, for example, what knowledge was produced and reproduced and how, whose interests were served, internal and external power relations, identity and subjectivity of individuals and their sense of agency and purpose, and gender-power relations were also present.
The second reading involved a deconstruction of these themes. As I read and re-read the themes from the first reading, I was attentive to the contradictions, tensions, doubtful matters (aporeias), blind spots (lacunae), and repetition. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, repetition of themes and concepts was consistently evident across police officers’ narratives. As a result of this reading, I began to categorise key concepts relevant to power and knowledge, gender, (dis)embodied practice, and practice and knowledge. Initially, I separated gender and (dis)embodied practice, but as I disrupted and deconstructed the data, commonalities were evident between the two, so I combined them into one chapter (Chapter 5.)

The third reading focused on finding shifts in meaning and disrupting meaning. I applied a range of theoretical lenses to interrogate the data. I drew on the theorists and their theories outlined later in this chapter. This reading formed the basis of the critique and discussion of police officers’ narratives in the three chapters – 4, 5, and 6. The third reading also assisted me in ‘remobilizing’ meaning: looking beyond what is to what could be.

**Ethical Considerations**

The primary ethical concerns centred on maintaining anonymity of the individual police officers and the organisation. As a consequence, I created pseudonyms for both. Each participant received a copy of the plain language statement and signed a consent form to participate in my research.

**A Moment ...**

I recall Fay’s comment that it is not so much ‘learning the theory’ but rather ‘learning to conceive of oneself in terms of the theory’ (1987:114, emphasis in original). I enjoy theory and theorising with an ‘affirmative’ (Biesta2001, p.33, emphasis in original), optimistic motivation and intent reflecting ‘a concern for the other’ (Biesta 2001, p.33). I see this intention and concern aligning with Derrida and his concept of deconstruction (Caputo 1997, pp.41-42). It is a
pertinent approach to my research ‘thinking about institutions ... [and] traditions’, keeping them ‘on the move’ and evolving to enable the emergence of new and different thinking and practice (Caputo 1997, p.37).

As I mentioned earlier in my thesis, I am keen to move towards something different, to new understanding with the potential for new learning. To achieve this, I am committed to engaging with theory to look between, beyond, and against prevailing attitudes and practices represented in the data (Ball 2006, p.3). The methodological and theoretical journeys I have taken have helped me to find and make space for my (researcher's) ‘creative imagination and personal cognitive ability’ (Kettley 2012, p.9). I have grasped Maclure’s (2010, p.277) advice to allow theory ‘to get in the way’ with the aim of ‘troubl[ing] tidy binaries’ (Lather 2000, p.36), identifying aproias and lacunae, and ‘produc[ing] different knowledge and produc[ing] knowledge differently’ (Lather 2006, p.52; St Pierre 2000, p.27).

I am very aware of the incompleteness, limitations, and tenuous nature of knowledge and I balance this with my awareness of my position and responsibilities as a researcher and the author of this thesis (Richardson 1990). I am not, and neither could be, completely objective, in part because of my experience working within Conundrum, but also because I am located “somewhere” (Richardson 1990, p.27). I am an ‘embodied, historically and culturally situated speaker’ of others’ experiences and stories (Richardson 1990, p.27). Along with that, I have an ethical responsibility for the ‘authorship’ of their stories (Richardson 1990, p.28, emphasis in original).

Equipped with this awareness, I am committed to the ‘necessity ... of theory’ in research to open up and keep the data in play, thereby avoiding closure (Ball 2006, p.3; Jackson & Mazzei 2012). I am very aware of the potential contradictions and tensions between my approach and the expectations of the budding profession of policing given the influential resurgence of positivist, scientific, evidence-based research agendas and practices (Ball 2006; Carr 2009; Green 2009; Lather 2006; Wright 2008). In addition, a focus on practice-based
knowledge, its production and reproduction, evident in policing carries assumptions of theory as ‘esoteric, separate from practice, often thought of as ‘critical’ in a negative way’ (Wright 2008, p.3), or irrelevant and unnecessary, and open to censure and disregard.

The Value of Theory

Without theory it would be difficult to counter the common-sensical appeal and the pedestrian contributions to knowledge of audit-driven approaches such as evidence-based practice and systematic review (MacLure 2010, p.278).

A deconstructive approach and the analysis of the narratives by way of three different readings meant that theory was integral to the methodology, hence its placement in this chapter, as opposed to Chapter 2. I was drawn to Macure’s (2010) description of theory as potentially offensive in that it challenges what is “known” and opens the way to something other. Her assertion of the necessity of theory to counteract the impact of Neoliberal, Managerial regimen and evidence-based practice on knowledge production is pertinent to policing, as discussed in the previous two chapters. I appreciate the value of theory helping me to keep in play data, relationships, structures and other phenomena (Ball 2006; Clandinin 2016; Lather 2006). On the one hand, I acknowledge that theories are contaminated with notions of truth and logic or ‘logos’ 10. On the other hand, I am conscious of the potential of theories to reveal what lies behind or within (i.e., ‘mythos’) while simultaneously exposing difference, contradiction, uncertainty, and Otherness (Maclure 2010; Spitzer 2011, pp.xvi, emphasis in original).

10 The Greek origins of the word ‘logos’ reveal numerous meanings ‘... from sentence ... to account ... to argument ... to reason (in the sense of a rational principle) ...’ (Brann, Kalkavage & Salem 1998, p.102). Another distinction is ‘logos’ – ‘argument’, ‘mythos’ – ‘story’ (Brann et al, p.2). ‘[L]ogos is truth (its status can be conclusively ascertained by the faculties of the intellect), mythos, in contrast, is neither true nor false ...’ Instead, it is likened to ‘myth’ and is ambiguous and ‘inferior’ to logos (Spitzer 2011, p.xvii). ‘[T]he cannot be discerned through the powers of reason, it therefore can be used to persuade, not by logical argumentation, but instead by appealing to lesser faculties of the senses’ (Spitzer 2011, p.xvii). Logos therefore can represent truth, reason, and logic.
“Unthought” Data

This brings me to Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012, p.3) research and their ‘efforts to resist the containment of interpretivism’ and so doing they were aiming to ‘use theory to think with data (or use data to think with theory)’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.vii). Their premise was that ‘theory and data constitute and make one another’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.6). To realise this, and with reference to Derrida, they ‘arrested’ the data, keeping them active and in play, acknowledging, or ‘mak[ing] a brief visit’ to, the ‘traces of past and future readings’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.6, emphasis in original). By arresting the data to think with theory, ‘temporary meaning ... can escape and transform at any moment – at moments after more readings ...’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.6, emphasis in original).

They identified particular theorists and their respective philosophical ideas. They described their analysis as if each theorist was ‘looking over [their] shoulder’ to ‘help [them] extend [their] thinking beyond an easy sense’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.7). Significantly, they saw ‘nothing pure’ in the participants’ stories. Rather, they saw the stories as vehicles ‘to see what gets made, not understood’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.3). Their approach resonated with my intentions. I invited participants to share their experiences realising that their experiences had already been interpreted and reinterpreted by them (Bruner 2002; Denzin 2004; Ricoeur 1991), but I still needed them to tell me of their experiences. I wanted to see what their stories produced separately and collectively.

I was aware of the need to bring rigour and validity to qualitative research by using recognised methods of coding, however, I noted and concurred with Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012, pp.vii-viii) cautions of the inadequacies of ‘mechanistic coding’, in providing thematic “chunks” and superficial interpretations. Their approach involved looking for and exposing ‘difference rather than sameness’ (p.4), attempting to unsettle phenomena in order to:

... decenter some of the traps in humanistic qualitative inquiry: for example, data, voice, narrative and meaning-making. In other words, our methodological aims
were against interpretive imperatives that limit so-called “analysis” and inhibit the inclusion of previously unthought “data”.

I noted similarities to Pearce and Maclure’s (2009, p.250) efforts looking for ‘absence rather than presence’ or ‘absence and difference’ and ‘the unsaid’ rather than ‘the said’.

Drawing on Jackson and Mazzei’s (2012) approach, I too identified significant theories and theorists, outlined in the remainder of this chapter. These theories and theorists gave me a framework with which to deconstruct the police officers’ narratives to identify aporias and lacunae in order to apply a different reading and interpretation. As mentioned previously, I was interested in doubtful matters, tensions, contradictions, and inconsistencies in meaning or the representation of ideas, what is visible and invisible, sayable and unsayable (Derrida 1997; Josselson 2004; Richardson 1990). The theorists from whom I drew inspiration and guidance represent a plurality of perspectives, promising and providing eclectic and workable concepts.

Gulson and Parkes (2010, p.79) have described theory as ‘productive ... provid[ing] a set of epistemological limits’. Such limits, however, have the potential to blur our vision, constrain and even stop us thinking beyond what is before us, taken for granted, unquestioningly tolerated (Maclure 2010). This was pertinent to police officers in Conundrum and the context of my research. I therefore preferred to see theory as a way of ‘thinking otherwise’, for applying a critical lens and hypothesising differently (Ball 1995, p.266). In educational research, Lather (2006, p.53) has argued for theory to expose problems, unpack and trouble complexities, and ‘think outside easy intelligibility and transparent understanding’. This sat comfortably with my motivation to disrupt and trouble the pedagogies. I was also inspired by from Rose (1999, p.20) who proposed: ‘... introducing a kind of awkwardness into the fabric of one’s experience ... interrupting the fluency of the narratives ... and making them stutter’.
This resonated with my concern for the tears\textsuperscript{11} and knots that expose aporias, and lacunae. To explain these terms and to put them into context, I refer to Spitzer’s (2011, p.37) insights to Derrida’s use of the phrase ‘the fabric of text’ wherein tears appear. These tears simultaneously join and separate representing at once a gap or fracture and an addition (Spitzer 2011, p.27). It is through tears that mythos, as opposed to logos, is revealed. This revelation involves ‘unheard’ and unthought remains’ (Spitzer 2011, p.3) that logos can neither capture nor understand. The tenacity of the logos is evident in the pedagogies that define professional practice and learning for police officers in Conundrum. Taylor (1990) advises to read in a way that is open to the tears, which once retied, create knots that interrupt and disrupt the meaning and reading of the text, creating ‘doubtful matters’ (aporias), including lacunae.

Expanding on this, I am reminded of Maclure’s ‘metaphors of fabrication’ when thinking about method and methodology (2003, p.127, emphasis in original), and her summary of Derrida’s thoughts:

\begin{quote}
Texts are always incomplete and fragmentary because they are part of the unceasing fabrication of the world, which involves both making and unmaking. Bits are unraveling at the very instant that new connections are being knotted together (Maclure 2003, p.128).
\end{quote}

The police officers’ narratives recounted by me are made and unmade through different readings and interpretations: my own and others’. Fundamental to the different readings and interpretations will be the narratives and their effect as examples. Massumi (2002) and Maclure (2010) advocated the power of examples as dynamic contributions, with the detail within an example or the details that constitute other examples within each example. In my research, the police officers’ narratives are the examples harbouring the tears, knots, aporias and lacunae. Massumi (2002, p.18) proposed that: ‘Every example harbors terrible powers of deviation and digression’; that examples can ‘shift’ thinking and

\textsuperscript{11} The tears are exposed by the ‘indecidable dynamic of mythos’, which ‘destabilizes’ logos. Tears can be understood as ‘ruptures … in a piece of fabric and the briny pools shed from the eye in times of joy and sorrow.’ These tears represent ‘how another reading intervenes, interrupting the discourse of logos’ (Spitzer 2011, p.24), or what is presented as logic and truth. The analogy of a piece of fabric is used in this thesis, and the tears are understood as ruptures, openings, that interrupt what is taken for granted, presented as universal truths.
'writing', and he encouraged researchers to remain open to the detours and the unexpected emanating from examples, and to the likelihood of 'surprise' (Massumi 2002, p. 18). I was reminded of Italo Calvino’s (1998, p.18) advice: To read properly you must take in both the murmuring effect and the effect of the hidden intention, which you (and I, too) are as yet in a position to perceive. In reading, therefore, you must remain both oblivious and highly alert.

**Theories and Theorists: Looking over my shoulder**

**Habitus, Field and Doxa**: Bourdieu | Maton

*Habitus*, field, capital, doxa and practice are assemblages of a suite of ‘thinking tools’ that are relational (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1989, p.50). The nature of the field (social spaces) and the capital (symbolic, cultural, social) to which individuals have access interact with *habitus*. They are conterminous concepts that produce and reproduce sets of dispositions that are reflected in doxa and through practice.

*Habitus* is interconnected with the ‘social world’ and the individual (Maton 2012, p.48, p.52). Bourdieu (1977, p.72, emphasis in original) described *habitus* as embedded structured ‘systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ (i.e., propensity, temperament) that create and construct ‘practices and representations’, which are unconsciously acquired and become particular ways of thinking, seeing and acting. Doxa represents the nexus between *habitus* and field (Bourdieu 1980, p.68). It can be understood as traditions, norms, prevailing thoughts and perceptions that are taken for granted, unquestioned ... adhered to, seen as normal and natural (p.68). It stems from experience, is ‘intuitive’, shared and, significantly, it represents unquestioned opinions and perceptions (Deer 2012, p.115). Importantly, the limits of the traditions and thoughts are so ingrained they are not recognisable (Bourdieu 1977, p.164).

This highlighted a tension between how individuals experience the world (‘individual agency’) and how institutionalised practice and systems implicitly regulate individual’s thinking and practices (Maton 2012, p.49). While individuals
might think they are ‘free agents’, their behaviour is “regulated” by implicit rules based on the expectations of society and others: what is understood to be good (appropriate) behaviour versus bad (inappropriate) behaviour. Maton’s (2012, p.48) interpretation of the purpose of habitus can be seen ‘to transcend a series of deep-seated dichotomies that shape ways of thinking about the social world’. Belief systems in institutions are generated, authorised, and maintained through discourse, signs and symbols, habits, rules, practices: what is speakable / unspeakable, what is knowable / unknowable, what is visible / invisible (Bourdieu 1977, p.169). Doxa is saturated in power and establishes and nurtures power relations. It is persuasive, demanding immediate submission where there are neither other nor alternative traditions, thoughts and perceptions.

One’s past in terms of experiences and contexts (community, profession, family, education, gender) shapes habitus and creates ‘schemes of perception, thought and action’ (1990, p.54). Within the context of practice, these schemes tend to the reproduction of what is as opposed to the contestation and transformation (p.54). Bourdieu (p.55) emphasised the generative capacity of habitus ‘whose limits are set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production ...’, which ‘enables the institution to attain full realization’ (1990, p.57).

Maton (2012, p.51) summed up habitus as that which:

... focuses us on our ways of acting, feeling, thinking and being. It captures how we carry within us our history, how we bring this history into our present circumstances, and how we then make choices to act in certain ways and not others.

Bourdieu (1980, p.56) asserted that habitus is internalised, representing ‘embodied history’. It invades and occupies the body, reflected in stance, posture, demeanour, and what can be thought and felt and how that is represented. Bourdieu (1977, p.93, emphasis in original) referred to the outcome of this embodied process as ‘bodily hexis’. He asserted that institutions:

seeking to produce a new man through a process of “deculturation” and “reculturation” set such store on ... significant details of dress, bearing, physical and verbal manners.
The body therefore is ‘made’ and is imbued with meta-messages such as ‘stand up straight’ and to which I would add, from a police perspective, ‘Don’t show your emotions’ and ‘Don’t cry’. Actions and behaviour become second nature.

An inherent connection exists between habitus and field. As mentioned above, habitus represents an internalised history, while the field is an externalised or ‘objectified history’. The meta-messages within, and of, the habitus signify what Bourdieu (1980, p.66) referred to as ‘a feel for the game’. This translates to an uncritical acceptance of what is rational, sensible; providing ‘a meaning and a raison d’etre, ... also a direction, an orientation, an impending outcome ...’ (Bourdieu 1980, p.66). Fundamental to an individual’s assimilation of a particular habitus and field is their belief, acceptance and willingness to commit to the game. While Bourdieu (1990, p.195, emphasis in original) described the investment in and commitment to the game as illusio, it is important to note that it ‘doesn’t become an illusion’: certainly not to those individuals in the game. It does however appear illusory to those who are outside of, or external to, the game. Taking the example of the “game” of police recruitment and training. It has been likened to a “fraternal funnel” (Conti 2006, p.240) whereby the recruits are ‘seeking an elevation of their status’ (Conti 2006, p.225) working towards achieving their police identity, wrapped up in notions of power and authority. However, ‘within a culture of obedience to authority, honour is eventually achieved through subordination ...’ (Conti 2006, p.238).

Bradley (2009a, p.101) likened police recruit training to a ‘rite of passage’. This is akin to Bourdieu’s concept of ‘practical faith’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.68) where entry to a field occurs in such a way as to achieve ‘undisputed, pre-reflexive, naïve, native compliance with the fundamental presuppositions of the field’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.68): socialisation and normalisation of the habitus and the doxa. Through this, ‘symbolic capital’ is created, which exists and is enacted requiring that ‘the logic of the functioning of the field remains misrecognised’ (Bourdieu 1990a, p.68).
Institutions that are closed or protective to external intervention and interruption are more likely to develop stable systems that have the capacity to construct enduring and wide ranging doxa. Interestingly, parallels can be drawn between doxa and common sense, also considered a commonly understood form of wisdom (Geertz 1973). Both doxa and common sense are ‘beyond question’, immune to rebuff (Bourdieu 1977, p.169; Rescher 2005). Deer (2012, p.115) described it as ‘the reality that goes unanimously unquestioned because it lies beyond any notion of enquiry’. While they each enable and, in a sense, simplify communication, they simultaneously limit what can be said, heard and known (Rosenfeld 2011).

**Forms of Capital : Bourdieu**

Bourdieu (1977, 1990a, b) identified three forms of capital, or power: symbolic, cultural and social. He described a field as a ‘site of struggles’ where some individuals will wish to maintain the ‘status quo’ while others will aim for change (1990b, p.14). The symbolic capital is ‘commonly called prestige, reputation, fame, etc’ (1990a, p.230). Significantly, capital ‘becomes symbolic, and exerts a specific effect of domination ... symbolic power or symbolic violence, when it is known and recognized ... when it is the object of an act of knowledge and recognition’. It can simultaneously occur, however, when it is ‘misrecognized in its arbitrary truth as capital and recognized as legitimate ...’ (1990a, p.112, emphasis in original).

Common to the recognition or misrecognition is the phrase “that looks”, where they resemble or are different from particular concepts, practices or ideas (e.g., ‘that looks professional’, ‘that looks paramilitary’, ‘that looks authoritarian’) (Bourdieu 1990b, p.113). The power of symbolic and other capital is reliant on the strength of individual’s ‘total and unconditional ‘investment’, a practical and unquestioning belief, in the game and its stakes’ (Bourdieu 1990b, p.14).

Cultural capital is produced following immersion in a particular *habitus* (e.g., the military, police) resulting in the ‘cultivation of a sensibility’ that befits the
specialised *habitus* and is able to be transposed beyond that field to others (Bourdieu 10977, 1990a,b; Moore 2012). Moore (2012, p.111) asserted that: ‘Cultural capital has its highest value when it is (a) most highly formed and (b) optimized in terms of transposability’.

The social capital is concerned with the language and, not just words, but symbolic forms of social capital. For instance, to become skilled at, to take on board and perform the language of a particular *habitus* and field is significant not only in acquiring the language, but that in doing so, power is vested in the individual by and through the group that ‘authorizes and recognizes’ the language.

Agents are thus distributed, in the first dimension, according to the overall volume of the capital they possess and, in the second dimension, according to the composition of their capital – in other words, according to the relative weight of the different kinds of capital in the total set of their assets (Bourdieu 1990a, p.231).

One’s place in a symbolic space depends on how immersed in the game one is and how one’s sense and place of self is always measured in comparison to others’ sense and place of self in a particular *habitus* and field (Bourdieu 1990a, p.113).

**Deconstruction :** Derrida | Biesta | Caputo | Johnson

I am applying Derrida’s concept of deconstruction as it operates within a radical hermeneutic framework. To put this into a context, the early hermeneutics of Heidegger and Gadamer were criticised for staying within the realms of metaphysics with the goal of finding and securing the truth (Caputo 1997, 2000; Derrida 1987). Derrida (cited in Caputo 2000, p.2) was concerned that in order to find the truth, hermeneutics was “‘arrest[ing] the text’” – seizing, halting, freezing text – as opposed to resting on the text and allowing ‘*temporary meaning* ... [to] escape and transform at any moment’ (Jackson & Mazzei 2012, p.6, emphasis in original). This corresponded with the mission of postmodern and radical hermeneutics, with its deconstructive bent, and my intention to adopt an attitude of ‘*doubt*’ (Richardson 2001, p.35, emphasis in original) and ‘*suspicion*’ (Josselson
2007, p.8) and to mobilise ‘the play of language’ (Fairfield 2011, p.196) and avoid arresting and fixing meaning. Instead, I aim to create space for other interpretations, perspectives, and concepts to emerge.

Despite criticisms of deconstruction, including but not limited to – ‘ethically void, politically impotent, potentially dangerous’ (Biesta 2001, p.33) – Derrida (1983, p.44) admitted he disliked the word, but he (1996, p.85) reflected: ‘as time passes, and when I see so many people trying to get rid of this word, I ask myself whether there is something in it’. I believe it is worthwhile and appropriate to apply to the context and topics of my research. In reading Biesta’s (2001, p.33) work on deconstruction, I am further convinced that its ‘concern for the other’ is ethically and politically sound. I see more positives than negatives in the application of deconstruction to my research. This is reinforced by Derrida’s (cited in Biesta 2001, p.33) assertions that it is not destructive, negative, or ‘an enclosure to nothingness’ rather it is ‘an openness towards the other’.

Deconstruction cannot be described and understood within the existing frames and terms that establish and regulate truths about identities, subjectivities, learning and professional practice (Newmark 2003, p.30). Rather it is alert to what happens and how events happen and thinking otherwise about events and phenomena (Newmark 2003, p.30). St Pierre (2011, p.616) explained that deconstruction is not understood as ‘something done to [the] text or any other structure’, but as something that happens of itself, by itself, on itself. Therefore, she (p.616, emphasis in original) argued, ‘the text, the concept, the structure undoes itself’.

In keeping with this notion of undoing and unraveling, Derrida (1981, p.63) recommended ‘follow ... the hidden thread’ rather than those threads that ‘lead to synthesis and unity’. Or as Norris (1987, p.19) proposed, ‘seeking-out ... “aporias”, blind spots of moments of self-contradiction ...’ and where there is ambiguity of meaning. Vigilance towards hidden threads, aporias and lacunae is what constitutes a ‘different’ reading (Spitzer 2011, p.52). Interpretation is not ‘arbitrary’
or aimed at abandoning reason (Caputo 2000, p.198) nor is it about creating ‘confusions and anarchy’ (Caputo 2000, p.200; Caputo 1997). Instead, as noted above, its mission is to keep things active in order to understand language and phenomena differently. In this context, unsettling modernist notions of law, order and policing in order to create movement that constructs pedagogies of practice and learning for police in *Conundrum*.

Deconstruction has also been described as a ‘critique’ (Johnson 1981, p.xv, emphasis in original). Explicating this in her introduction to her translation of Derrida’s *Dissemination*, Johnson (1981, p.xv) wrote:

> The critique reads backwards from what seems natural, obvious, self-evident, or universal, in order to show that these things have their history, their reasons for being the way they are, their effects on what follows from them, and that the starting point is not a (natural) given but a (cultural) construct, usually blind to itself.

Johnson’s advice to look beyond that which is taken-for-granted, seen as a natural consequence or occurrence, and instead seeing phenomena as culturally constructed is relevant to policing and *Conundrum* in terms of power relations and gendered relations for instance. Newmark (2003) noted the rejection of deconstruction by some based on negative perceptions and misunderstanding of its functions. In particular, he (p.37) explained:

> … deconstruction tends to be summarily dismissed by those institutions and their representatives that would be most threatened and have the most to lose by having their own unexamined claims to mastery and purity exposed as illusory.

Johnson’s (1981) description and concerns and Newmark’s (2003) explanation of the rejection of deconstruction align with some of the features of institutions or organisations (e.g., policing and *Conundrum*) that tend towards closure and disregard for difference and other ways of thinking and functioning. Such closure and disregard could be founded on fear of losing power, credibility, and intrigue, or an unwillingness or inability to acknowledge and accept critiques of the constructs simultaneously creating lacunae and undermining their very foundations. Literature has revealed an avoidance of, and towards, the
postmodern in police research, despite claims by some of the benefits for policing in the twenty-first century (Clark 2005; Waters 2007).

Brown and Jones (2001, p.99) advised that opening up does not equate to replacing or reversing binaries and contradictions. Instead, ‘... it obliges another look and yet another set of questions ... [or] alternative interpretations’, supporting the existence of multiple meanings, interpretations, and possibilities. It is starting from the position of looking for what is invisible, unknown, unthought, and unsaid, as opposed to what is visible, known, and said (Brown & Jones 2001): those doubtful matters (aporias) and blind spots (lacunae).

**Mimesis : Derrida | Schweiker**

Derrida (1981, p.193) argued that ‘mimesis’, as a modernist concept, is the obsession and the object of truth, on the one hand being defined as imitation and, on the other, ‘the presentation of the thing itself’ true to its present form because ‘the present is its norm, its order, its law’ (Derrida 1981, p.193). He (p.191) described it as ‘feed[ing] its own proliferation’. This conception of mimesis connotes realism and security (Schweiker 1988), whereby truth is implanted in the mimetic act (Derrida 1981, p.193). It is inherent in the modernist character of policing and Conundrum. Participants’ narratives expose the mimetic act of learning as predominant and encapsulated in that act of learning are pedagogies that reinforce gender and power relations, what knowledge is produced and how it is reproduced.

Mimesis becomes more fluid and less definite from a deconstructive/postmodern perspective confounded by ambiguity and the potential for different perspectives (Schweiker 1988). As mimesis represents something – an action, a word or a belief – that something simultaneously becomes visible and invisible (Derrida 1981, p.193). It is ‘constantly disappearing’ (Derrida 1981, p.157), deferring meaning and what is or how things seem to be (Schweiker 1988, p. 34). Policing, as a word and an action, is caught in a mimetic process reflecting greater ambiguity and deferment of its meaning. Schweiker (1988, p.34) declared mimesis as
‘paradoxical’ having a ‘performative and figurative character’. Underlying his understanding of mimesis as a ‘form of praxis’ is the conterminous nature of ‘practice’ or ‘enactment’ (Schweiker 1988, p.37). This not only connects with the predominant nature of learning in Conundrum but also a disembodied approach to learning, which will be introduced in this chapter and discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters.

**Sous Rature : Derrida**

Sitting alongside the notion of mimesis is sous rature, being under erasure, being erased, adjusted and readjusted in response to particular situations. Words and concepts are not fixed signifiers of meaning; instead they represent the interplay of difference between the signifiers of meaning because there is always a trace of the other (Derrida 1997, p.xvii). Meaning therefore is exposed to erasure (sous rature): constantly adjusting and readjusting.

Identity is sous rature. Through experiences and encounters with others and institutions, identity is in a constant state of alteration and modification. Not in terms of correct or incorrect or ‘truth and reality’, but rather adjusting, readjusting to experiences and encounters with others (Rambo-Ronai 1999, p.115). It is essentially a construction of oneself in response to encounters with others and systems and institutions. As is noted in analyses of subjectivities, one’s identity and subjectivity can be simultaneously understood as “I”, based on one’s own experience, as an “Other” to others, as ‘a subject of knowledge’, or discourses and doxa, and a subject of the ‘physical environment’ (Gagnier 1991, p.8).

Derrida asserted that identity involves a process of sous rature ... this can be applied to police officers' identities and subjectivities as they respond to particular situations, experiences and environments in a context filled with contradictions and tensions. A number of events and changes are occurring on the periphery of policing (yet central to policing) in the twenty-first century (e.g., pluralised society, private policing services, technological changes, agendas to apply scientific rigour to policing, to name a few). Policing is however stuck in place,
glued to existing frames that regulate conceptions of policing founded on modernist notions of police, law and order, power and gender relations and knowledge claims.

To varying degrees, an ‘invisible erasure’ is occurring where different notions of what policing entails are being tested, but these differences and changes are not being acknowledged or recognised because of the glue of modernist notions, so police continue to ‘act as though this makes no difference’ (Derrida 1997, p.xviii). The very closure towards acknowledging the difference represents an invisible erasure.

**Power Relations and Power-Knowledge**: Foucault | Gore | McNay

The very nature of power is multifaceted, produced and reproduced through constant processes and strategies of contestation and transformation: it is ubiquitous ‘because it comes from everywhere’ (Foucault 1976, pp.92-93). It is simultaneously linked to and inherent in numerous relationships – social, economic, political, individual, institutional, ideological – that operate as its source and vehicles, establishing power-relations (Foucault 1976, p.94). While this conception of power implies notions of passivity in the face of its processes and strategies, Foucault (1976, pp.95-96) stressed that resistance comes from power, is embedded in power and power-relations, creating the dichotomy of power / resistance.

Alongside and within power relations is power-knowledge, which reflects the constitutive functions of power to produce knowledge and for knowledge to exist within relations of power (Foucault 1977). I am guided by Gore’s (1993, p.51) recommendation to view power-knowledge (with a dash) to denote difference between the two words, as opposed to power/knowledge (with a stroke) that joins the terms or implies either/or. Importantly, Foucault’s work over a number of years identified three significant dimensions, namely power, knowledge and self. Further to this, is the embodiment of power: ‘in, on, through and around the body’
(Gore 1993, p.55). Power therefore can be understood as a ‘productive network’ (Foucault 1980, p.119), with the potential to produce negative and positive consequences or outcomes. The symbiosis of power and knowledge – how attached and detached – and how knowledge of self is produced and sustained are central considerations for police officers in Conundrum (Foucault 1980).

Wrapped up in the power-knowledge network is truth or ‘regimes of truth’ (Foucault 1980, p.131) evident in discourses, procedures, systems and ‘the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true’ (Foucault 1980, p.131). There exist regimes of truth in policing and Conundrum, produced and reproduced by social, cultural, institutional systems, procedures, and traditions, and enduring modernist notions of law, order and policing. Significant and requiring scrutiny and disruption are the effects of truth and power-knowledge relations on ‘the bodies of social agents’ (McNay 1994, p.63). Foucault (1977, pp.27-28) asserted that ‘power-knowledge relations’ needed to be understood and examined in terms of the ways (i.e., procedures, practices, discourses) in which ‘forms and possible domains of knowledge’ are established, maintained, and resisted. Further to this, is a concern for the ‘body politic’ and how power-knowledge relations subdue bodies to become ‘objects of knowledge’ (Foucault 1977, p.28).

Add discipline to the play of power-knowledge and bodies become ‘subjected, practised ... and ‘docile’ ... in ‘a relation of strict subjection’ (1984, p.138). Foucault (1984, p.83) claimed that ‘[t]he body is the inscribed surface of events’, carrying the scars of previous experiences. Further to this, McNay (1994, p.91) described ‘[t]he human body [as] the most specific point at which the microstrategies of power can be observed’, therefore the ‘disciplinary techniques’ of systems and institutions (i.e., such as schools, army, police) that produce the body as a political object (Foucault 1976, p.140; McNay 1994, p.93).

Surveillance as a method of ‘disciplinary power’ is a further source of the production and reproduction of power-knowledge relations (Foucault 1977, p.175). The significance of surveillance is its subtle yet invasive and coercive character
that establishes and controls behaviour and practice through ‘observation’ –
 hierarchical and lateral or individual – and ‘normalizing judgement’ (1977, p.170).
 Surveillance as a hierarchical function is effective at keeping visible and malleable
 whole systems and those inside the systems. The full potential of its functions, as
 a discipline and ‘relational power’, is realized through the efforts of individuals
 within systems to observe and judge others’ compliance or non-compliance to
 established rules and practices (1977, p.177). Punishment as a ‘corrective’ measure
 is used in response to non-compliance (1977, p.179). In policing, discipline might
 well be seen as a way of ensuring correct behaviour with punishment (e.g.,
 exclusion, humiliation) providing the means of correcting behaviour. It is however
 far more problematic. For police recruits living and training in the academy, they
 are under constant observation and subjected to judgements measured against
 the existing rules, procedures and discourses of policing and the organisation. The
 interrelated nature and effects of power-knowledge relations and truth on the
 body also touch on the concept of (dis)embodiment and (dis)embodied practice
 and learning, the focus of the work of Csordas (1994), Merleau-Ponty (2002),
 O’Loughlin (2006) and others.

**Postmodern Self and Subjectivity**: Biehl et al | Hall | Haraway | Deleuze

Postmodern notions of culture are integral to thinking about the postmodern self,
 subjectivity, and agency. Central to this consideration is that culture is evolving,
 being regularly reconfigured by and through the range of complex and multiple
 social encounters, interactions, ethico-political manoeuvres and debates,
 resulting in different and dynamic social arrangements and roles (Biehl, Good &
 Kleinman 2007; Fischer 2003; Hall 2004). In today’s society, in the first world,
 people can choose different lifestyles, ‘modes of self-presentation’ including
 gender and sexuality, and they can experiment with different identities. There is a
 diverse set of options from which to choose and with which to engage and
 participate in; no longer ‘I’ but ‘we’. A proposition for a postmodern conception of
 self and subjectivity might more aptly read as ‘We think ... and rethink ... and
therefore we are’ (Hall, p.130), replacing Decartes’s original cogito of “I think therefore I am”.

Haraway has applied the phrase “permanent partiality” to notions of subjectivity (1991, p.173), denoting fluidity. A number of authors also emphasise ethics and responsibility – individual and institutional – with reference to self, subjectivity and culture (Biehl et al; Fischer 2003; Hall 2004; Haraway 1991). Globalisation, technological advances, and the interface with technology impact on one’s agency, how one perceives oneself, how one is perceived by others: there is less clarity about self and identity and more choices to make about so many aspects of our lives (Hall 1991; Haraway 1991). Alongside ethics and responsibility are notions and questions surrounding ‘responsibility and culpability’ (Hall, p.125).

The postmodern self is ‘heterogeneous’ – varied, incongruous – and it is temporal, being inured by time, always distinguished in terms of the past and the future (Lawlor 2015, p.1). I note Deleuze’s (1994, p.86, emphasis in original) description of self as essentially fractured:

... there is no identity constitutive of the self (or of the subject). Instead of identity, I find, inside myself, difference: ‘I as an other’.

The ‘we’ is collective, but not unified. It is varied (Deleuze 1994). The erasure of police officers’ identities and the changing roles and responsibilities create multiple and conflicting subjectivities.

**The Body and Perception** : Merleau-Ponty | O’Loughlin | Csordas

There is a plethora of literature and theories as to the corporeality of the body. The body and perception are pivotal to police culture and the pedagogies that produce and reproduce learning and practice for police officers in Conundrum and is realised through the binary of ‘mind/body’, which presupposes and establishes the privileging of one over the other. In today’s knowledge economy, the mind is privileged over the body with the latter being ‘subordinated’ and invisible (Grosz 1994). Grosz identified other dichotomies and argues their conterminous
relationship with the mind/body dichotomy. In particular, she noted: ‘reason and
passion’, ‘outside and inside’, ‘reality and appearance’, ‘temporality and spatiality’,
and rational and emotional, public and private, male/man and female/woman
could be added to the list (1994, p.3). Within these dichotomous frames, the
body’s function is seen as natural, a logical consequence of such coupleings,
denoting passivity and a lack of agency. Significantly, the body is perceived ‘as an
intrusion on and interference with the operations of the mind’, or reason (Grosz
1994, pp.3-4). Further to this, Grosz (1994, pp.4-5) asserted that the pairing of
‘mind with maleness and the body with femaleness’ in the context of philosophy
as a conceptual, cognitive process has impacted on the how bodies in general, and
women’s bodies, have been interpreted and constructed in philosophy and
knowledge production. This is certainly evident in the resistance to women’s entry
and participation in policing where women were perceived as a sexual threat to
men’s morality.

So questions of the body as an object or an agent or its capacity for agentic action
become pertinent. Merleau-Ponty (2002) believed the body is in and of the world,
temporally and spatially. O’Loughlin (2006, p.5) reinforced this asserting that the
correlation of the body to place is integral to understanding embodiment. Whilst
the body has been and continues to be objectified, in the twenty-first century’s
consumer culture, it is also ‘self-regulated’ and ‘inscribed’. It is simultaneously
‘engaged in ‘doing” – performing, consuming, getting fit and healthy – while it is
having some things ‘done’ to it (O’Loughlin 2006, p.1). The body has become a
commodity and essentially represents ‘cultural’ capital for institutions and society
(O’Loughlin 2006, p.2). The socialisation of police recruits exemplifies the
significance of the body as a commodity and possession, albeit within traditional
notions of policing as a masculine occupation concerned with law enforcement. In
Conundrum, the body, a significant image in policing, is masculine and a product
of the cultural capital. As O’Loughlin (2006, p.3) stated:

Bodies perform in culturally visible space – they are therefore ‘read’ by others and
themselves in ways that are culturally determined ... they are constructed and
inscribed as members of [particular] groups ...
Csordas (1994, p.2) was also concerned with destabilisation of the body by the consumer culture, being impacted by constantly changing social arrangements and spaces where performance, appearance, and how the ‘body/self’ is perceived become imperatives. Parallels can be drawn with changes to the role and functions of policing, the reconfiguration of what constitutes a police officer in the twenty-first century, and police officers focus on appearance and bodily image in the face of such changes. Merleau-Ponty (2002, p.77) asked the question – ‘Is not to see always to see from somewhere?’ – which prompts me to think and respond that ‘somewhere’ could be a combination of temporal, spatial, experiential, and cultural dimensions of bodily experience, for instance, in policing, the conflation of women and their bodies and sexuality and women and their hysterical bodies and irrational emotion, which has contributed to resistance to women’s entry to policing.

Harcourt (2009, p.22) has argued for reconceptualising bodies as ‘sites of contestation’ as opposed to ‘essentialist, naturalistic’ fixed sites. They are ‘cultural’ commodities produced and reproduced by and through ‘economic, political, sexual and intellectual struggles’ and social, institutional discourses. Further to this, she stated, ‘Our experience of ourselves, our cultural, political and social identity, is an embodied one, determined by our relations to other bodies’. They are enmeshed in ‘politics’ (p.24). Such claims have echoed Foucault’s (1976) assertions of the interconnectedness of relationships, and the impact of power-relations on the body, and essentially oneself.

Perception is at the very heart of thinking about the body and embodied experience. An embodied response requires synergy between internal and external perception as it relates to oneself, others, the body, emotions, and experience. Merleau-Ponty (2002) drew on Kant’s (2003, pp.245-246) claim of the interconnectedness of ‘inner experience’ and ‘outer experience’, in particular that ‘... inner experience in general is possible only through outer experience ...’ and vice versa (p.247). Applying the notion of perception to experience, ‘outer’ and ‘inner’ perceptions constitute experience (Merleau-Ponty 2002, p.352). To
explicate this, a focus on outer perception alone evokes a sense of separation, a removal from the experience – keeping things at arms length – not fully comprehending what is happening or has happened. This is pertinent to police as they adopt a calm, controlled, impassive response to situations and adopt a disembodied approach to practice. This can result in ‘confusion’ and lead to ‘misapprehension’, which can form the basis of habitual practice and become part of cultural capital (Merleau-Ponty 2002, p.356).

Merleau-Ponty (2002, p.111) explained experience as ‘innercommunication with the world, the body and other people, to be with them instead of being beside them’. As Kant (2003, p.356, emphasis is added) argued, ‘Neither bodies nor motions are anything outside us ...’ Instead, they are in and of us. The linchpin of inner and outer perceptions is experience, which can be understood through temporality, spatiality, the context and environment, people, movements and sensations (Kant 2003, pp.234-235). Merleau-Ponty (2002, p.161, emphasis in original) reinforced this when he asserted that the ‘body ... inhabits space and time’. But what is significant in embodied versus disembodied experience is how that habitation is reflected upon and realised, and in policing there is a distinct lack of reflection on practice beyond what was done.

Returning to O’Loughlin’s (2006, p.3) examination of the body. While she believes it is inscribed, disciplined and produced ‘through discursively constructed norms’, she agrees with Butler’s (2006, p.201) counter claims to the binary and conflict of ‘free will and determinism’ to which Butler argued for the mutual existence and interplay of each: ‘construction is the necessary scene of agency, the very terms in which agency is articulated and becomes culturally intelligible’. The body can be understood as a landscape upon which to work to establish and maintain subjectivities (O’Loughlin 2006); being both actor and acted upon. Grosz (1994), however, questioned how bodies are susceptible to cultural and institutional inscription.
In exploring notions of inscription and disciplining bodies and previous comments about habitual practice and cultural capital, I would like to consider the concept of habit. Merleau-Ponty (2002, p.169) defined habit as the ‘absorption’ and ‘assimilation’ of ‘new meaning’. New knowledge and practice is ‘transplanted ... or ... incorporate[d] ... into ... our own body (Merleau-Ponty 2002, p.166). The development of a habit was understood and described by Merleau-Ponty (2002) more in physical terms (i.e., motor skills) and that it is not a form of knowledge per se, in the strict cognitive sense, but instead, a knowing or sensing that comes when the body responds to some stimulus. It is automatic and directly in response to that stimulus. Habit represents the world by intervening between the mind and thought and the body.

O’Loughlin (2006, p.3) described the school curriculum ‘incorporat[ing] certain conceptions of bodywork’, based on the predominance of the mind to control ‘a sometimes unruly and unpredictable body’ (2006, p.5). Parallels can be drawn with the pedagogies within Conundrum that function in imperceptible ways to construct ‘understandings’ and attitudes regarding action and human agency’ (2006, p.3). O’Loughlin (2006, p.10) argued strongly for rethinking notions of the ‘inscribed socialised (passive) body’ to one that is ‘communicative, relational and interactive’; having what McNay (2000) referred to as a generative agency. For police officers, the socialisation process is powerful in establishing regimes of truth prescribe ways of thinking, seeing and behaving, reinforced in the academy and in the field. The result of the strength of these regimes is a negative agency (a passivity) to learning from practice.

Of relevance to this research and police is O’Loughlin’s (2006, p.7) discussion of the ‘occularcentric culture’, also described as the ‘vision-centredness’ of Western culture. This aligned with elements of the consumer culture, where images, appearance, performance, and “being seen“ are the source and value of meaning because ’[v]ision is the pre-dominant means by which the world is revealed ... includ[ing] bodies’ (p.7). We see this played out clearly in magazines, on television, on social media. Vision is concerned with the superficialities, the
surface effects of discursive formations, disconnecting the body from social, emotional, and embodied experience. For many police officers, appearance in terms of dress, behaviour and reputation was at the heart of what constituted professionalism. This conception of professionalism objectified the body and separated and compartmentalised self, the body, emotion, and experience. Phrases such as “looking the part”, “looking as if you know what you’re doing” were evident in the data.

**Embodyment and Emotions**: Hochschild | Barber et al | O’Loughlin | Bendelow and Williams

Emotion feelings are unique in their ability to capture and dominate the mind, to preempt information processing channels, color perception and cognition, and influence our actions (Izard 2002, pp.798-799).

The activation of emotions is integral to connecting with and understanding environments and events. They essentially help to define experiences and guide behaviour (Izard 2002). From a workplace perspective, the regulation of emotion or what is known as ‘emotional labor’ involves the management of feelings in accordance with cultural, organisational and peer-group rules and expectations (Hochschild 1997, p.138). For instance, in service-oriented work, the experience of negative emotions might be suppressed and not expressed and instead positive emotions, akin to ‘fak[ing] emotions’, might be expressed to support a professional, quality service (Hochschild 1997, p.103). In doing so, however, the emotion is still present and experienced (Tsai & Huang 2002; van Gelderen, Bakker, Konijn & Demerouti 2011).

It has been argued that police work necessitates the demonstration and expression of both positive and negative emotion. This was determined based on the different types of work in which police engage: ‘service-oriented’ and ‘force-oriented’ (Barber, Grawitch & Trares 2009, p.182). The former can be understood in the context of community policing and the latter, law enforcement. In expanding on these areas of police and emotion work, the researchers identified ‘surface acting’ (masking or hiding felt emotions to conform to emotional display rules)’ and ‘deep acting’ (modifying the actual felt emotions to conform to
emotional display rules’ (Barber et al 2009, p.183, emphasis in original). They found that force-oriented work involved the suppression of positive emotions and the expression of negative emotions while the service-oriented work involved the expression of positive emotions and the suppression of negative emotions (Barber et al 2009, p.183). The dynamic nature of police work might well require police officers to shift between expressing and/or suppressing positive and negative emotions (Barber et al 2009, p.185).

A premise upon which to begin this discussion is that ‘... embodiment is expressed through the productive activities of bodies...’ (O’Loughlin 2006, p.6). A central plank of O’Loughlin’s work is that she saw bodies as being ‘productive’, having ‘potential’, being generative, rather than merely seen as passively inscribed and disciplined. Again, the significance of agency is highlighted to disturb the notion of constrained bodies and subjects, as O’Loughlin (2006, pp.9-10) claimed:

Body-subjects are not simply subject to external agency, but are simultaneously agents in their own social-construction of the world ... Gesture, body orientation and proximity are vehicles through which the body-subjects’ meanings are actually expressed, and expression presupposes an intersubjective encounter. If the communicative body is about the sharing of others’ embodied experience in their pleasure and happiness as well as their unease and suffering, emotion is absolutely fundamental to its functioning as embodied subject.

Integral to the embodied subject are the interactive, relational and emotive dimensions associated with the activities of the body. Emotion is ever-present in the activities of the body because ‘an adequate understanding of social agency demands a concept of embodied agency’ (O’Loughlin 2006, p.10).

In thinking about education and curricula generally and more specifically in policing, very little attention is given to emotions within the context of police work, and what is discussed is about staying calm and in control and not letting the public or offenders get the better of you. Compounding this is the lack of acknowledgement of the learner (i.e., police recruit, police officer) and the emotions associated with learning. O’Loughlin (2006, p.11) eschewed beliefs of the predominance of ‘reasoning and cognition’ in learning and instead stressed the need for a depth of emotion and ‘emotional involvement’ to enable
‘assessment of one’s own situatedness as a learner’ and to engage with others and the learning process.

Hochschild (1997, p.11) drew connections between emotions and managing emotions. She starts by declaring that:

Emotions always involve the body; but they are not sealed biological events. Both the act of ‘getting in touch with feeling’ and the act of ‘trying to feel’ become part of the process that makes the feeling we get in touch with what it is. In managing feeling, we partly create it.

Further to this, Hochschild (1997, p.11) saw ‘culture’ rather than ‘instinct’ trespassing upon and driving feelings and emotions. She noted various points where this occurred: ‘recognizing’, naming, assessing, controlling and communicating feeling. Particular cultures can therefore influence how relationships are perceived, how experiences are interpreted, how and why feelings are controlled.

In the knowledge economy, the mind, reason and cognitive processes have centre stage, leaving the body and emotion in the margins or shadows of the stage. Bendelow and Williams (1997, p.xv) argued the relegation of emotions to the private domain, associated with ‘irrational’, personal or ‘inner sensations’ has reinforced stereotypical notions of women and ‘hysterical bodies’. In keeping with this the need to restrain and control emotions: to apply reasoned and rational response, as opposed to an emotional (read irrational) reaction. These notions focus attention and responsibility on the individual, representing a flaw in someone’s nature to outwardly show emotions. Empathy and compassion for and towards others is either suppressed or disregarded.

The body is a ‘knowledge-acquiring apparatus’ (Merleau-Ponty 2002, p.409). To be effective in acquiring knowledge, the full range of sensors would need to be active and engaged. Emotions can be understood as ‘embodied modes of being’, deeply connected to ‘culture and self’ (Bendelow & Williams 1997, p.xvi, emphasis
in original). Such an understanding of the body is relevant to practice and learning.

Csordas (1994, p.4) raised concerns about the ways in which the term and conceptions of the body are used. In particular, when the body and the person are presented as synonymous / interchangeable, the body is likely to be viewed as an object ‘devoid of intentionality and intersubjectivity’. Such a conception, conveys a passive, negative agency and ignores the significance of emotions as the ‘embodied approach to social agency and social (inter)action’ (Bendelov & Williams 1997, p.xiv).

**Gender, Sexuality and Masculinities** : Butler | Connell | McNay | Foucault

A number of concepts sit within and alongside the discourses, practices and notions of gender, sexuality and masculinities. Fundamentally and historically, ‘heterosexual hegemony’ (Butler 1993, p.xxiv) and the ‘reproductive arena’ (Connell 2005, p.71) continue to form a regime that establishes the parameters for gender and sexuality (Butler 1993; Connell 2005). Conceptions of gender are situated temporally and spatially (Butler 1993; Connell 2005; McNay 2000). It is realised in and mobilised through systems (structural, institutional, cultural, ideological), processes, practices and pedagogies that impact on and influence physical, social, cultural experience and behaviour (Connell 2005).

It can also be understood as relational and agential (Butler 1993; Connell 2005; McNay 2000) with ... Relevant to this is Foucault’s (1977, 1978) seminal work on power relations, whereby the body and sexuality become both products and resources of these power relations. Foucault (1977) and Butler (1993, p.xii) argue that the ‘regulatory norms of “sex”’ produce and reproduce the ‘materiality of bodies’. Butler notes the reiterative nature of these norms and processes:

...“sex” not only functions as a norm, but is part of a regulatory practice that produces the bodies it governs, that is, whose regulatory force is made clear as a kind of productive power, the power to produce – demarcate, circulate, differentiate – the bodies it controls [sic] ... It is ... a process whereby regulatory
norms materialize “sex” and achieve this materialization through forcible reiteration of those norms (1993, pp.xi-xii).

The norms are performed through repetition: habitual thinking and practices are ‘reiterated under and through constraint, under and through ... prohibition and taboo, with the threat of ostracism ...’ (Butler 1993, p.60). The performance represents a persuasive and pervasive process that regulates power relations of the body, gender and sexuality. In institutional settings such as the police, the process is aimed at discipline and ‘enclosure’, which implies a passive agency (McNay 2000, p.93).

Conceptions of gender are situated temporally, spatially, relationally, and agentially (Butler 1993; Connell 2005; McNay 2000). Postmodern notions of gender features increased complexity, uncertainty, diversity, and change in today’s society McNay (2000, p.1) notes the emergence of ‘[n]ew forms of autonomy and constraint’ which move beyond the binaries of male / female and domination / subordination. Instead, ‘inequalities‘ based on generation, class and race have been constructed (McNay 2000, p.1). Different ‘types of behaviour and action ... by men and women’ are evident as they navigate their way through new and different social, political, economic, professional relations (McNay 2000, p.2). The literature reveals the emergence of the ‘new competent’ policewoman achieving status and recognition (Silvestri 2003; Westmarland 2001).

A discussion of the construction of gender needs to acknowledge *habitus* (i.e., social practice) and ‘performativity’ (Bourdieu 1990a,b; Butler 1993, p.xii; McNay 2000). For Bourdieu, *habitus* typifies an embodied, temporal social practice, however, the extent to which the practice is understood and realised as embodied and how that plays out or is realised depends on and might well be influenced by and limited by the ‘pre-reflexive mode of habitus’ (McNay 2000, p.41) pre-determined, pre-existing, entrenched and essentially unconscious ideas of, and behaviours, practices associated with gender, e.g., the binary of male / female, masculine / feminine. The strength of these ideas can be difficult to identify and
reconfigure. Questioning of these ideas might well close thinking and solidify existing conceptions of gender.

Of particular significance to my thesis are historical theories of male and female bodies and sexuality. While these are historical, the residues of these theories permeate and determine power relations between policemen and policewomen. For instance, the underlying pathology that frames women as ‘hysterical’, weak, prone to emotional responses, and therefore not suited to ‘hard’ police work, is evident in participants’ narratives (Foucault 1976/1978, pp. 103-105). The ways in which discourses, practices and pedagogies maintain stereotypical views of reproductive and sexual functions are also evident the narratives, for example, men’s resistance to women entering policing and the perception of women as a sexual and moral threat to policemen. The perception of threat also extends to what is perceived as different sexual preferences, marginalising and ostracising those whose sexual orientation is different.

**Masculinities : Connell | Irigaray**

Definitions of masculinity abound and represent different paradigmatic connotations ranging from ‘[e]ssentialist’ and ‘positivist’, through to ‘normative’ and ‘semiotic’ (Connell 2005, pp. 68-71, emphasis in original), each of which attempts to determine masculinity ‘as an object’ in comparison to conceptions of femininity. Connell (2005, p.71) asserted that the focus needed to be on ‘processes and relationships through which men and women conduct gendered lives’. In major part, this acknowledges that one’s gender identity is impacted and influenced by multiple discourses, structures. So many things in life impact on and influence one’s sense of gender (Connell 2005, p.72). Masculinity is very much a product of ‘practice within a system of gender relations’ (Connell 2005, p.84), and very much inherent in policing. Intrinsic to masculinity is ‘the power of reason’ which in turn reveals how ‘masculine authority is connected with disembodied reason’ (Connell 2005, p.164), and this is also connected with policing and disembodied practice and learning.
One form of masculinity can dominate while ‘different masculinities’ can be produced and reproduced in a particular culture or context (Connell 2005, p.36). Connell (2005, p.76) eloquently described hegemonic masculinity as ‘the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable’. Power and subservience between men and women has been a long-standing cultural belief in Western societies (Connell 2005, p.77). The power and dominance represents the authoritative norm upon which gender power relations are measured (Connell 2005, p.77) and difference in terms of sexuality, race and class are also judged.

Violence and intimidation, including the use of offensive sexist language and humour is a product and a strategy of the police culture (Connell 2005, p.83) as revealed in the recent inquiry into Victoria Police (VEOHC 2015).

We know what it [masculinity] is when we see it: it is commonsensical, produced by testosterone or by nature. We can easily ascribe a series of characteristics to masculinity: “muscular”, “strong”, “hard”, “brave”, and “in control” are words that come to mind. We know that it is the opposite of femininity. We can also make a list of adjectives that do not describe masculinity, such as, “weak”, “soft”, and “emotional” (Reeser 2010, p.1).

I am reminded of Irigaray’s – the binary – feminine is “outside”, the other (inferior) to the masculine, constructed from a phallocentric perspective (1993, p.12). As such it is always under erasure (sous rature) because ‘...the feminine cannot be said to be an intelligible term’ (Butler 1993, p.13).

**Gendered Substructures : Acker**

Inequalities in gender intersect with, or are interconnected with other forms of inequalities, such as race and class (Acker 2012). It is likely that other forms of inequality exist and are reproduced in organisations through a number of different processes. Acker referred to these as ‘gendered substructures’ (2012, p.214) that represent the ways in which organisations and individuals within them construct, perform and endorse gender. Acker (2012, p.215) defined ‘gendered substructures’ as the:
often-invisible processes in the ordinary lives of organizations in which gendered assumptions about women and men, femininity and masculinity, are embedded and reproduced, and gender inequalities perpetuated.

Her (2012, p. 215) studies revealed common processes of inequality evidenced in ‘wage gap[s]’ and the division of employment and positions based on sex, and these persist to varying degrees, despite efforts to achieve greater equality. Key features of gendered substructures included: ‘gendered subtext, gendered organizational logic, and the “ideal worker”’ (Acker 2012, p. 215). Processes that contribute to gendered substructures, the ‘often-invisible’, taken for granted and taken to be neutral processes such as how jobs are designed and work allocated. The gender power relations within Conundrum, and policing generally, reflect the work of gendered substructures.

Aporias and Lacunae

Deconstruction of the data has revealed a number of aporias and lacunae, which I have categorised as follows: power and knowledge, gender and (dis)embodied practice, and practice and knowledge. I disrupted and deconstructed the aporias and lacunae with the aim of making connections (borrowing from Deleuze 1983; Rajchman 2000), keeping phenomena and concepts moving (Deleuze 1983; Jackson & Mazzei 2012) in order to ‘create possibilities for thinking beyond what is already known and assumed’ (Colebrook 2002, p.19), opening towards something different.

Conclusion: Methodology and Theory

A qualitative research approach was adopted, using narrative methodology with particular focus on postmodern and experience-centred narrative. Semi-structured interviews were chosen and used to capture police officers’ lived experiences of professional practice and learning in Conundrum. A number of theorists were identified whose theories provided a theoretical framework for the disruption and deconstruction of police officers’ narratives, with the aim of opening up to the in-coming of the other.
Where to next

In the next chapter I deconstruct the narratives of police officers to identify a number of *aporias* and lacunae that highlight the ways in which pedagogies construct and enact power relations and knowledge claims.
Chapter 4

Finding Otherwise

Power and Knowledge: Aporias and Lacunae

I love the uniform... I love being a copper ... I love locking up naughty people (Ralph, constable)

Police ... ‘tour guides in the museum of human frailty’ (Bayley 1994, p.30)

Power Relations and Knowledge

... power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); ... power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations (Foucault 1977, p.27)

Pedagogies produce power and knowledge and knowledge is a both a product of and a mechanism for perpetuating power relations (Foucault 1977; Gore 1993). Power establishes types of knowledge through relatively imperceptible strategies, including pedagogies (Foucault 1977; Gore 1993; McNay 1994). To a significant degree, the power relations of the field of policing are being challenged and reconfigured.

Aporias and Lacunae

The disruption and deconstruction of the pedagogies revealed a number of aporias and lacunae embedded in conflicting perspectives of accepted forms of knowledge. Knowledge claims related to the practice of policing, discourses of policing, status and symbolism of policing, and power through the wisdom of policing. For example, accepted and durable truths of policing and its practices – command presence, authority, image, and discretion – are under review,
contested and, to varying degrees, experiencing shifts and changes. For many police officers in my research, a sense of uncertainty and confusion underscored their efforts to comprehend this change to their practice and their identity.

**The Practice of Policing**

Forty-two years ago, Bittner (1974, p.17) described police as the ‘best known and least understood’ public service. It could be argued that it is on everyone’s radar today, but it is still not fully understood. A popular and enduring image of police in media – law enforcers using force, removing liberties, taking risks, asserting authority and power, emphasising heroism and excitement – is at the very heart of a preferred narrative of policing (Manning 2005). This is contrary to the ‘mundane’ or routine nature of police work with focus on general duties, traffic, community liaison, public order, emergency and other incidents, and paperwork (Manning 2005; Wakefield & Fleming 2009, p.233). Many police officers I interviewed in my research struggled to understand the changing role and functions of the police, as the primacy of law and order and fighting crime is being challenged. This touches on the notion of police as artisans of a craft or trade versus police as a profession (Lee & Punch 2004) and tensions between command and control versus community-oriented policing (Murray 2002, 2005). Much of the literature has highlighted the changing nature and scope of policing in the twenty-first century, which essentially reflects shifts in power relations (Burgess et al 2006; Fyfe 2013; Lanyon 2007,2009a,b). This was certainly acknowledged by the police officers in my research.

**Moulding versus Qualifying**

Learning the practice of policing starts in recruit training, which has been described as a program of re-socialisation and organisational surveillance and control (Bradley 2005, 2009a; Conti & Nolan 2005). Constant surveillance of recruits in terms of their behaviour, thinking, attitudes, performance and socialisation into policing reinforces the gaze and judgement of the organisation, peers and others including outsiders (e.g., the public, integrity commissions). The socialisation of recruits is a product and mechanism of the *habitus* of the field of
policing (Bourdieu 1990a, p.68). The foundations of the 'cultural capital', inherent in the *habitus*, are established in the academy and remade in the field, and within and alongside this are the 'social capital' and 'symbolic capital', what constitutes the correct discourse and appropriate image and performance (Bourdieu 1977, 1990a, b, p.14, p.113; Maton 2012).

David’s description of recruit training provided insights to the expectations of the training and qualification process. He described a technical, process-driven, matter of fact approach to the preparation of police officers in *Conundrum*.

Policing is a mix of skills-based and education-based training. Our approach to training is that you take a bunch of people, stick them in the academy for X number of months and you bombard them with a lot of information, give them a taste of what operational policing is about and then unleash them on the public. They’re trained up to be uniformed constables (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

An analysis of David’s comments suggests that the quality of training is secondary to the production of police constables who can, with all the accoutrements of power and authority, be ‘unleashed’ on the public. Training is more a process of socialisation, albeit presented as a qualification process, involving the ‘bombard[ment]’ of information. This certainly aligns with the didactic approach to recruit training in *Conundrum* and pedagogies with a doctrinal intent as opposed to an educative one. It could be asserted that to the public the responsibility of qualifying police is a serious matter with significant social, political, professional considerations and obligations. As noted earlier in Chapter 1, however, a scan of Australian police jurisdictions revealed no consensus about what is required to be trained to be a uniformed police constable, with recruit qualifying programs ranging from 25 weeks (Queensland) to 52 weeks (South Australia) before they are then ‘unleashed’.

The underlying purpose of recruit training is complex and power-ridden. David’s reference to ‘tak[ing] a bunch of people’ and placing them in a police academy involves deliberately separating them from their families and the community. This further signifies the ways in which the individual and their agency can be lost and
subsumed into a particular culture that has the potential to regulate an individual’s way of thinking, seeing, behaving (Fairclough 1995; Hager 2013). The consequence of which is establishing group cohesion and thinking according to prevailing discourses, norms and traditional practices (i.e., doxa) (Bourdieu 1977; 1990a; Conti & Nolan 2005; Vivona 2014).

Ronnie’s advice to recruits in relation to their interaction with the public reflected an accepted and expected practice and established and reinforced the binary of police / public, us / them.

I say to recruits, don’t let them [the public, offenders] get under your skin. You’ve got to be bigger than them. Don’t let them bring you down to their level. We need to be professional. It’s “yes, sir, no sir” ... they’ll say “don’t call me sir” ... don’t upset them, don’t rile them and you won’t get complaints. The saying, “you’re not getting complaints, you’re not doing your job”, is long gone. You take the statement, you make the report, you show them that you care and then you walk away (Ronnie, constable).

His advice reproduced what is considered the ‘accepted drill’ – not ‘let[ting] them [the public] get under your skin’ – which corresponds to the expected, automatic, unquestioning ‘correct and ordered procedural movement’ (Young 1995, p.152). The recruits therefore are engaged in a modernist form of mimetic learning involving imitation of their role and their relationship with the public, proliferating the collective, universal belief of police (superior) – public (inferior, subordinate) relations and interactions. This binary might well be under question given greater public scrutiny of police and changing expectations of police by the public. More about scrutiny and changing expectations are revealed in the narratives of police officers throughout this chapter. One mechanism for reinforcing the distinction between the police and the public, the ‘us / them’ binary, is humour.

I witnessed humour about others’ afflictions and frailties and humour used to shun or humiliate. This was not always directed at the public; it was also directed towards fellow officers and non-police personnel who were perceived to be different and/or not fitting in, typifying the family relationships subculture and associated discourse (Ryan 2008a,b,c). The use of humour and in particular black
humour is not specific to police. Humour can assuage concerns, anxieties, hide fear, and reduce emotional tensions associated with police work (Critchley 2006; Scott 2007). It can also influence power relations constructing and reinforcing a sense of dominance, arrogance and brashness in relation to the other. Research has shown that it forms part of the socialisation process, building group bonds and cohesion because social and cultural understanding is needed for humour to occur and be accepted (Critchley 2006; Vivona 2014). This was certainly the case for the recruits in Conundrum.

Data from my research revealed how social and cultural understanding for the use of humour was nurtured in recruit training, by trainers such as Ronnie, who recounted for me what he told recruits.

I joke. I may make comments, black humour, to deal with things, but you've got to remember your audience. If I get back in the car with my partner and we've just seen something not very nice, we can joke about it (Ronnie, constable).

In establishing the rules for the use of humour with the recruits, Ronnie made a suggestion – ‘keep your mouth closed’ – and provided a warning to for them to be circumspect about what they say, where, when and with whom, to avoid any Access and Equity issues.

If you want to make any sly comments, do them back in the muster room, but then you have to be careful because of Access and Equity, with others around like cleaners, state service employees, and you don't know whose related or married. I have a saying, “A closed mouth gathers no feet.” So if you keep your mouth closed and you can't say anything nice, don't say anything at all (Ronnie, constable).

His message to the recruits epitomised the correlation between cultural capital and the process of socialisation of recruits in Conundrum. Rather than forbidding the use of humour, Ronnie presented it as an acceptable practice and context specific such as the 'muster room' and ‘in the car’ with fellow police officers, and, preferably, out of the range of “others” who are outside of the culture (i.e., ‘cleaners, state service employees’).) Signifying non-police personnel as the “others”, established the power relations of police and non-police personnel in Conundrum.
In addition to humour, Ronnie referred to the relevance of appearance and perception in police practice.

It also comes back to appearance. The way we drive the police vehicle. It’s the way we’re perceived in public. It doesn’t hurt to look good, practice what we preach, and I think the organization is doing that (Ronnie, constable).

The accepted drill that Ronnie communicated to the recruits, encompassing the importance of ‘look[ing] good’ and the use of humour, denoted developing the recruits’ ‘feel for the game’ (the illusio), which conveys and embeds the universally accepted discourses, beliefs and practices of the doxa of policing. In this instance, the drill is establishing the police/public power relations and internal relationships (Bourdieu 1977, 1990, pp.66-68). The coercive nature of the illusio is such that those involved in the game will be oblivious to its influence. For the recruits in Conundrum, their identities as civilians (members of the public) are sous nature. Their compliance with the accepted drill ensures they have a ‘feel for the game’, enabling their transition to the identity of the police officer. Through the socialisation process, the accepted drill is ‘absorbed’ and ‘assimilated’ to create ‘new meaning’ that then becomes habitual and an automatic response that requires little thought and is potentially devoid of emotion (Merleau-Ponty 2002, p.169). Significantly for the recruits’ experiences of absorbing the accepted drill is their status as paid employees and therefore commodities of the organisation and the occupation of policing with limited power and autonomy.

**Treading a Thin Line**

The changing nature of policing is posing tensions for police with increased social responsibility as opposed to strict law enforcement and crime fighting. In addition to the data from my research, I noted the experience of German police working in legalised safe drug injecting rooms alongside health professionals. It was described by one German police officer as ‘a very thin line we have to walk’ (Duff 2016, p.19).
Elizabeth, George and Oliver each provided insights to policing in the twenty-first century, which reflect increased social responsibility, greater community engagement, and collaborative approaches to policing. The local, community-based approach sits in direct contrast to symbolic and cultural capital of the authoritative status of policing and heroic law enforcement officers fighting crime and terrorism; regularly featured in popular media and guarded by police (Manning 2005; Reiner 2003; Silvestri 2003).

I think we have a leadership responsibility in the community to not necessarily solve, but value-add. Policing is not just about enforcing the law. It’s about working with people in the community to solve problems that we’re all facing. We’re just one part of that. We hear the word ‘collaborative leadership’. We do have a reputation for leading some change and leading a different approach (Elizabeth, senior police officer and corporate manager).

We’re going to have to work with other agencies to achieve better outcomes. I think it’s not just around law enforcement. We’ve really got to be proactive in collaborating with others to solve some community issues. We play a lead role in that (Elizabeth, senior police officer and corporate manager).

Elizabeth’s concepts of ‘leadership responsibility’ and ‘collaborative leadership’ highlighted fundamental changes to the functions of policing and how police are perceived in society. As she noted, police are not only concerned with solving problems they also have the potential to add value, and this can be realised through collaboration with communities and other professionals.

Now policing is about supporting the community. Listening to what the community has to say. When I joined it was about locking up the bad guys, not listening to what other stakeholders had to say; paying them lip-service, if I can use that phrase. Now, we work in collaboration with all these other agencies and government agencies to look at issues effecting the community as a whole and together we put something in place to alleviate the concerns (George, inspector).

Now, we don’t work in isolation. We have involvement with the government, non-government and community members in partnerships to solve problems. Community engagement is what it’s all about (Oliver, inspector).

Elizabeth, George and Oliver referred to the community-oriented model of policing while acknowledging both law enforcement and working in partnership and collaboration with various community groups, services, businesses, and professions to address community problems. This can be understood as a
postmodern mimetic process where the meaning of policing – as a word and an action – is deferred: constantly shifting and creating tensions and contradictions. On the one hand there are deliberate moves to focus on the community, social responsibility and collaborative policing. On the other hand there is the popular image of policing associated with terrorism, the militarisation of police, and expansion of police powers persists.

The juxtaposition of these two models of policing signifies tensions and confusion for many police officers as to the authoritative, self-assured image of the police identity and policing versus a more democratic, collaborative and inclusive image and practice. Sally saw this approach presenting police as:

... a socially responsible organisation and service (Sally, constable).

A contradiction or tension seemed to exist between perceptions of changes to policing versus the purpose and functions remaining the same. As Harry noted:

I think the purpose is changing because of the terrorism factor. Public order is becoming an issue and functions of police have expanded into all kinds of areas. Police can’t solve all the problems. It needs to be a multi-agency approach. Our underlying purpose and functions are still the same: investigate crime and maintain public order and safety (Harry, constable).

David expressed similar thoughts to Harry in relation to the core purpose remaining the same, but noted changes to the functions of policing.

Effectively, the purpose is to prevent crime and maintain law and order, that’s why we exist. The functions are far more diverse than they’ve ever been and that’s grown as the nature of policing changes. Not that many years ago, policing was purely reactive – law enforcement – and now we try to be more proactive with longer strategies to reduce crime, prevent offending, which is highlighted through our work with children and young people with diversionary processes. These don’t have an immediate impact but in 10 years’ time hopefully they will. So the core functions of policing haven’t changed and probably won’t but the forms and range of services we provide probably will and have expanded already (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

There appears to have been a definite shift or expansion to a social agenda, alongside law enforcement, as noted by David’s example of youth diversionary interventions in line with a proactive rather than reactive approach to policing,
supported by longer term strategies. It is instructive to note the change in language from fighting crime to notions of police providing different ‘forms and range of services’, aligned with the Managerial regimen. This challenges historical practices where police operated as an isolated, secretive occupational group, in keeping with the characteristics of the traditional model of policing (i.e., command and control) (Lewis 2007; Murray 2002, 2005). The contemporary model of policing (i.e., community policing) was certainly evident in David’s description of the current status of policing in *Conundrum*.

There was a time when police didn’t talk to other government departments or to councils in a formal way. We’re far more open, we share more information. We’re more about problem solving and collaboration, particularly with other government agencies and non-government sector as well. It (policing) is more social, more integrated across government, breaking down some of the silos, so the victim, the customer gets a better response and service from the government, including police (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

On face value, the advent of community-oriented policing and the change of nomenclature from police force to police service, including Customer Service Charters where the crooks have become the customers, as noted by David, has further positioned the police as service providers, now dealing with wide-ranging social and criminal issues (Loader 1999). The complexity of these issues has necessitated police to engage in collaborative service responses with other agencies and community groups, as noted previously by Elizabeth, George and Oliver.

So while police find themselves crossing professional boundaries and engaging in inter-professional practice, they will often have the legal authority to act as the lead agency and will take command and control of many emergency incidents. A shared or joint responsibility with other disciplines and professions beyond the usual emergency services is less familiar and not always understood. Police officers’ comments indicated they are experiencing a degree of ambiguity about their role and feeling under-valued and compromised.
I think they’re [the purpose and functions of policing] are a bit muddled. I don’t think we’re doing what we should be doing. We’re trying to be everything to everybody. I think we’re spread too thin (Hugo, sergeant).

More and more it’s not simply: “My house has been broken into, find the crook”. Instead, we’re dealing with conflict resolution problems between people who don’t have the skills to work it out themselves and police are lumped with more and more of society’s issues (Larry, sergeant).

It [policing] is rather confused. It was, to quote a previous commissioner, “drunks, dogs and domestics”: far more simple when I started [24 years ago]. Now I think we are delving far more into other areas of society, which I think can be dangerous because health and education aren’t doing what they’re supposed to be doing and we’re starting to jump into those areas and it’s not our job (Oscar, sergeant).

I think we’ve got to be careful and I do understand they all connect and we do make up this big thing, but are we washing down our role and responsibilities? The education system isn’t taking responsibility, the families aren’t taking responsibility: let’s blame the old coppers and let them try and pick up the pieces … we’re still picking up the pieces in society. I know we are getting into things like early intervention, but I think it’s getting very complex (Oscar, sergeant).

Policing was seen as ‘a bit muddled’ and ‘rather confused’. For Hugo this involved police attempting to be ‘everything to everybody’, which further reflects how the meaning of policing is deferred. Larry’s thoughts about police dealing with ‘conflict resolution’ matters depicted police attending to ‘society’s issues’ for which he saw the public ill-equipped to address, but which go beyond traditional police roles. The power relations between police and the public are therefore shifting and becoming muddied and more complex. Police saw themselves as having become the default responders for a range of issues not coherent with the Warrior and Perfect Self discourses and “real” police work subculture (Ryan 2008a,b,c). The ‘regimes of truth’ about what is a police officer – the individual’s sense of self – are being challenged on a number of levels (Foucault 1980, p.131; Gore 1993).

The above quotes strongly suggest that concomitant with the changing social, cultural, economic and political fabric of society is the changing nature of policing (Fleming & Wakefield 2009). As a consequence, more sophisticated responses are demanded of police (Lanyon 2007, 2009a,b). Practice in these new areas,
however, involves ‘messy, confusing problems’ (Schön 1987, p.3) and such problems are unresponsive to technical rationalist interventions (Cox 2011; Fyfe 2013). Effective problem solving requires police practitioners to engage with others outside of Conundrum to identify and examine problems and find solutions that better address the broad range of interests and expectations (Eck & Spelman 2005). This shift in power relations for police, their role with the public and other professionals presents the practising police officer at the workplace level with a challenge to intervene in areas outside usual law enforcement strategies for which they are not trained. In deconstructing this anxiety expressed by those at the frontline of policing, it was not seen as problematic by the senior officers. Instead, they ‘act as though this makes no difference’ (Derrida 1997, p.xviii).

What’s in a Name?

As mentioned in Chapter 2, a change of nomenclature from police force to police service was based on the assumption that change in function would follow.

A significant focus of police work, within notions of social responsibility, is social regulation: maintaining order, reassuring communities, protecting public safety and security. Police officers in my research expressed less respect for the broadening scope of service provision as it expands into areas previously the responsibility of other occupations or professions, as noted previously by Oscar, Larry and Hugo and expanded upon below by Rita and Kylie.

I don’t think policing really changes. You know, it’s to stop the bad people doing bad things to themselves or others. But I guess the perceptions of what police do don’t match what we do. People think we have these amazing abilities that we cure and fix, and we just don’t, you know. We try and involve a multi-agency approach to things and get others involved, but they’re not doing their job, which makes us look like we’re not doing our job, but people are relying on us to do it. I mean, some people think we have a master key to every door of every house (Rita, constable).

The purpose is still there, to protect life and property, but our function and our roles have changed significantly. We’re definitely reacting (Kylie, constable).

It sort of feels like “If you don’t know how to deal with life, call the police, they’ll help.” “I’ve locked myself out of the house, oh, ring the police, they’ll come.” I feel like we’re not really helping people the way we should be. A lot of people are
becoming more disgruntled with us, which is a bit disappointing because we’re not as responsive as we could be (Kylie, constable).

Rita and Kylie’s comments exemplified the public’s perception and expectation of police as problem-solvers (Eck & Spelman 2005), demonstrating how the purpose and practices of policing are under erasure in response to the changing social, political, economic fabric of society. Police need to manage different, and often conflicting, expectations set by governments and the public. As uncertainty and perceptions of risk in society increase, so too the public’s need for reassurance, and therefore the public’s gaze turns ‘to authorities’ such as police for assistance and to regain a sense of security (Fleming & Wakefield 2009, p.233).

Correlating with the expanded role of police alluded to by Oscar, Larry, Hugo, Kylie and Rita is the redefinition of policing as a service as opposed to a force. This change in name is significant for police officers as it moves policing away from the prevailing Warrior D/discourse in which many find comfort and security (Ryan 2008a,b,c).

We [police] have been in an enforcement model, but now we’re in a service model: very different (Oliver, inspector).

It [policing] has changed a lot in the 23 years that I’ve been in the job. It’s now more of a service delivery. We still have the underlying protection of life and property and prevention and detection of crime, but there are far more demands on the police service. The public and the community demand a lot more, and there’s a lot more accountability. I think policing involves a lot of stakeholder relationships with businesses and with government (Charles, sergeant).

Oliver and Charles acknowledged a shift in power and status, flipping the binary to us (public) / them (police as servants of the public). Wrapped up in this are tensions between what police perceive as the dull, mundane (‘soft’) police work versus the glamorous, dangerous (‘hard’) police work. The latter, as mentioned previously, is part of the cultural and symbolic capital and therefore the preferred image and representation of policing, setting police apart from the community and justifying their powers and status as enforcers of law. Now the public can demand more and measure what police are doing (i.e., scrutiny and accountability). Shifts in perceptions of policing, underscored by ideological shifts
in approaches to policing therefore impact police officers’ identities and sense of purpose. Reflecting on her experience, Patsy identified various roles and functions in response to the diverse situations, people and problems police frequently encounter.

Obviously policing is a lot more community orientated. I think a lot more is expected. Before you were more likely to go to a job, respond and that was done. Now there’s a lot more expectation on you, a lot more accountability and you’re expected to do more with pretty much the same stuff so you’re expected to be a lot more to people so you’re not just the uniform copper on the street you are the supervisor, you are the cleaner upperer, you are the counsellor, you are the welfare agent, you are the community spokesperson, you are this, you are that and you find you’re wearing ten different hats now compared to what you probably were twenty years ago where you were just the copper on the street and that’s what you did (Patsy, constable).

Significantly, Patsy did not see herself as ‘just the uniform copper’. Instead, she appeared to be experiencing a fractured sense of self as her identity as a police officer is under erasure (sous rature). From a postmodern perspective, Patsy’s subjectivities are multiple and potentially conflicting, as well as being a police officer she is expected to be ‘the counsellor’, ‘the supervisor’, ‘the welfare agent’. It represents a fluidity or ‘partiality’ of her subjectivity (Haraway 1991, p.173). The ‘I’ becomes ‘an other’ or others (Deleuze 1994, p.86, emphasis in original; Derrida 1997). This echoes the sentiments of other participants such as Kylie, Rita, Joe and in particular Edward’s descriptions of police as ‘social worker’ and ‘odd job man’ (beginning of Chapter 1).

The paradigmatic shift to social responsibility underscored by the corporate and managerial discourses, policies and practices are driving many of these changes. Police officers described struggling to comprehend the impact of these on their role in the provision of services that support and facilitate the mission of Managerialism to control ‘capitalism and society’, let alone the political mission of Neoliberalism (Klikauer 2013, p.5).
Hard versus Soft Policing: Losing our Way

My Master’s research showed the prevailing D/discourses within a police organisation, which described itself as a service as opposed to a force. The strength of these D/discourses, however, would suggest that for many the ideal police work, the “real” police work was authoritative and paramilitary. Contemporary changes in demands, as described by Oscar and others, demonstrated that more than hard policing skills and techniques are required.

We’re social workers, the society’s parents. We are the odd job man of problems (Edward, sergeant.)

For some police who work more within community policing and similar areas it gets a little more “welfare”. They are less like a police officer (Gracie, constable.)

Having considered police officers’ comments in the previous pages in relation to the practice of policing, Edward’s description of police eloquently summed up many police officers’ sentiments towards the changing and confused landscape of policing. Notions of social work and becoming ‘welfare’ when involved in community policing further reinforce the distinctions between soft and hard policing for the practising police officer. There is a sense in Edward’s words not only of extra and different work but also a denigration of the role of police in society; ‘the odd job man’ is at odds with the institutionalised D/discourses of policing described in Chapter 1 (Ryan 2008a,b,c). Another source of confusion for police officers seeing their roles as diluted and diverted by trans-agency demands is the increasing media portrayal of policing as bulwarks against terrorism generated fear (Manning 2005).

Frank acknowledged the difficulty and tension some police officers feel about these changes.

When I joined [28 years ago] we were more about policing. It seems to me that when I joined we were more paramilitary and we were focused on those core functions, but now, we actually need to be more paramilitary because we’ve lost sight of core functions and we’re trying to make ourselves more flowery. You know other police services are moving to the paramilitary style of uniform and it’s about officer safety and we seem to be ignoring that (Frank, sergeant).
Frank described the contemporary, community-oriented model of policing as ‘flowery’ and he referred to the introduction of dark blue/black uniforms in other Australian police jurisdictions (e.g., VicPOL, NTPFES, SAPOL) as representing paramilitary attire. Frank seemed to prefer *Conundrum* to return to being more paramilitary to counter the shift to a flowery (soft) police service. His focus of concern centred on aspects of the cultural and symbolic capital of policing (e.g., paramilitary ethos and the uniform), which ultimately impacts his sense of self and identity as a police officer. This corresponded with Patsy’s concerns (earlier in this chapter) for the changing expectations of police and the expansion of roles and functions that impact her sense of self and identity. Both Frank and Patsy’s comments accentuated the significance of and shifts in power relations and knowledge claims for police in the twenty-first century; shifts that are perhaps not fully understood by individual police officers.

Joe also expressed concerns about police acquiring different roles that seem to be contrary to traditional notions of policing.

> I think sometimes we’ve taken on roles that are not our responsibility. I think we need to get back to ... well, it’s a debate in itself as to what policing is, but we need to get back to keeping the peace and to investigate crime and serve the community (Joe, senior police officer).

> We’ve started to take on the responsibility of fixing the ills of society. That’s not for police. That is the government’s role through health, education ... we’ve got confused about our role and we’ve started to take on welfare roles, education roles in the community (Joe, senior police officer).

> We’re about making people feel comfortable in their environment, to make them feel safe by being there, investigating crime, being a presence on the streets, not about doing all the warm and fuzzy stuff around it. We’re an emergency service, a response agency (Joe, senior police officer).

As a senior police officer in *Conundrum*, Joe acknowledged moves from more traditional (modernist) notions of policing and highlighted uncertainty as to the exact nature of policing. He identified a number of functions and purposes that create contradictions, for example, taking on ‘welfare roles, education roles’ and attending to what he described as the ‘ills of society’, involved in the ‘warm and
fuzzy staff’, which are antithetical to an authoritative, command and control-based emergency service with a focus on public order, safety and investigating crime. Again, this reinforces the ways in which police officers’ subjectivities are multiplying and identities of self and policing are fracturing and under erasure (sous rature) (Derrida 1997, xvii).

As well as uncertainty about priorities, there was a pervasive sense of losing some control of the functions and purpose of policing. The following police officers highlighted their sense of confusion and frustration as they found themselves crossing agency and professional boundaries.

The functions or the reality of policing I think is as a catch-all. Policing has become a government catch-all for anything that someone else can’t do. We’ve become so used to being the person that can do anything, and I mean that organizationally, that we struggle saying “no”. We really struggle with ‘no’ (Henry, sergeant).

You know our business is about protecting decent people from crimes or criminal and disorderly behaviour, and I think we’ve lost our way. We’re the “go to” agency, and we’ve allowed ourselves to become that (Frank, sergeant).

The experiences and perceptions of Henry and Frank did not fit with the heroic, crime-fighting image of traditional policing. Their discomfort was exacerbated by not having an acceptable substitute.

Len reinforced the need for an ‘authoritarian style’ and the adoption of both a ‘reactive and proactive’ or preventive approach to policing.

For me, the purpose of policing is that thin blue line between what is right and wrong and policing is to try to correct the wrong doings and to ensure people don’t recommit offences. So, the functions of policing are to obviously enforce those things. We have a reactive and proactive approach (Len, constable). I think we’ve gone away from the authoritarian style and to one where people don’t give a stuff about us. We’re not fully there. We’ve still got some authoritarian style due to the nature of the job, for the crisis situations (Len, constable).

Len connected the authoritarian style of policing to emergency or crisis situations as distinct from everyday, routine policing matters. His description of policing as enforcing the law and a focus on crime highlighted again a tension and a
contradiction between police working alongside and with communities and individuals versus enforcing laws, removing people’s liberties, and adopting an authoritarian response. For him, shifting the focus from the ‘thin blue line’ meant they had lost respect. In other words, the authority, power and compliance inherent to the Warrior D/discourse had been diminished. This too is indicative of shifts in power-relations. Police working in community welfare can no longer fall back on their secret knowledge as law enforcers. There is in this sense a shift in powers.

Gracie, Elliott and Monty’s comments were less black and white than Len’s about hard and soft policing.

I don’t think the purpose and functions have really changed from being concerned with safety and protection. But I actually think we’ve become much more mature in our thinking in terms of our responsibilities and accountabilities. We’re more preventive rather than just reactive (Gracie, constable.)

I think it’s purpose is to obviously maintain law and order ... Its functions, well ... we need to be available, visible, be seen, being there when we’re needed and/or just being there anyway for people. Making people feel safe and to make people feel protected (Elliott, constable.)

I think policing, in the last 10 years, is more proactive. I think we’ve gone outside, for better or worse and probably for better, to things that Justice and other Departments should be doing and don’t want to do. We’re trying to prevent things. But I’m not sure that we’ve got it right (Monty, sergeant.)

They saw ‘soft’ policing as being proactive with the long-term goal of crime prevention. Nevertheless, there was still an uncertainty about their position in providing soft services. Police in community-oriented policing are, as Gracie commented, ‘less like a police officer’ (i.e., a ‘hard’ police officer). Even so, police officers in my research maintained that the real purpose of policing should always remain law and order and guardianship, making people safe and protected. They revealed what is likely to be an enduring and fractious source of tension for traditionally trained police officers.
**Being Measured**

Police organisations in Australia, USA, UK and European countries have committed to Managerial regimen of which performance management is key (Fleming 2009; Klikauer 2013). Paramount are expectations of achieving efficiencies and being fiscally responsible in delivering a viable police service (Fleming 2009). Performance management is applied to individual and organisational performance. It has been argued that performance management supports accountability and transparency, consequently reducing corruption and unethical behaviour, and provides significant data relating to crimes (Fleming 2009). Foucault’s concept of suveillance as a disciplinary power is relevant to consider here. While Neoliberal and Managerial regimen might argue that surveillance via statistics and benchmarks is a means of ensuring productivity, it could also be viewed as a ‘corrective measure’ to deal with ‘non-compliance’ (Foucault 1977, p.179, emphasis in original).

A number of police officers talked about the requirement to achieve individual benchmarks or performance indicators about their law enforcement role, which acted as significant drivers of police officers’ daily work, and highlighted tensions and contradictions for them on macro (socio-political), meso (organisational), and micro (individual) levels. For police, benchmarks are not something to which they ‘aspire’ nor are they a component of any goal-directed performance; they are driven purely by political agenda from inside and from outside Conundrum (Billett 2010, p.29)

In both Ronnie and Maddie’s comments there was a harkening back to less confusing days when police officers were there just to apply the law.

Policing is very orientated towards benchmarks, but it’s also orientated towards community. We’re very big on partnerships. So we’re looking more at let’s work together, as a community with community partnerships. It’s more professional. But I feel funny about benchmarks when we’re working for / with the community while I’m supposed to go out and get X number of TINS [traffic infringement notices] (Ronnie, constable).
Well the purpose and functions seem to be driven by statistics these days, as opposed to allowing police to be practical and use their discretion. That's the way we're guided and headed and it's not something that I agree with (Maddie, constable).

Maddie's concern about the 'statistics' driving how policing is done illustrated the impact of regimes of benchmarks and performance management and measurement on the individual police officer's sense of control and discretionary practice in day-to-day work. The adage, 'What gets measured gets done' attains greater status (Fleming 2009, p.225).

Ronnie's comments strengthened Maddie's concern. He identified a potential conflict between achieving benchmarks while working collaboratively with the community; he 'feels funny'. It creates a professional–personal tension for the individual police officer working at the boundaries of the police/public power relations and reinforces a perception that the remit of police work is increasingly driven by the agendas and priorities of the state government, well beyond the control of the individual police officer.

Critics of performance management have argued that a quantitative approach to measurement of individual and organisational performance does not and cannot adequately capture the complex and dynamic nature of policing in today's society (Long 2003). In particular, it cannot account for the nuances and subtleties of police work and the intrinsic features of community policing especially relationships, partnerships, inter-agency and inter-professional engagement.

Harry reflected on the political nature of policing which is in tension with traditional peace-maker role.

I think policing today has become more political then it used to be. It's lost its way. It's about meeting certain requirements instead of police officers being peace-makers. You know, police officers keeping the peace by conversing with

---

12 Not long after starting to work at Conundrum, I was told by a senior officer of a commissioned officers' forum where the Commissioner of Police berated them for the low numbers of traffic infringement notices (TINs) in the previous six months. The curious thing was that the day before the Police Minister had praised the police for their good work in reducing traffic infringements.
people rather than “these are the things we have to do, these are the things we have to get [benchmarks]” (Harry, constable).

The spectre of the politicisation of policing was evident in Harry’s descriptions of working to government benchmarks or performance indicators as opposed to engaging with the public and maintaining order. Again there was a perceived loss of autonomy for the individual police officer and his/her capacity to use discretion and to be responsive rather than regulatory and reactionary.

Performance management, while accepted and implemented in police organisations, represents a space of contestation. For the individual, a focus on performance indicators or benchmarks, as a measure of effectiveness, constructs a competitive and individualistic work environment for police officers, and diminishes their sense of discretion and control over work priorities. Such a strategy represents a ‘discourse of competition’, which impacts on teamwork, placing greater emphasis on individual achievement as opposed to shared, collegial efforts (Evettts 2014, p.44). This is antithetical to the socialisation of recruits and the culture of group solidarity (Skolnick 2008).

**Discourses of Policing**

**Looking Good is Being Good**

A superficial notion of a profession and being professional was evident in comments about appearance, including uniforms, manners, driving, and generally going about the technical matters of police work. It has been said by Grosz (1994) that the mind was associated with rationality, common sense and good judgement, the body was associated with irrationality and emotion. Police, however, have a confused schema of Grosz’s mind-body concept where the body is sexualised (see Chapter 5) but it also has a special function as a major part of the perceived police self, e.g., looking good, how you present, ‘squared away’ (Oklahoma Highway Patrol 2016).
There was little if any evidence of an internal, individual focus and responsibility when it came to being professional and police practitioner. Essentially, superficial notions of a profession and being professional were central to establishing and maintaining the police / public versus us / them binaries. Also shown in previous sections, the public was at the heart of considerations of professional practice. In part this might reflect the response of police to ‘civilian oversight’ and accountability measures: a response that has tended to be negative and critical, and is most likely to increase (Prenzler & den Heyer 2013).

I found two dimensions in how police officers identified and described being a professional and being a member of a profession. One centred on internal expectations and perceptions of them by the organisation, superiors, subordinates, and peers. The other was focused on external features (e.g., appearance, dress, quality of paperwork) as critical in establishing what constitutes a professional police officer. This is exemplified in a recent Facebook posting by Oklahoma Highway Patrol (2016) about the importance of ‘command presence’ with an emphasis on looking good and being ‘squared away’ as opposed to looking like a ‘hot piece of salami’ (see Footnote 6 in Chapter 1.)

Harry, Elliott, and Len cited appearance (uniform or dress), paperwork, and interaction with the public as important indicators of being professional.

I suppose the uniform. The way the uniform looks. That's a hard one [question]. Just making sure that you look professional, at the end of the day, that's a big part of it ... perception ... you might turn up to a job and don't know what you're doing but you've got to be seen to (Harry, constable).

Yeah, your appearance the way you speak to members of the public and to your colleagues and to your colleagues in front of the public, your paperwork you know looks professional, not sloppy ... that's it (Harry, constable).

When you think professional you think, you know, uniforms. You see people taking pride in their appearance, their work. I try to dress appropriately and how I speak to and approach people, I try to be professional (Elliott, constable).

It's how they [police] present themselves in a manner that is professional and conduct themselves to the public in a professional manner. The way they are driving, talking or working. There are just so many areas that determine whether you're professional or not (Elliott, constable).
I think it comes down to a number of factors. Things like appearance. For me, when I go out on the street, I like to look my best. I have my set of standards and I set the bar high. I strive to go for it. That means my appearance, I always put a lot into my appearance and my paperwork (Len, constable).

Notions of image and appearance also extended to actions, behaviour and practice: looking and practising like a police officer. This signified the importance of the ‘ocularcentric culture’ (O’Loughlin 2006, p.7) where meaning is acquired and maintained through images and performances of the superficialities of practice. In this instance, creating a preferred representation of police officers as cleanly attired with a calm and controlled demeanour.

Elliott’s example of driving the police vehicle could be seen as a way of modelling appropriate behaviour, but is superficial within the context of professional practice. For Harry, looking as if he knows what he is doing and being seen as competent and capable reflected a professional approach. Such a perspective and practice begs the question as to what happens when that cannot be achieved, when one does not know what to do. The pretence of ‘acting as if’ can be seen to reflect a disembodied form of practice underscored by a logic of looking good, looking capable while feigning competence and possibly blocking or faking emotions. It can also hide gaps in training, experience and abilities, and this is especially significant in policing where a lack of ability or competence is perceived as a weakness, being unreliable and incapable of supporting peers and others (Vickers 2000).

Pretence might also reflect ignorance. As noted in Chapter 3, ignorance translates to a lack of guidance and informed practice, perhaps indicative of inadequate training, and ignorance ‘can lead to outright error’ (Rescher 2009, p.1). Ignorance, convenient and inexcusable or ‘contingent’, might well underscore such superficial conceptions of a profession and being a professional (Rescher 2009, p.3). Contingent ignorance can be examined from institutional and meta-cognitive dimensions separately and together. The former is indicative of the power of
institutions to establish knowledge that is accepted without question, through the
socialisation process and pedagogies. It is persuasive and tenacious. In terms of
the individual and the meta-cognitive dimension, ignorance can be seen as a
product of a negative or passive agency and an inability to engage in critical
reflection.

Another area with an external focus was how police engaged with the public.

The way we deal with the public, the way we present ourselves is a big part of
being professional. I like to speak to people how I would like to be spoken to, and
I'm conscious of the way I deal with them and portray myself. It comes back to
me, and the organisation, and I also think your paperwork and the reports you
write. If they're sloppy, you look unprofessional (Len, constable).

I'm a big believer in appearance for professionalism. I think you've got to present
well. I think you have to present as trained and as controlled and calm within this
job. So you know that public perception of a professional organisation is
someone who looks smart. It's your own behaviour in front of your peers and in
front of the public and the customers (Charles, sergeant).

Both Len and Charles defined professionalism in terms of overall presentation,
including how one communicates and 'looks smart'. I also note Charles's reference
to maintaining a 'controlled and calm' demeanour. This rests comfortably with
notions of commanding, authoritative presence that distinguishes the police
officer as capable and in control of self and the situation. It connected with a
façade that simultaneously protects the police officer and establishes a superior
status and reinforces power-relations. It could also be understood as a means of
managing one's emotions, as noted previously, blocking and faking emotions
(Hochschild 2012)

I don't think it's all about window dressing. It's about being genuine in your
approach and I believe that not changing as a person to suit the situation. Well
we're very good actors, we put on a number of very good masks. We have to it's
the nature of the job, but I think if you are genuine to yourself and genuine to
other people and don't try to be super-human. I think if people see that you're
genuine and that you care about what they're doing and value what they're
doing; I think it puts forward a professional approach (Oscar, sergeant).

Oscar's description of being 'genuine to yourself and genuine to other people'
signified a view of professional practice that encompassed a sense of authenticity
underscored by awareness of self and others, more closely aligned with a reflexive professional practitioner.

Similarly to Charles, Oscar’s reference to wearing masks reflected the façade, the public persona that police often adopt in order to protect themselves emotionally and against physical attack or intimidation. This is documented in literature on the psychology of policing (Bonifacio 1991). In all of the above, the ‘symbolic and disciplinary functions’ of work, and culture, are at play in determining the power-knowledge relations a police officer has with the public (Foucault 1980, p.161).

Elliott spoke of being respectful towards others. It is worth noting that his respectful engagement with others (i.e., the public) extended to not engaging in inappropriate or canteen humour that ‘make[s] fun of people’. As discussed previously, humour can be used to desensitise an individual’s encounter with a challenging situation or it can be used to assert one’s superiority (Scott 2007), reaffirming the us (police) / them (public) binary and associated power relations.

I don’t try to make fun of people or anything like that. You might go to some strange situations but you’ve got to treat it all professional … mental issues and things like that you’ve still got to be professional about the way you conduct yourself. I just try to do it in a respectful manner (Elliott, constable).

I like to set an example. I like to come early and be the first one here and one of the last ones to leave, if I can. It’s to do with appearance as well as involving yourself with the group around you (Reg, sergeant).

You’ve got to be able to come across that you know your business, or look like you know your business. I like to consult and work with people. It gives them a bit of ownership too rather than just being a robot and coming to work (Reg, sergeant).

Reg’s example had an internal focus, concerned with how one might present to one’s peers and subordinates in establishing relationships and modelling what he saw as a professional image. This internal focus involved individuals establishing their symbolic space in Conundrum, which depends on their immersion in the game, but importantly, their place and sense of self is always measured in comparison to others (Bourdieu 1990a).
Adopting a slightly different approach to public satisfaction and a professional image, Oscar raised the notion of the ‘can do attitude’.

I think we do put out a professional image. We get in and have a go, it’s our “can do” attitude, and we’re very accountable (Oscar, sergeant).

Parallels can be drawn between Reg’s comments and Harry’s earlier comments. They each identified portraying competence, looking as if you know what you are doing, even if you don’t know what you are doing. The features of the external and internal considerations of one’s performance, practice and appearance, as noted in the previous comments of other police officers in my research, resonates with Bourdieu’s (1977, p.93, emphasis in original) notion of ‘bodily hexis’ where the habitus is internalised and, in this instance, the police officer’s body and persona – the uniform, stance and demeanour, communication and etiquette – are made and remade.

Oliver, however, raised a different perspective, when he mentioned the standard and types of service provision: what police are required to do in the course of their duties.

For me, a professional is someone who is a specialist in their field. I think I’m a professional (Oliver, inspector).

Professionals provide high-quality service and they are able to do things that others aren’t able to do or be expected to do, like the dirty jobs. At accident scenes, we pick up pieces of skull and bones, we clean the area so there’s no blood; we do some very dirty jobs (Oliver, inspector).

Oliver took the definition of professional beyond superficialities to the grimmer realities of police work; these are tasks that many emergency services personnel encounter and manage without specific training. The ‘façade’ and dissociative behaviour act as buffers or protections to the less heroic and more profoundly human functions that police encounter and in which they take pride. It is noteworthy that the high quality service that Oliver mentioned is not based on formal knowledge but on a willingness to do well what others won’t do.
Status and Symbolism of Policing

The “Professional” Artisan

While literature has highlighted the drive for policing to change from an artisan\(^{13}\) status to that of a profession, there is still conjecture as to how that could be achieved (Green & Gates 2014; Lanyon 2007). The origins of policing as a working class craft or trade and the police officer as a skilled, capable, pragmatic practitioner can neither be forgotten nor overlooked. An inherent tension exists between the artisan police practitioner and defining the professionals requiring further tertiary education.

The artisan learns the practical wisdom of policing on-the-job by observing and mimicking others with the likelihood of reproducing existing knowledge and practices. As my data has shown, policing in *Conundrum* is commonly portrayed with the elements of a craft or trade rather than a profession, and for some of the police officers, including Hugo, Eleanor and Joe, the probability of professionalising policing is remote.

\[\text{We're a long way from being a profession. We're more professional then we were. I would have described us as a trade when I joined [18 years ago], and the calibre of the senior constables and sergeants, generally was pretty low from an educational and intellectual point of view. There were pretty slim pickings. Most of the smart people were either promoted or working in investigative areas and you had very little to do with them (Hugo, sergeant)}\]

Hugo exemplified the conflation of acting professionally (i.e., acting in a certain manner) and being part of a profession. *Conundrum* and other police jurisdictions nationally and globally have started to embrace tertiary education as one means of professionalising policing (Lanyon 2009a). It is one of six objectives to professionalise police and policing identified by police commissioners from New Zealand and Australia (ANZPAA 2013; Lanyon 2009a,b). Education was also a

---

\(^{13}\) The term ‘artisan’ is used in my research in its broadest sense as a way of capturing how police view their learning experience. Further references to artisan are in Chapter 6.
significant factor in considering notions of a profession for many of the police officers in my research. This represented a somewhat limited conception of a profession and was more relevant to considerations of professionalisation through credentials.

Doubt as to the relevance of academic learning to police practice was common.

More and more, you hear that policing is becoming a profession because more people are coming into the job with tertiary or other qualifications (Reg, sergeant).

I’ve got a view that we, policing, shouldn’t be a profession. I think we should be professional in the way we go about it [policing]. Being professional is acting appropriately, doing what’s right in all the circumstances. It is dictated to by the environment in they’re the people they’re associated with, the culture of the organisation (Joe, senior police officer).

We’re more professional then we were, but I think we’re a long way from being a profession (Hugo, sergeant).

I think it’s a pipe dream that policing will be a profession. We hear it a lot “We’re a profession”, but I just don’t think we are. We can introduce tertiary studies and have affiliation with XX university to show we are moving forward. We can change our uniform and we can look nice, and that’s certainly acting professional, but it doesn’t make us a profession (Eleanor, constable).

Eleanor, Reg, Hugo and Joe span the rank structure – constable to senior officer – and all agree that while they could always improve and perhaps have some tertiary education, the desirability or possibility of becoming a profession was doubtful.

Eleanor saw it as a ‘pipe dream’ and disagreed with the rhetoric of some that police already are a profession. She clearly saw the distinction between looking and acting professional versus being a profession, which was often overlooked. Her reference to tertiary studies highlighted a process of credentialing, which is only one element of a multi-layered definition of a profession.

Joe distinguished between behaviour and actions that might be deemed professional to actually being a profession. He linked context and culture to police knowing how to act ‘appropriately’ and ‘doing what’s right’. This too presented an
extrinsic focus (discussed previously in Looking Good is Being Good) as opposed to an intrinsic element to professional practice.

I would like to think we’re more professional because of the way we go about our business, not because I have a certificate that says I can do it. You’ve got to show you can do it (Reg, sergeant).

I think we’re professional because of the way we go about our job (Oliver, inspector).

The practical nature of much of policing as a craft defined Reg and Oliver’s practice and pointed to the difficulties to be encountered in convincing the workplace of the necessity and benefits of becoming a profession.

Further to this, Eleanor offered a cautionary note that reinforced policing as a practical occupation.

People who do well academically might not make very good police officers because it is a very common sense role and you need to be flexible, so I just don’t know that policing is designed to be one of those professions (Eleanor, constable).

The general and most acceptable perception of policing sat comfortably in the technical rationalist approach with reference to instrumental knowledge and practical wisdom, and positioned policing in the realm of craft or trade. The literature has highlighted that policing has traditionally been the occupation (akin to a craft or trade) of the working classes (Sparger & Giacopassi 1986). This was evident in Oliver’s reflection of his own move into policing 37 years ago, and significantly, Oliver equated notions of professional with continuous or lifelong learning.

I grew up in a housing commission area. My father was a truck driver and my mother didn’t work. I came from very basic, humble beginnings. But it has only been through my ability to learn and develop myself that I’ve been able to provide a better standard of living for myself and my family. I don’t consider myself to be the academic. My schooling ended at year 10 and then I joined police. I’ve since done tertiary courses. And yes, I am a professional because I behave professionally. (Oliver, inspector).

Learning is lifelong and is much more important than training, which is about skill acquisition, doing something or a process. Learning changes my thinking, my knowledge; the way I behave, the way I respond (Oliver, inspector).
Research of the impact of tertiary education for police indicates a reduction in the use of force and ‘fewer complaints’ (Bradley 2009a; Lanyon 2009b, p.249). The results of research of higher education programs for British police revealed: enhanced ‘personal and professional self-confidence’; a critical understanding of the nexus between police and government; a more ‘self-reflexive and questioning’ approach to practice; and the potential for counteracting ““group-think”” and the production of ‘stereotypical thought and conduct’ (Lee & Punch 2004, pp.245, 247, 248). Concerns, however, were expressed about the education and skill levels of current police officers in *Conundrum* coupled with the general low standards of education of the general population.

If you look at the varying degree of skill level and education amongst the police officers we have, you can’t put everyone into one basket ... I don’t think we’ll ever be a professional organization unless there are prerequisites such as a required Bachelor Degree or equivalent (Eleanor, constable).

I’d like to see us being more rigorous in terms of formal education and being more rigorous with who we select, with a longer-term view than we currently have. We have a lot of issues in that we attract those people with low levels of education in this state’s community (Hugo, sergeant).

These comments raise an important issue and questions regarding the transition to tertiary education credentials for police, e.g., ‘you can’t put everyone into one basket’. For example what will be the impact on an individual’s career progression? Will preferential promotion be given to those with tertiary education? What then of those without relevant levels of education? These questions are as yet unanswered and largely ignored. This establishes another layer of internal power relations when added to the existing hierarchy of *Conundrum*.

David’s comments about moving to a profession gave an indication of the stressors in the debate.

Given the criteria for a profession, policing ticks many of the boxes bar one or two. Those are mandatory qualifications and central registration body (like doctors and teachers). So a registration board, body of knowledge, set of standards, and recognised by community as a profession. ANZPAA has identified
criteria and one is national registration (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

A barrier to police being a profession is the individual police commissioners wanting to have the final say. If I want someone in my state to become a police officer, I want to make that decision. I don’t want a registering body deciding I must appoint them (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

His comments reminded me of the description of police organisations as ‘artisan entities’ that prefer to exist beyond external influences (Casey & Mitchell 2007, p.5). Such an existence cannot be maintained in light of political and managerial agendas and increased public scrutiny. This also signified the influence of power relations and knowledge claims that have emerged from an exclusive, autonomous, self-regulating existence for police organisations and individual police officers. Traditional professions maintain agreed upon standards across governmental jurisdictions and display those standards to the public. Given David’s opinion, this will be difficult, if not impossible, for police.

The literature has noted arguments for restructuring policing, moving away from paramilitary trappings (i.e., hierarchy, rules, procedures, orders) that control and constrain, to a structure that engenders more flexibility, independence, and professional discretion (Lanyon 2009a,b). The extent of autonomy and control a police professional has and will have, however, is questionable. Historically, police in Australia have been state initiatives and responsibilities, unlike other countries (Finnane 2005). The state government-police relationship therefore presents tensions between demands of the ‘bureaucratic regulation’ (i.e., audit culture, setting of agendas, administrative requirements, measurement of work and performance, budget exigencies) versus efforts to develop ‘collegial regulation, or peer review’ (Freidson 1983, pp.280-281, emphasis in original). According to Lanyon (2009a) there is some support for within policing for it to adopt proactive, preventive and responsive strategies and interventions, better equipping police for their role in the twenty-first century as opposed to reactive approach influenced by the nature of the organisation and ‘political’, ‘economic’ and other agendas. Unfortunately, experience has shown that state governments can bow down to political agendas and increase or decrease police numbers without regard
to services needs or an available pool of candidates who meet higher education standards. Sometimes it is “get the 20 best available” not “get 20 suitable candidates”. This lack of consistent criteria leads to confusion about professionalisation at all levels by a number of police officers in my research.

**The Public Gaze**

The task of maintaining a sense of safety and security in society is challenging where ‘fear is now managed and buttressed by normalizing the neoliberal claim that it be accepted as a general condition of society ... and used to mobilize the individual’s fear of the other’ (Giroux 2015, p. 5). The purpose of proactive and preventive policing is to reassure the public of their safety, in the face of a rhetoric of fear and a ‘politics of disposability’ (Giroux 2015, p.105). In speaking with police officers in my research and many more during my work in *Conundrum*, altruism was often identified as one of the key motivators for being in the job of policing. In fact, for many police officers, there was a belief that the public neither understood nor fully appreciated such a motivation because the public did not fully know what police did.

For example, Reg described the ideal of a synergy between community, preventive, and responsive policing with law enforcement, the central thrust of which comes down to ‘catch[ing] crooks’. There was also a sense of resentment that police are not credited with all that they ‘do behind the scenes’.

Law and order, safety, and all that sort of stuff, but in reality we do a lot more. The community probably doesn’t know what we do. And it depends how the media portray us, but there’s a lot of what we do behind the scenes that people don’t know about – good stuff – being involved with the community and charities and involved in projects nationally and internationally. I like to think that we try and make people feel safe out there. I like to help people. I think a lot of police officers like to help people, catching crooks and locking them away. That’s how I feel about policing ... (Reg, sergeant).

Lydia also saw crime fighting as core, but impacted upon by public opinion of what is being done.
I think our purpose is all about perception, community perception of what we do. I still see the grass roots as fighting crime and bringing people to justice, but I worry about that more now [about public’s perception] where in the earlier days, well I didn’t care what they [the public] thought cause that’s what I did. But now I care because the boss cares and it’s eventually going to be my problem so I may as well care now and deal with it (Lydia, sergeant).

Maddie offered a more cynical or pragmatic view of external scrutiny as informing practice.

The purpose is to look after the community and the interests of the community as a whole, but also our purpose is to keep our government happy. I think that’s a big part of what we do, keeping our government happy (Maddie, constable).

As has been mentioned previously, police are becoming more of a political (or government) apparatus and the managerial audit culture places demands on police that requires police services to be reconfigured and commodified to suit market-driven agendas, and to strive for customer (public) satisfaction (Manning 2005).

I think our purpose is all about perception, community perception of what we do. At the end of the day, I still see the grass roots as fighting crime and bringing people to justice (Lydia, sergeant).

I worry about that more now [about public’s perception] where in the earlier days, well I didn’t care what they [the public] thought cause that’s what I did. But now I care because the boss cares and it’s eventually going to be my problem so I may as well care now and deal with it (Lydia, sergeant).

Monty raised another dimension, the corporate image.

Are we professionals? We can seek a professional tag, but ultimately it’s the public that will let us have that professional tag. We can’t just suddenly say, “We’re professionals now.” The cars look clean. We respond well. Public satisfaction is good (Monty, sergeant).

I think within XX [Conundrum] we’re seen to be professional. We come in on budget. We have a corporate plan and glossy brochures, but do the public see it? (Monty, sergeant.)

I think we have leaders now who are consultative, to a degree, with the troops and are able to portray that to the general public, to the government. So I think it’s the brass who really portray us as professional and then the troops try and carry that through as well (Monty, sergeant.)
The connection between state-authorised control and Managerial regimes of accountability and audit, *Conundrum* is “performing” as is expected and required. It is looking good, promoting an image to the public that the ‘troops’ imitate as best they can.

I think we understand customer service because once again we’re getting complained about all the time, so we talk about learning… well have we learned? Are we becoming more professional because we’re being complained about and we don’t want to get in the shit? (Oscar, sergeant.)

Oscar viewed complaints as a trigger, or reason, for presenting a professional image, to avoid adverse consequences, including receiving more complaints. Again the extrinsic features – external image, monitoring behaviour and tempering behaviour and managing image so as to avoid complaints — of being a profession and professional were identified.

Maddie, Oscar and Lydia’s comments also carried a degree of cynicism in relation to increased public scrutiny and expectations of accountability, and for police to consciously consider the public and public perceptions. The power relations of the police (us) / public (them) have been reconfigured with the public’s expectations and interests having greater influence, which could be perceived by some police as a loss of power, or Lydia and Oscar’s avoidance of disciplinary measures was the prime motivation not care and concern for the public. This also highlighted tensions for individual police officer’s with regard to internal power relations driven by cultural norms and Managerial regimen.

Another aspect of police work that has impacted on the public’s perceptions and expectations of police has been the behaviour of police officers.

If they [public or offenders] start to arc up, I have to take ownership of the situation. I need to show them that I’m in control and that I need them to settle down. I’m not going to have a shouting match. Instead, let’s talk about it (Ronnie, constable).

Yes, your own behaviour in front of your peers and in front of the public and the customers. There’s bad examples whereby police are singled out for one bad act that’s thrown on YouTube for example and reflects poorly on everyone, so your manner, your behaviour, the way you act in front of the people, the public, is how you reflect as professional or not (Charles, sergeant).
In general duties policing you’re dealing with the public face-to-face ... you need to treat everyone equally despite the fact that you might not think they are at the time. Professional delivery of what you need to say. Being able to adapt I suppose your mannerisms to the different people within society. What I do notice in this organization is some people don’t have the flexibility or the skills to be able to do that. And when we’re claiming to be professional. We’ve got people whose basic skills are pretty average (Eleanor, constable).

Taken together, Ronnie, Charles and Eleanor’s comments illustrated the tension and awkwardness that police officers feel in their relationship with the public. When a situation requires it they must take control but they are always aware that what they do can easily be become general knowledge, and yet there is a desire for public approval and understanding of what they do. A more nuanced and sophisticated response is lacking, highlighting the need for changes to police education and training beyond technical knowledge and skills to the development of police officers who can engage and work with and alongside a range of other professionals and community members in settings other than crime control.

The personal and professional power of police leaders is significant and especially ‘in times of uncertainty’ and change (Lindberg et al 2015, p.103). Recent research of police leaders’ approach to leadership and their role as ‘change agents’ revealed that many are caught up in everyday police matters as opposed to attending to and supporting strategic matters. Instead, they align more with the practices and concerns of the lower ranks and ‘therefore embody [and replicate] police organisational culture’, which translates to maintaining the status quo and resisting change (2015, p.114).

**Power through Wisdom**

**Common Sense: Goes Without Saying**

Common sense is at the centre of power through the wisdom of policing. It is both a source and product of power. A brief foray into the area of common sense as an enduring knowledge claim is relevant to both internal and external power relations for police officers in *Conundrum*. Common sense, as it informs practice, is considered in Chapter 6.
Police officers in my research identified common sense as necessary for police officers, as noted by Monty and Edward.

Police need common sense. I believe there’s a lot of room for common sense and discretion, and it should never be taken away. The law is black and white but its application is very grey in most areas (Monty, sergeant.)

We select academically, we don’t select on common sense and you can’t teach common sense and yet it’s the most important element for police work (Edward, sergeant.)

One of the features of a profession is a unique body of knowledge. It is this knowledge base that distinguishes a member of the profession from a member of the public. For police, it would seem that common sense lies at the heart of its knowledge base. This was evident in the data. Common sense was the primary characteristic that separated police officers from the public, and yet, as Edward commented, ‘you can’t teach common sense’. Its very vagueness establishes a power dynamic within police and with the public. A good police officer has common sense and much of a police officer’s learning takes place at the feet of good police officers, but it cannot be taught. I am reminded of the Stoics notions of virtue and vice, of which one of the virtues is the wisdom of ‘good sense’, while vice encompasses ‘foolishness, injustice ... intemperance’ (Stephens n.d.). The dichotomy of virtue / vice (good / bad) can be aligned to the police / public power relations reinforcing police as virtuous in comparison to the public because, as the literature of the Stoics has revealed:

[t]he vast majority of people are non-virtuous because though they may follow reason correctly ... they fail to conform to ‘the laws of life as a whole’ by acting appropriately with respect to all of the other virtues (Stephens n.d.)

In my research, the police officers’ understanding of common sense reflected a ‘mental capacity’ or a source of good judgment supporting a degree of discretion (Rescher 2005, p.14). For police, ‘experience and maturity’ are the preferred sources of common sense over specialist and intellectual knowledge (Geertz 1973, p.788; Rescher 2005; Rosenfeld 2011). It is useful in applying the structure of the law but lacking when police officers move into areas for which they are not trained and are therefore ill-equipped. As Monty noted:
You’re dealing with things that you haven’t got skills in. No formal training in. You’re branching into areas like social work and all that stuff. So common sense prevails. I recall [as a young uniform police officer] going to a domestic involving 40 year olds and they’re asking you for advice. Jesus! You’d make something up, based on very little (Monty, sergeant).

David, on the other hand, saw common sense as the key to surviving in policing.

Common sense and good people skills will get you by. You’ll survive as a police officer pretty much (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

For Eleanor and Edward common sense was integral to general duties policing and decision making.

In general duties policing there are no rules and it does rely common sense through to the way, the way you speak to people and how you deal with things; quite simply, that’s common sense (Eleanor, constable).

I make decisions based on common sense and rational, objective decision-making (Edward, sergeant).

Eleanor and Edward saw that inherent characteristic of the police officer involved making decisions and taking actions that made ‘good, rational sense’ equating to ‘reasonable or good judgment’ (Rescher 2005, p.49). The implications being that good sense and good judgement equate to appropriate action and behaviour were more relevant and important to practice than training and education, which is supported by the literature (Geertz 1973; Rescher 2005; Rosenfeld 2011). Opposite to good judgement is poor judgement and mistakes. This underscores power relations.

The doctrinal and pragmatic “wisdom” of common sense is persuasive and pervasive, and functions well in technical rationalist contexts. It is comforting because common sense implies fact or truth, to be accepted without question, and when it is supported by practice and viewed as practical wisdom (i.e., rational, self-evident), it offers a sense of certainty, closure and comfort (Geertz 1973; Rescher 2005; Rosenfeld 2011). It implies consensus about what constitutes appropriate action. It becomes the very wisdom (i.e., ‘collective belief’ or ‘doxa’) to which everyone adheres (Bourdieu 1977, p.167, emphasis in original),
subsequently establishing regimes of truth and the ‘limits of intelligibility’ (Britzman 1995, p.155; Rabinow 1984) that elevate common sense as an essential and valued characteristic of a good police officer which in turn diminishes the relevance and value of training and education.

Wrapped up in this, is the notion and application of common sense as a way of keeping things simple and understandable. Its very organic, practical nature and its accessibility to every reasonable person through everyday experience were central to its capacity to influence decision-making.

Before summarising the findings of this chapter, I wish to share more of Elizabeth’s words that essentially sit in direct contrast to previous comments and discussion of the importance of common sense.

I think the way that we are developing our people, if we continue to build upon that sort of learning approach, and get them to critically think, they can really value-add to some of those issues that we’ve got, and it won’t be driven just by the senior leadership team, it’ll be people [police officers] putting forward their views and influencing what we do. We have the opportunity to challenge traditional ways and thinking (Elizabeth, senior police officer and corporate manager).

Elizabeth acknowledged that change will involve directly challenging traditional thinking and practice and she did not shy away from that. It is an immense undertaking to transform enduring power relations and knowledge claims that have become instinctive. Her desire and vision for paradigmatic change is juxtaposed with the glue of tradition and modernist notions of policing, prevailing discourses and subcultures, as is evidenced in the narratives of police officers throughout my thesis.

**Conclusion: Power and Knowledge**

The potency of pedagogies to produce and reproduce power relations and knowledge claims founded on traditional, modernist notions of policing was revealed in the police officers’ narratives. The recruits, as paid employees of *Conundrum*, are subjected to training that simultaneously qualifies them as state-
based police officers and socialises them in the doxa of the *habitus* of the field of policing. Ronnie’s narratives of recruit training revealed pedagogies imbued with symbolic and cultural capital of the traditional (command and control) model of policing that establish and maintain internal and external power relations, the latter framed as the us (police) / them (public) binary. The training and pedagogies also develop the recruits’ ‘feel for the game’ (the *illusio*) with regard to internal and external power relations, stressing the importance of an authoritative persona, looking good, and the use of humour in interactions with the public and peers.

The advent of community-oriented policing has challenged these traditional power-knowledge relations, however, as the role and functions of police expand to include increased social and regulatory responsibilities alongside judicial, custodial responsibilities, as noted by Elizabeth, David, George and Oliver. The Managerial regimen and performance management are key drivers of the provision of police services and the nomenclature of police service rather than police force has reinforced these changes. Confusion and frustration was commonly expressed by Hugo, Larry, Oscar and other police officers in my research in an effort to understand what they perceived as an imbalance between their preferred traditional, command and control image of themselves involved in hard, real policing and the new-found social and regulatory responsibilities (soft policing). Essentially, the police officers identities were under erasure (*sous rature*).

The police officers’ narratives exposed a number of *aporias* and lacunae highlighting tensions between the hard and soft policing and subsequent shifts in power relations. A significant shift in relations involved police crossing inter-agency and inter-professional boundaries, working alongside and with other professions and disciplines. The boundary crossing requires a reflexive, social, relational, agential professional, equipped with more than common sense and practical wisdom. Police officers’ perceptions of a profession and being professional, however, rested upon superficial elements – dress / uniform, driving
police vehicles, walking, talking, being seen to be capable and in control – that are far removed from the reflexive professionalism required of a professional police practitioner of twenty-first century. The police officers’ concentration on these elements might reflect a degree of ignorance as the product of the power of institutions (social, cultural, organisational) to construct knowledge that limits thought and practice to current, existing claims of knowledge: heroic, exciting, dangerous, high risk. For many of the police officers in my research, a return to authoritarian, command and control modes of practice might well be a means of addressing power imbalances and reaffirming or regaining a sense of authority with the public. When policing is seeking to professionalise, however, there is no place for complacency and ignorance because professional status entails significant obligations and responsibilities.

**Where to Next**

In Chapter 5 I identify *aporias* and lacunae that surround gender and (dis)embodied practice. These represent unrelenting issues of gender and emotional labour in policing.
Chapter 5

Finding Otherwise

*Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice: Aporias and Lacunae*

A good chick that’s worth workin’ with (Bea, constable)

Just enough [empathy] to keep it real (Kylie, constable)

A Moment …

I found the pedagogies that produced and reproduced ‘gendered knowledge and experience’ (Gore 1993, p. 26) in Conundrum insidious and pervasive. They represented potentially significant, yet subordinate foci of my research of professional practice and learning. I therefore did not ask specific questions about gender because it would run the risk of the interview being construed as agenda driven. Instead, matters of gender have surfaced in my data, with a degree of repetition and aligned with notions of disembodied practice.

*Aporias and Lacunae*

The narratives of Patsy, Gabby, Bea and others reflected significant interaction and continuity around gender and disembodied practice, presenting what has happened, is happening and is likely to continue to happen: that which is obvious, ubiquitous in Conundrum. A deconstructive lens exposed a number of aporias and lacunae: sexual harassment, complex power relations, tacit knowledge (i.e., what is invisible, “unknowable”, and un-said), gender roles and styles, and rational
versus emotional work of policing, reflecting disembodied approaches to practice and responses to learning. A significant schema of gender and practice in *Conundrum* involved the binary of mind (male) / body (female), which can also be read as the mind (rational, logical) and the body (emotional, irrational) (Grosz 1994, p. 3). The paradox in policing, while the female body is sexualised and is inferior, the male body is the measure of masculine competence.

**Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice**

The police world has always allocated priority and respect to male categories and symbols, finding it difficult to contend with the lurking problem of gender, simply because masculinity has historically held the prime position and is deferred to and understood (Young 1991, p.192).

In many countries, women are participating more in ‘economic and political life, including decision-making’ (International Labour Organization 2015, p.90), and, as noted in previous chapters, women are making significant inroads to policing (Silvestri 2003; Westmarland 2001). Despite changes to work and society, many cultural, social, historical expectations and assumptions remain intractable (Barsh & Yee 2011). There is still evidence of the role of women being seen in and by society as ‘wife, mother and homemaker’ (International Labour Organization 2015, p.91). Research has revealed that advances supporting women’s participation in work seem to have stalled, noting the significance of imperceptible obstacles in the form of rigid assumptions of women and work (Barsh & Yee 2011). These can be understood as being inscribed in systems, structures, *doxa*, and the *habitus* of individuals: men and women (Bourdieu’s 2001, p.8).

Returning to the context of policing, efforts to resist the entry of women into policing were aimed at preserving the pre-existing structures and power relations through strategies such as the selective placement of women in roles that represented the ‘softer’ policing practices. These strategies represent ‘gendered substructures’ that construct and endorse gender in organisations (Acker 2012, p.214). This was evident in Bea’s (constable) narrative of her experience of
'emotion work' later in this chapter (Hochschild 2012, p.163.) These deployments did not prepare women for promotion. Instead, they were seen to protect them from the high-risk, ‘hard’ (real) police work, for which they were seen to be ill-equipped (Brown & Heidensohn 2000; Westmarland 2001, p.178.) Despite equity, access and diversity policies, the gendered discourses, assumptions and practices of police work are persistent and compelling (Westmarland 2001.) Research has revealed that policewomen are still experiencing resistance and discrimination because it is framed as the problem of individuals not culture and systemic circumstances (Silvestri 2003; Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission 2015.) Of significance in my research was how gender power relations configured around notions of masculinity, femininity, bodies, and sexuality were essentially invisible and implicated, as opposed to explicated, in the narratives of many of the participants.

**Sexual Harassment**

Research has also found that sexual harassment regulated how gender was done in workplaces and justified punishment of non-compliance and difference (West & Zimmerman 1987). Data from my research and other research has revealed a history of sexual harassment that reinforced how the body and sexuality become products and resources of gender power relations (Foucault 1977, 1978). This was reflected in Patsy’s formative experiences, which exemplified her work situation.

There was a lot of crap that used to go on before, the people used to know, whether it was towards each other or towards the public or whatever, that it just wasn’t on, especially towards each other and women particularly (Patsy, constable.)

I could write a book of the amount of not abuse but oh, discrimination, harassment sexual harassment, intimidation. Back when I joined it was the norm you know. You were called a “front bum”, you were ostracized, you were felt up like it was just the norm (Patsy, constable.)

While Patsy’s description of the language and behaviour of male police officers towards female police officers is historically situated, recent claims of sexual discrimination and harassment and predatory behaviour in Victoria Police have
confirmed similar findings (Silvester & Perkins 2015; Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission 2015.) (See Chapter 2.)

The police officers’ language and behaviour towards their female counterparts aligns with research showing that men tend to generate more disparaging and abject terms for female genitalia, then is the case for men’s genitalia. The use of deprecating and demeaning terms for women’s genitalia functions to sustain a culture that on the one hand perceives and categorises ‘women’s genitalia [as] either conceptually absent or perceived negatively’, or unifies ‘women and women’s genitalia ... [as] the same thing’ (Braun & Kitzinger’s 2001, p.152).

It highlights how the division of the sexes (biologically and anatomically) constructs social relations, gender relations and divisions of labour (Bourdieu 2001) that are used to exclude women and impact women’s subjectivities (Martin 2001). Intimidation and denigration of women by men can be seen as a way of re-establishing male dominance in the face of perceived threats (Connell 2005). Research has revealed how gender, power and harassment are interrelated; establishing a complex set of power relations, with women often tolerating harassment to remain employed and to have a working relationship with others (McLaughlin et al 2012).

Returning to Patsy’s words that ‘it was just the norm’, I am reminded of Bourdieu’s (2001, p.9) claim that ‘The strength of the masculine order is seen in the fact that it dispenses with justification ... impos[ing] itself as neutral ...’. Studies have shown a correlation between the prevailing attitudes towards women and the use of sexist language (Hamilton 1991; Hyde 1984; Parks & Robertson 2004). Underlying these attitudes is male hegemony. Such language and effects can influence and damage perceptions of women’s status in society and work, their entitlements, careers, and, importantly, reinforcing notions of superiority (men) and inferiority (women). Studies have shown women typically support ‘women’s rights’, while men’s responses to women’s rights reflect apathy and disinterest (Parks &
Robertson 2004). It is important to acknowledge the interconnectedness of
gender, race and class (Acker 2012). Hugo’s comments reinforced this connection.

I hear it all the time. “What do we need women for?” and “Shouldn’t coppers be
6’5” and bullet proof?” And some of the bigoted, racist attitudes that are
expressed, but I’m sure that’s through the whole public service and other
professions and not endemic to us, but it is concerning (Hugo, sergeant).

Hugo clearly linked gender, sexism, racism and general bigotry – ‘I hear it all the
time’. Although he expressed concern, his partial justification that it was more
generally throughout the public service and not just police was significant.
Research has revealed the strength of discourses and formal and informal
practices in organisations and professions constructing and reconstructing gender
and racial definitions and relations that determine the inclusion or exclusion of
others. Neoliberal ideologies are at play in constructing class inequalities and
making them appear natural (Acker 2012). This typifies arrangements of
intelligibility (Foucault 1977) that limit and fix thinking, so that what is beyond
accepted thinking and practice is neither visible nor able to be spoken.

The Invisible, “Unknowable”, Un-Said

Power Struggles

Gabby began her career in policing at the age of 23 and has been in Conundrum for
11 years. Gabby’s narrative centred on a situation that she found challenging
when she was appointed acting sergeant in one of the Criminal Investigation
Branches (CIB). The CIB is a highly esteemed area of policing because it requires
specialist training, demands more rigorous intellectual reasoning than uniform
policing, involves a business-like professional persona and attire, bolsters
prospects for promotion, and, as a consequence, is much sought after
(Westmarland 2001). It is seen as a form of élite ‘real’ policing and has been
traditionally a male-dominated domain.

The gender power relations and struggles reflected in Gabby’s descriptions of her
experiences are not clearly articulated by her. Instead, they remain hidden,
unnamed and therefore unproblematic. Yet the historical and cultural assumptions of policing present a multiplicity of meanings and tensions.

The challenge was that I was working with my colleagues, my peers, and all of a sudden I was in charge of the team, and I had one person who decided to rebel because I was doing the acting sergeant and he wasn’t. In fact he questioned our superiors as to why I was doing it and he wasn’t. He was told I was chosen was because: I was higher in rank than he was; I had six more years experience in the CIB than he had; and I had recently passed my exams. He then made my role as the supervisor quite challenging for the entire time I was acting (Gabby, constable).

Historically, policing was established by and for men and remained a male domain for many years, and women’s entry to policing has been slow, sporadic, and in small numbers. The residue of such a context has permeated the thinking of many male police officers even today and is either consciously or not consciously evident in their language and behaviour. Cultural attitudes are evident in practices that construct women as ‘inferior’ by affording ‘their roles, their tasks’ with ‘less prestige’ than those of their male counterparts (Ortner 1998, p.23). Gabby’s appointment to the management role in CIB was at odds with the historical context and steadfast cultural attitudes. There could be no other objection to her appointment to the role because she had higher qualifications and more experience than the male detective. Gender was central to this situation and Gabby’s experience, albeit she did not articulate it because it was imperceptible to her.

Gabby learned of other examples of the detective constable’s actions.

One of the daily tasks that I needed to do in the position was to allocate investigations that had come through over night to the team members to investigate. I was responsible for overseeing the investigations as a whole. I discovered he was reallocating investigations I had assigned to him, giving them to other members of the team. When I asked him why he was doing this he said he didn’t think he should do them (Gabby, constable).

His actions were contrary to procedures and protocol and did not support Gabby’s leadership and management of the team and the investigations. Power is inherent in the ‘notion of binary opposition’, such as ‘male/female’, ‘masculinity/femininity’, and in this case male detective/ female detective (Reeser 2010, p.38). The argument is founded on the very nature of the relationship
whereby, ‘one element of the hierarchy needs opposition to impose ...its hegemony on the other’ (Reeser 2010, p.38). This seemed to be happening in this situation between Gabby and the male detective constable. Various organisational processes – job design, the role of supervisors, rules directly or indirectly guiding behaviours – can function as ‘substructures’ preserving particular assumptions of gender (Acker 2012, p.215). In this instance, Gabby’s experience could be examined and understood from the perspectives of sex-role stereotypes, notions of expertise, and the ‘power-threat model’ (McLaughlin et al 2012, p.626).

One of three standpoints identified in a recent study was the long-standing sex-role stereotype that constituted men’s and women’s roles and responsibilities, thereby fixing meaning (Barsh & Yee 2011). This has significance given that policing and CIB have been male dominated domains.

When I asked him why he was doing this, I was basically lied to. Then his paperwork didn’t match up as he’d decided not to put his paperwork through me first, as per procedure, and instead put it through another sergeant (a male) who was not involved with the team (Gabby, constable).

A residue of this standpoint in this context is that women can still be seen as outsiders, by some male (and female) police officers. A study of gendered organisational cultures found that when positions or roles have prestige, are highly valued and sought after, fewer women will have access to those positions and roles, and be seen as not as eligible as men for those positions and roles (Rutherford 2014, p.195).

Sitting alongside and within stereotyping is the notion of masculinity ‘equate[d] ... with expertise’ (Rolston 2012, p.904). Gabby also recounted:

I found out he was putting his own covering report on the file and completely missing the next step. When I asked him why he was doing this he said, “I’m trying to save you work. It was a complex investigation and I know you don’t have a lot of time, you’re quite busy” (Gabby, constable).
Obviously, I had to explain that I was in charge of the team at the moment and it was my role to check the file and put a covering report on it, not him or another sergeant from different team (Gabby, constable).

The detective constable’s actions could well be seen as an attempt to assert or reclaim his authority and to resist the emergence and presence of a competent policewoman achieving status and recognition (Silvestri 2003; Westmarland 2001). The implications of his statement to Gabby about the ‘complex’ nature of the investigation and her being ‘quite busy’ could be understood to signify the need for particular expertise (e.g., masculine) and raised questions or doubt about Gabby’s ability to handle the demands of a supervisory role in CIB. Due to their small numbers, policewomen and their performance are exposed to greater scrutiny and judgement, albeit based on standards that reinforce males having greater self-control, rational thinking, and therefore external control (Reeser 2010; Silvestri 2003).

From another perspective, the situation could be seen to typify the ‘power-threat model’ which occurs when ‘women who [are perceived] to threaten men’s dominance’ become objects to be harassed. Women’s foray into policing has been fraught with resistance. In essence, women or more specifically women’s bodies were seen as a sexual threat to men’s rational thinking and morality. The paradox of which is that women in authority are more likely to experience harassment, discrimination and to be the subjects and objects of power struggles (McLaughlin et al 2012, p.626).

Research by the International Labour Office (2015, p.93) argued that the culture of many organisations replicated ‘society’s gender norms’. Police officers are recruited from society and, in the main, epitomise dominant societal values associated with class, race, and gender. Policing, along with ‘the military, and construction’ are ‘male-dominated, gendered’ and, to varying degrees, ‘masculinized industries’ (Collins 2014, p.2). It has been argued that an ‘invisibility of masculinity’ exists in gendered organisational cultures where particular beliefs,
assumptions, and practices relating to gender and difference are accepted, remain unchecked, and gain hegemonic status (Rutherford 2014, p.194).

Men’s resistance towards women’s entry to particular occupations can be seen as symbolic or actual violence, based upon the realisation that:

social positions themselves are sexually characterized, and characterizing, and that, defending their jobs against feminization, men are trying to protect their most deep-rooted idea of themselves as men, especially in the case of social categories such as manual works or occupations such as those of the army, which owe much, if not all of their value, even in their own eyes, to their image of manliness (Bourdieu 2001, p.96).

It is paradoxical that on the one hand the concept of masculinity is visible as many of the participants’ voices reflected yet it was also invisible in the sense that it was not named and seen as a problem. Instead, it was the norm: the dominant and accepted way of knowing and going about policing. In this instance Gabby’s presence in the role was antithetical to the hegemonic masculine norms. The pervasiveness of such norms can translate to women’s acceptance of their place in policing and complicit in adapting to the norms.

**Tacit Acceptance**

In thinking further about her experience as acting sergeant, Gabby said:

At first, I was disappointed because we had been friends for eight or nine years, working together on and off. I felt personally upset by his behaviour. In thinking more about it, I decided to remove myself from the situation and to start to try and understand how he was feeling and perhaps why he was doing this (Gabby, constable).

Gabby adopted an objective stance and attempted to move beyond the personal, subjective feelings to a more objective de-personalised stance. She said:

I finally realised that I needed to let him see that he was valuable to me, so I decided to work on his strengths, so I gave him investigations that suited his work experience and let him take charge of those (Gabby, constable).

While this might be appropriate from a leadership perspective, bringing the outsider (i.e., detective constable) back into the team, it simultaneously excused his efforts to gain control or assume authority and overlooked her experience of having her authority undermined. This typified women’s experiences of sexism
and subordination going unchecked, under the radar of many women, but especially men, in settings such as *Conundrum*. It was a constant reminder of the natural order of things, how things should be. Gabby’s acceptance of the situation and lack of critique of the situation translated to her conditioned acceptance of the ‘symbolic violence’ and the reality of her and women’s place in policing (Bourdieu 2001, p.1). This is akin to Pearce and Maclure’s (2009, p.250) concept of ‘looking for absence rather than presence’.

While some women accept discriminatory behaviour towards them in order to stay in the job, others through ignorance or lack of awareness of the gendered power relations might tacitly accept the limits imposed by the dominant. Gabby’s, and later Bea’s, narratives provided insights to the discursive and seductive nature of social, cultural discourses and practices that constructed gender and associated power relations.

This domination – conscious or not – was inscribed in Gabby’s and the detective constable’s *habitus*, and was ‘inseparable from the structures ... that produce and reproduce them, in both men and women’ through pedagogies, *doxa*, and ritual activities (p.42). In this instance, the detective constable’s need to take charge of the situation as a right, as a natural outcome, in keeping with:

... the *paradox of doxa* – the fact that the order of the world as we find it ... with its relations of domination, its rights and prerogatives, privileges and injustices ultimately perpetuates itself so easily ... [a]nd masculine domination, and the way it is imposed and suffered, [is] the prime example of this paradoxical submission, an effect of what I call symbolic violence, a gentle violence, imperceptible and invisible even to its victims, exerted for the most part through the purely symbolic channels of communication and cognition (more precisely, misrecognition), recognition and even feeling (Bourdieu 2001, pp.1-2, emphasis in original).

Forms of hegemonic masculinity are not spatially and temporally fixed. Instead, they inhabit and permeate archetype behaviour and accepted power relations. Authority and a semblance of neutrality and objectivity are central to hegemony’s success. In policing, it is the authority and dominance of men and the subjugation and subordination of women. To quote Irigaray (1993, p.12): ‘... the feminine has become, ... the non-masculine, that is to say an abstract nonexistent reality’.
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Now I will introduce Bea and her experiences of the gendered power relations of policing in *Conundrum*.

**Gender Roles, Styles, and Subjectivities**

Bea has been with *Conundrum* and engaged in police work for 24 years. She chose to reflect on her experiences and practice and her sense of self and subjectivity reflected incongruity, impacted by context and culture, for she was at once herself and another to the other. The culture demanded more traditional and static notions of self and gender, yet she experienced contradictions as she encountered situations, which engendered responses that were contrary and inferior to tradition. In her narrative below, Bea spoke of how she would like others (i.e., peers) to describe her and I found her response enlightening and compelling.

**V8s, Football, and Racing**

Without hesitation and in a manner that conveyed conviction, Bea said:

I’d like them to describe me as a good chick that’s worth workin’ with (Bea, constable; Ryan 2012, p.7).

Bea explained her statement when she said:

My attitude is: who you work with makes a difference whether you enjoy your shift or not. You can have the worst shift, but if you still enjoy the person’s company and you get on well, that’s all that matters. I’ve had some people I’ve worked with and I’ve had nothing in common. I was old enough to be his mother [laughter] (Bea, constable).

Bea’s approach reflected a combination of the ‘feminine’ and ‘semi-masculine’ styles adopted by women in policing (Garcia 2003, p.341). On the one hand, Bea’s approach to working with male police officers reflected the ‘semi-masculine’ style adopted by many women in policing. Simultaneously, her words also highlighted aspects of the ‘feminine’ style, being a mother figure representing maturity and experience and guidance and protection. While research shows these styles caused less stress, they did not generate acceptance and respect for women (Garcia 2003).
Bea provided further explanation of her efforts to establish working relationships.

There’s only so much football you can talk about. Yes, I prepare for the shift, reading about football and what the clubs are up to. I can hold conversations about V8s, football and racing. But you can only go so far and only do so much (Bea, constable; Ryan 2012, p.7).

I’ve got it down pat when you work with men for as long as I have. I have to pick out a good perv for the guys – “Hey, check that out, check that out!” You know, it takes effort to build relationships (Bea, constable; Ryan 2012, p.7).

Bea’s final statement emphasised women’s efforts to build relationships, prove themselves in male-dominated occupations and organisations because of their subordinate status. Women’s identity and position are negatively constructed as different, lesser or lacking. As a consequence, women have to construct their identity and affirm their status as legitimate (Irigaray 1993). Bea goes to considerable lengths to fit in, establish relationships, and to accommodate the needs of her male partners, even to finding them ‘a good perv’. Her language ‘chick’, ‘perv’ and feeling the need to talk about V8 cars and football situates her in the hegemonic masculine space and discourse, albeit as an interloper.

Underlying the need to build working relationships is a particular culture that demands compliance. As Bea said:

It was drummed into us when I joined. We were told, we were all family and we had to look after each other and that was it cause no one else was going to look after us. So we had each other’s back (Bea, constable).

While the notion of being part of a family and of looking after ‘each other’s back’ is understandable in an operational context, it does not automatically extend to having to adopt a combination of feminine (i.e., mother, protector) and semi-masculine (i.e. a macho persona) values and discourses in order to be accepted. The pedagogies of the hegemonic masculinity are paramount, having greater value than an inclusive, mutually respectful interaction and relationships (Ortner 1998). Irigarary (1993, pp.39-40) argued that the female body provokes a:

respect for difference, the patriarchal social body constructs itself hierarchically, excluding difference. Woman-as-other has to remain the natural substratum in this social construction ...
In essence, this categorisation and standing as a natural substratum within the hegemonic masculine space sanctions distinctions between policemen’s work as rational labour (‘hard’ police work) and policewomen’s work as emotional labour (‘soft’ police work).

**Rational Work versus Emotional Work**

Reflecting on her experience and practice of situations that did not go well, Bea shared with me her first experience of a ‘cot death’, early in her career. What she described highlights issues associated with work and gender and in particular conceptions of ‘emotional’ versus ‘rational’ labour (Westmarland 2001, p.68). Women have been described as doing more ‘emotion work’ than men and doing it differently from men because, for the majority, they have been or are afforded a low status in society and many workplaces. They are ‘a subordinate social stratum’ (Hochschild 2012, p.163). It has been argued that:

... the lower our status, the more our manner of seeing and feeling is subject to being discredited, and the less believable it becomes. An “irrational” feeling is the twin of an invalidated perception. A person of lower status has a weaker claim to the right to define what is going on; less trust is placed in her judgments; and less respect is accorded to what she feels (Hochschild 2012, p.173).

In policing, rational labour is equated with ‘hard’ (real) police work (e.g., fighting crime, strategies and interventions that reduce crime, arrest rates) and performance indicators are aligned to it, which gives it greater value and legitimacy.

Bea described the situation:

I went with a senior constable to this Maori lady. Her husband was working down the mines. It was really late, after midnight and she found her little fellow [baby] ... umm ... passed away. It was quite emotional. Then she started singing him a goodbye song in her Maori tongue and we’re bawling. We’re all bawling and I’m thinkin’, “Oh, my Gawd, how can we cope with this?” It was horrible. When I eventually came away from it, I rang my husband early in the morning and I couldn’t talk. I just could not physically talk (Bea, constable; Ryan 2012, p.6).
Bea’s words reflected a deep emotional response to this situation, bawling and being unable to talk to her husband when she telephoned him. This situation is typical of emotional labour (as opposed to rational labour) and one to which many policewomen have been historically, and to varying degrees today, assigned to and/or chosen (i.e., sexual, child and familial offences and violence). These domains have been referred to as ‘warm, fuzzy policing’ or the ‘pink ghetto’ (Wertsch 1998, p.35). A consequence of the rational / emotional binary is that women are perceived as being less capable for managing feelings, potentially incoherent and prone to crying, while men are seen as, and expected to be, lucid, logical and undemonstrative (Seidler 1998; Westmarland 2001). In occupations such as policing, it epitomises emotional work. In organisations generally, those who express emotions can be judged as feeble, pitiful, and expendable (Nicholson 1996), and in policing, displays of emotion represent a weakness, lack of strength, discipline, and professionalism (Seidler 1998; Silvestri 2003; Westmarland 2001).

Bea then recalled attending her second ‘cot death’ quite some time after the first experience.

I was in tears even before I got there. I was thinkin’, “Oh, I do not want to do this.” The tears were rollin’ down my face. It was drainin’. Cot deaths are one of the worst things you can go to, but you’re human and it doesn’t matter how hard you try to put these sort of emotions aside, you’re gonna cry, and there’s nothing you can do about it (Bea, constable; Ryan 2012, p.6).

Bea’s expression of emotions in response to this situation represented an embodied, agentic and relational dimension to her practice. She acknowledged that it is human to cry and show emotion, noting that it is hard to ‘put ... emotions aside’, to essentially adopt a disembodied approach to distressing and sad situations. The illusio of impassive and disembodied responses to police practices is embedded in and promulgated by and through pedagogies imbued with social, cultural, institutional discourses and rules. As Hochschild (2012, p.49) declares, ‘Some institutions ... suggest how to imagine and how to feel ... [they] manage how we feel’. In hierarchical settings such as police and Conundrum, those officers perceived to be more experienced and knowledgeable are incredibly influential in teaching others how to manage their emotions, ‘plac[ing] parameters around a
worker’s emotion memories’ (Hochschild 2012, p.49).

This challenge is evidenced further in her description of delivering ‘death messages’: another routine task for police.

There was a double fatality, couple of kids, boys going surfing and they hit a tree. We had to deliver death messages. The first mum’s hitting me, saying she didn’t believe it. It was drainin’ and exhaustin’, and we were continually in tears that day. Afterwards we just had a beer and sat in silence. You feel like shit. You feel horrible. It’s like watching a movie. You don’t know the people, but you still get involved in it and you still feel things, smile at the happy bits; cry at the sad bits. These [jobs] never went well emotionally (Bea, constable; Ryan 2012, p.6).

Bea’s final statement that these situations (i.e., the cot deaths and death messages) – ‘never went well emotionally’ – was profound. She depicted her emotions or emotional work as a negative consequence and placed it at the centre of her experience. Her reflections of and responses to her show of emotions represent ‘a moment of indeterminacy’ where her ‘embodied subject [self] is constituted through dominant norms but is not reducible to them’ (McNay 2000, p.33). Essentially, Bea judged her show of emotion (i.e., crying, bawling, unable to talk) as a weakness, diminishing her performance and competence because it is the antithesis of what is taught, expected, and understood to be valued in policing. Drodge and Murphy (2002, p.425) claimed:

The ideals of neutrality, objectivity, and impartiality are viewed as necessary antecedents of professionalism in the male dominated institution of policing. The emotional prescription for police work is tacitly understood: calm, disengaged, affectless order, an unquestioning obeisance.

At the heart of this is the conflation of emotions and gender. In settings where rational, logical responses are valued and expected, expressions of emotions are usually seen as irrational, weaknesses, and dismissed or even ridiculed (Hochschild 2012). These situations and Bea’s responses can be explored from a number of different perspectives: emotion, police culture, professional persona, self-discipline, and gender. Studies have revealed that the expression of emotion is often assessed as either the ‘good or bad functioning of a police officer’ (Aaron 2000; Carpenter, Tait, Quadrelli & Thompson 2015; Frewin et al 2000, p.252; Howard, Tuffin & Stephens 2000). For men, a show of emotions would also include diminishing their reputation and status. An implication of showing one’s
emotions is equated to a lack of discipline, not being committed to the *illusio*, not having ‘a feel for the game’. A further implication: a lack of discipline in what constitutes high-risk situations could translate to not having the other’s back with the potential of endangering others.

Bea’s perception of herself and her practice might also point to her adoption of the ‘semi-masculine’ role, tending to abide by the dominant culture and expectations in order to establish relationships and fit in. I recall Frewin et al’s (2000, p.252) study, which showed that:

... if you are a police officer taking charge of a situation, coping and being emotional, in this case weeping or acting as a “cot case”, are not compatible.

Bourdieu (2001, p.52) drew connections between notions of ‘courage’, manliness, fear, and ‘cowardice’. With reference to armies and police, he argued that stretching the bounds of safety in dealing with risks and even in engaging in ‘reckless behaviour’ arose from ‘the fear of losing the respect and admiration of the group’ (Bourdieu 2001, p.52, emphasis in original). He saw ‘[m]anliness’ as a ‘relational notion’ ... ‘against femininity, in a kind of fear of the female, firstly in oneself’ (Bourdieu 2001, p.53, emphasis in original). I am also reminded of McNay’s (2000, p.41) ‘pre-reflexive mode of habitus’ where entrenched and unconscious ideas of behaviours and practices associated with gender limit what can be thought otherwise and that questioning these ideas might well close thinking and reinforce existing conceptions of gender. A study by Howard, Tuffin and Stephens (2000) revealed that police officers see emotions as a threat to their identity and capability, destabilising the values and practices of logical and reasoned command and leadership.

**A Moment ...**

I mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that I deliberately did not broach the topic of gender in my interviews with police officers. Gender related matters emerged from the data. Patsy’s descriptions of sexual harassment were quite explicit, however, she still dismissed it as a typical feature of the culture. Gabby
and Bea’s narratives touched on features of the gender power relations and notions of self and subjectivity. What is most striking is the silence surrounding gender in their experiences of working in an organisation and occupation saturated with notions of masculinity and confounded by gendered power relations. Police continue to ‘act as though this makes no difference’ (Derrida 1997, p.xviii).

**Policing Emotion Work**

An understanding of embodied praxis requires that we address the issue of emotion, for if the body is to be understood as more than that which constitutes individual subjectivity, then it must be conceptualised in its essentially relational and interactive dimensions, not simply in its socialised form (O’Loughlin, 2006, p.10).

Police are regularly confronting situations that elude profound ‘negative emotions’, which need to be managed (Barber, Grawitch & Trares 2009; Berking, Meier & Wupperman 2010, p.329; van Gelderen, Bakker, Konijn & Demerouti 2011; Williams, Ciarrochi & Deane 2010). Research has revealed that police officers struggle to recognise and endure negative emotions and can then have trouble participating in situations that involve heightened emotions (Berking et al 2009; Williams et al 2010). My data reveals examples of a ‘detached rationality’, which is valued over emotion, valorising an unbiased, impassive representation of professionalism in policing. The suppression of emotion in police work aligns with masculine notions of policing and represents a disembodied form of practice, one that reflects ‘calm disengagement, affectless order, and unquestioning obeisance’ (Drodge & Murphy 2002, p.425). This is supported by research of cultural and organisational factors that contribute to how emotions are regulated and how the rules of emotion work are determined, controlled, and enacted (Barber et al 2009; Pogrebin & Poole 1991; Tsai & Huang 2002; van Gelderen et al 2011; Williams 2010). Rules constraining and suppressing the expression of emotions are in direct contrast to an embodied practice involving the synergy between internal and external perceptions of experiences (Merleau-Ponty 2002). For police in
*Conundrum* the connectedness of ‘inner experience’ and ‘outer experience’ is denied (Kant 2003, pp.245-246; Merleau-Ponty 2002)

The police persona or façade and the place of feelings in policing were explicit in Joe and David’s reflections.

In policing, people do suppress feelings significantly and sometimes that comes out in bad ways (Joe, senior police officer).

You try to keep your emotions to one side. If you go to a job and you’re too emotional to do your job, that’s no good. So you’ve got to try to isolate, suppress it at least while you’re dealing with the situation and it might come out later in other ways, good or not so good. You’ve got to suppress your emotional response to get the job done and to protect yourself. Keep a lid on it so you can function. Not everyone can do it. Generally, our recruitment processes look for those who have a reasonably good control over their emotions (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

Studies have found that police culture has imposed a ban on the expression of emotions (Barber et al 2009; Pogrebin & Poole 1991; Williams et al 2010), which Joe and David clearly admitted. Further to these findings, emotional detachment quickly becomes the norm for police officers and is reinforced in recruit training (Robinson, Sigman & Wilson 1997; Williams et al 2010). The recent reviews of Victoria Police by the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission (2015) and by Cotton (2016) noted that putting one’s emotions aside was a key feature of the culture. David reinforced the need to suppress emotions in order ‘to do your job’ and ‘to protect yourself’. Such an attitude and approach rests within the vestiges of the masculine traditions of policing, underscored by an objective, detached character (Chan 1997; Drodge & Murphy 2002; Frewin et al 2000; Heidensohn 1992). It has been argued that ‘emotional labor’ (Hochschild 1983, p.138) involving the act of faking emotions, is more likely to become common practice in organisations that place greater emphasis on outcomes and processes as opposed to people (Barber et al 2009; Drodge & Murphy 2002). The implications of faking or suppressing emotions are potentially serious and far-reaching. This is explained more, later in this chapter.
Elliott’s comments, while supporting more proactive approaches to dealing with stressful situations, provided an illustrative bridge between emotional expression and gender perceptions.

I think [police officers] have got to learn how to deal with stress and situations and how to de-stress and I think they’ve got to learn to talk, be open and no matter how they feel that it might be unmanly or girly or whatever, you know... I think they need to be able to express themselves (Elliott, constable).

He raised valid concerns about police officers confronting trauma and stressful situations on an almost daily basis. For Elliott, the expression of feelings was necessary. In this respect he was perhaps ahead of others. Whilst his advice was sage, police officers in my research and that of others emphasised the suppression and denial of emotions as a common practice (see Chapters 2 and 5.) Worthy of note was Elliott’s reference to the expression of feelings as ‘unmanly or girly’, implying the binary of emotional / feminine, unemotional / masculine or rational (masculine) and irrational (feminine), which nevertheless did not fit well with his inherent masculinity. His perceptions of what constituted masculine and feminine responses reinforced the stereotypical notions of gender and expressions of emotion identified and discussed in Chapters 2, 3, and 5. There was a logical connection between common sense as the basis of good policing and perception of weakness in gender difference and emotional honesty.

Literature has revealed that police officers have also tended to use humour (also referred to as black humour) to deal with the stressors of their work (Frewin et al 2000; Innes 2002). This is common practice of other disciplines involved in high risk, emergency work, such as nursing and other emergency services (Vivona 2014; Young 1995). Humour has the potential to reinforce shared experiences and knowing and to support a calm façade in the face of trauma (Vivona 2014; Young 1995). In studying police work and the place of emotions, Drodge and Murphy argued:

There is a presumption that rational thinking can exist in a pure state devoid of emotional content, something that is highly valued in police work where the phrase “Just give me the facts” belies a deep mistrust of emotions and a presumption that facts are untainted by emotional color (2002, p.425).
The importance of a calm demeanour recurred throughout my data.

**Touchy-Feely**

As previously noted in Chapter 4, contemporary policing is seen as having increasing social responsibility. It has been described by some of the police officers as akin to welfare and social work functions and relegated to the realms of ‘soft’ policing, as opposed to ‘hard’, real police work; the command and control, authoritative style of policing. Increased social responsibility raises the spectre of relational, agential practice and therefore emotions.

Gracie has been a police officer with *Conundrum* for 26 years. Gracie described policing as:

> [O]utcome-driven and very process-driven. Many police officers see themselves in charge of the outcomes rather than just the people. The people are secondary to the outcomes. When we’re out there doing policing, there’s no room for all this other stuff like thinking, feeling, and reflecting (Gracie, constable).

The strength of the focus on processes and outcomes in policing has been noted previously by police officers in Chapter 4 (i.e., benchmarks, targets). In this instance, Gracie acknowledged the potential for people to become ‘secondary to the outcomes’. People include one’s self and others. This approach exemplified an external focus and perception of experience with the potential for an internal focus to be reduced or disregarded (Kant 2003; Merleau-Ponty 2002). Operating only from an external or outward focus involves the separation of mind, body and emotions from an experience. Yet, the body is inherently connected to and influenced by the context, people, movement, time and space (Merleau-Ponty 2002). In part, for police this can be seen as adopting the police persona or façade, as a means of protecting themselves from the trauma of a situation, as noted earlier by David. Concerns for individual police officers and the efficacy of practice arise when an external focus becomes habituated and part of the cultural capital (Merleau-Ponty 2002).
Gracie acknowledged:

While some police officers have a sense of their own emotions and things, I question their identification of their feelings. They might have a general sense but I don’t know how specific they’d be in knowing exactly what the feeling is ... whether it’s anger or frustration or disappointment. It might just be something that feels negative or not right (Gracie, constable).

This reminded me of the study of police recruits by Williams et al (2010) that found the habit of controlling and rejecting emotions resulted in limiting individual’s ability and capacity to recognise and name emotions and to draw on them to manage behaviour. Further to this, Gracie commented:

To think or feel in a way that is different to anyone else is seen as a weakness even when other people have probably felt it too, it’s just not OK to say it or do it [show emotion] (Gracie, constable).

One police officer in Cotton’s (2016, p.47) report of the findings of a review of mental health and wellbeing of employees in Victoria Police stated:

My very first job was the death of a child. My sergeant moved the box of tissues away from me and told me I needed to suck it up.

The binary of emotion / weakness reflects the cultural capital of pedagogies that regulate how emotions are managed: suppressed, modified or deliberately misrepresented or falsified. In policing, as noted previously, the police persona or façade represents significant cultural capital, determining how experiences are interpreted and how feelings and emotions are controlled (Hochschild 1997). Pedagogies regulating emotions are driven by organisational and peer-group rules and expectations and an emphasis on cognitive ways of knowing. Other police officers in my research raised similar concerns about expressing emotions.

Gracie described the practice of managing emotions.

It’s a cultural tendency to connect with the head [thinking] and not the emotions, not to connect with things seen as touchy-feely (Gracie, constable).

The pervasive nature of culture is evident here as it encroached and impacted on emotions at every point from acknowledging feelings and emotions to naming, evaluating and controlling them through to showing and communicating
emotions (Hochschild 1997, p.11). To perform otherwise or differently from
cultural expectations can be problematic. This also emphasised ongoing concerns
about the lack of reflexive practice in policing based on an erroneous notion of
incompatibility between thinking reflectively or critically and maintaining
assertive control (Bonifacio 1991).

In thinking about learning, Gracie referred to the interrelationship between
emotions and the personal when she said:

I learn more from experiences that have an emotional impact on me because they
have connected with me personally (Gracie, constable).

Gracie’s reference to emotions and the personal aligned with features of the
Western tradition of separating the ‘body from mind’ and categorising emotions
as ‘private, ‘irrational’, inner sensations, which have been tied, historically, to
women’s ‘dangerous desires’ and ‘hysterical bodies” (Grosz 1994; Williams &
Bendelow 1998, p.xv). The aportia of gender is ever-present in discussions of
emotions and embodied practice generally, but especially in policing. This was
echoed in Bea’s (constable) narrative (earlier in this chapter) of her negative
assessment of her response to others’ grief; that her expression of emotion
showed a lack of competence and could be judged as a weakness, which is in
direct contrast to Izard’s (2002, p.798-799) contention that the activation of
emotions define experiences and guide behaviour.

As was noted earlier in this chapter, the residue of the masculine characteristics of
policing is deep-seated, creating “truths” that support the rational / emotional
binary and how it should be played out or demonstrated by both women and men.
Being emotional is equated with women and a rational and unemotional approach
is expected of men (Butler 1993; Connell 2005; Westmarland 2001, p.68). This
represents a symbolic practice that is not specific to police, but that which has
been propagated through pedagogies founded on discourses and culture that
determine the body’s relationship to place, space and other (Connell 2005;
O’Loughlin 2006). It also reflects societal structures of gender as social practice
based on assumptions and expectations of men and women’s bodies (Butler 1993; Connell 2005).

Gracie acknowledged, however:

There are some police officers who do it [thinking, feeling, reflecting] really well, but that’s where they really stand out and that’s often where they get labelled as more of a “touchy-feely” type of person because they’re more open to problems and dealing with some of those emotions with other people and the public as well (Gracie, constable).

Ridicule and a devaluing of those who demonstrated a reflexive approach to their practice reinforced aspects of the masculine discourse and values, and were reflected in pedagogies that were used as instruments to control behaviour.

Harry’s comments gave further texture to Gracie’s observations.

Feelings are a difficult one. You don’t really express your feelings. People just don’t really show their feelings at work very often. Sometimes, if you do a really good job, people pat you on the back, but, yeah I mean if it was a kind of really difficult job where people might get a little bit upset about it you might ask, “Are you all right?” (Harry, constable)

I found Harry’s opening statement that the topic of feelings was a difficult one to consider compelling. While I was very aware of a reluctance by many police officers to talk about their feelings, I was somewhat surprised, and pleased, by Harry’s candour. His example in relation to a ‘difficult job’ where people ‘might get a little bit upset’ seemed to typify a potential masking of feelings and emotions. It also reflected a tokenistic attempt at empathy with a cursory acknowledgement of and response to a colleague’s or another’s expressed emotion. This linked to the rules of the game that eschew overt expressions of emotions.

A justification and, in a sense, a cautionary note with regard to an empathic, embodied response was evident in Harry’s next comment.

It may be perceived as a sign of weakness if you show too many feelings and it’s just something else that people can take the piss out of you for, so you don’t generally kind of get too emotional (Harry, constable).
It has been reported that police struggle to acknowledge negative emotions either willingly, deliberately or as conditioned to do so (Barber et al 2009; Berking et al 2010; Evans, Coman, Stanley & Burrows 1993; Violanti, Marshall & Howe 1985). This amplifies the commitment to suppressing, ignoring and avoiding emotions, and the ways in which peer pressure is used to achieve compliance (i.e., ridicule, emphasising weakness of character and lack of competence). Research of police officers’ coping mechanisms in response to negative emotions has revealed distinctions between a focus on problem, task, or process (technical rational) versus a focus on emotions (or affect). The former connected with stress and distress while the latter tended to reduce stress and distress associated with negative events (Patterson 2003). The practice of many police to detach emotionally is contrary to such findings, as affirmed by others (Hochschild 1997; Tsai & Huang 2002; van Gelderen et al 2011).

**Empathy**

A paradox surrounds the notion and practice of empathy in the policing context. On the one hand, definite feelings of ‘empathy and cooperation’ were evident in Skolnick’s (2005, p.275) research of the police officers towards their fellow officers, based on occupational solidarity, ‘authority’ and ‘isolation from the community’ (Skolnick 2005, p.272). On the other hand, a lack of empathy in response to expressions of emotion was evident in my research, and noted in Gracie and Harry’s comments above.

Adding further to the notion of empathy and how it was perceived, I found Kylie’s reflections remarkable:

> I know not all of us have it [empathy] [laughter]. But I think you need to be a little empathetic. You need to be approachable, not only to the guys you work with, but to the members of the public as well. You need to have a little bit, just enough [empathy] to keep it real (Kylie, constable).

Her comment about having ‘enough [empathy] to keep it real’ could be understood in terms of the police persona or façade that protects police officers from the realities of their work. In terms of adopting a reflexive approach to
professional practice and learning, a disembodied, rational, unemotional and unreflective approach is antithetical to a truly embodied form of practice and learning.

Fred provided further insights to how policing was perceived and needed to be conducted from a personal and professional perspective.

I connect a lot [to feelings] actually. I have to work hard to overcome some of the “soft things” you know the emotive things cause you ... I generally feel sorry for someone but I have to manage something in this way, or you’re furious with someone as well and you want to tear their head off over what they’ve done but you maintain that equilibrium. Yeah, quite often I have to work hard to overcome empathy (Fred, inspector).

Kylie and Fred’s descriptions of empathy were almost like a condition, something that could be acquired, but equally could be avoided, not acquired, or to have it in limited doses. Again, the language reinforced notions of the binary of soft / hard policing and police persona. Fred’s mention of the ‘soft things’ denoted the emotional aspects of work framed as something one must ‘overcome’ and avoid, or conquer in order to maintain a firm persona directly associated with hard (“real”) police work.

Reg’s description of a typical experience in his career provided further insights to the discourses and expected practices.

There was none of this talking about feelings, emotions or what did you learn. I mean, it was that bad (Reg, sergeant).

One of the fellas that went through the academy with me, we started afternoon shift in traffic at 4 o’clock. I’d been to a wedding for lunch. We went to a fatal accident at XX. It was one of our course members who’d been to the same wedding. He was dead on the road and we did our job and straight back to work. Not one phone call, no nothing. No stress management. There was nothing. You know, back in those days there was just absolutely nothing. They’d say: “You’re a police officer, you don’t show your emotions, you go back to work.” (Reg, sergeant)

Critical incident stress management (CISM), with an international set of standards and intervention programs, has been adopted by numerous disciplines – police, airline pilots, navy, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) – and has proved to be
efficacious (Everly, Flennery & Mitchell 2000) as well as other broader interventions detailed in Cotton’s (2016) report. It is reassuring that changes and advances have been made, and are continuing to be made, in terms of the provision of psychological support for police officers, along with research that has emphasised the detrimental effects of traumatic experiences (Cotton 2016; Everly et al 2000). It is unfortunate however that the residue of thinking and practice that perpetuates negative responses and reactions to stress is inscribed in the field of policing and habitus of many police officers. It is both pervasive and persuasive. Cotton’s (2016) Victoria Police mental health review has highlighted the need for cultural change with regard to mental health issues. Cotton (2016) highlighted the stigma associated with emotional / stress issues considered to be detrimental to career prospects. In his recommendations, Cotton (2016, p.15) also stated:

> It is abundantly clear that the cultural drivers of gender-based discrimination and harassment significantly overlap with the drivers of mental health-related stigma and tolerance margins for bad behaviours that so strongly impede appropriate early help-seeking behaviours in relation to mental health issues. All of this points toward a need for significant culture change.

**Learning with Feeling**

Typically and traditionally, education has separated the cognitive and affective domains and focused on the cognition (Dewey 1916; Dumont, Istance & Benavides 2010; Jarvis 2006). My data suggests a disconnection between the two domains resulting in a disembodied approach to learning, as well as practice. I note that in reviewing his definition of learning, Jarvis refers to the integration of cognitive, social, emotional, agential, and contextual elements.

> ... the whole person – body (genetic, physical and biological) and mind (knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, emotions, beliefs and senses): experiences a social situation, the perceived content of which is then transformed cognitively, emotively or practically (or through any combination) and integrated into the person’s individual biography resulting in a changed (or more experienced) person (2006, p.13, emphasis in original).

Attention to feelings or emotions therefore provides a foundation for profound, transformative learning. The literature relating to police training and education
has revealed strong commitments to traditional notions of learning with the transmission of knowledge, or information and skills (i.e., a doctrinal intent), with little if any attention to emotions (Birzer 2003; Birzer & Tannehill 2001; Bradley 2005, 2009a; Chappell 2008; Marenin 2004; McCoy 2006; White 2006). The rationalist perspective of experience sees emotion misrepresenting experience, the subjective perspective contaminating the objective or true perspective, which limits thinking, practice, and learning that results from a reliance on experience without emotion (Dewey 1916; Pring 2007). This aligns with an external perception of learning as opposed to one that integrates internal and external perceptions that engender deeper learning (Kant 2003; Merleau-Ponty 2002).

Insight to police officers’ thinking about the place of emotion (or feelings) in learning can be gained through their language. In particular, my data reveals a tendency amongst the officers to speak of feelings in the second person, not the first. Elliott began his statement in the first person, but reverted to the second person when he mentions feeling ‘satisfied’, ‘confident’ and ‘proud’.

I feel like I’m getting something from it. I think I feel it brings confidence that I’m learning something new and it’s another challenge that you’re learning to overcome. I suppose it just makes you feel satisfied. You feel like you’ve done something, and you’ve achieved something and you feel confident with yourself and proud (Elliott, constable).

Feelings of satisfaction, confidence and pride were not directly attributed to him or owned by him, but were removed from him and attributed to someone else, namely ‘you’. Language such as this can reflect the denial, lack of acceptance of those feelings, and in the policing context, an inability or unwillingness to overtly own and express those feelings for fear of retribution. The feelings are not internalised. Instead, they are external to the individual and separate from the process of learning.

Charles gave another example.

Gee, there are a lot of times within this job when you’d feel thrown in the deep end. I know having done different development courses where you’re not familiar with the stuff that you’re learning and you feel very, very much out of your depth, you feel very uncomfortable (Charles, sergeant).
The analogy of being ‘thrown in the deep end’, implying notions of sinking or swimming, was significant for Charles’s experiences of learning in *Conundrum*, albeit not directly attributed to him. Charles inferred that feeling ‘out of your depth’ (i.e., likely to sink rather than swim) and consequently feeling uncomfortable were common to learning in *Conundrum*. As has been noted in previous chapters, the *habitus* and doxa of policing have established a set of standards that require rational, controlled, confident, calm, capable responses to situations. Feeling uncomfortable does not sit well with police officers. They prefer not to show inadequacies (or what might be conceived of as incompetence) in any situations and learning with one’s peers has the potential to expose one’s vulnerabilities.

When thinking and talking about how he felt when learning, Fred’s opening statement was in the first person, but subsequent statements were in the second person. He admitted that learning is not ‘easy’ for him, but when he started to talk about feelings, he moved to the second person. Within his statement he referred to ‘your head’ and ‘things stay[ing] in’, aligning learning with the cognitive domain and separating it from the affective domain.

As I say, learning doesn’t come easy to me, so it can be a struggle sometimes. But you do get a good feeling when you start to get your head around it, and it starts to make sense to you and things ... actually ... things stay in and you actually feel as if you are learning. You’re not repeating your mistakes you know and you’re starting to make confident decisions and you’re starting to develop ... you know ... the appropriate rationale and logic that goes with the role, so there’s that part of it as well. Ah, so I suppose it can be very satisfying (Fred, inspector).

Fred did take the notion of learning to experience when he mentioned ‘not repeating your mistakes’ and ‘confident decisions’, albeit based on logic and rationality, which seemed to be important features of his practice and his identity. Finally, he suggested that learning can be ‘very satisfying’.

Alex described his feelings when learning and provides some different dimensions to the learning process, expanding on some of what Fred had mentioned.
I’m challenged. I find it challenging because it does force you to consider your own values, beliefs, ideals and your own knowledge base causes you to think about ... and sometimes it can be confronting because you think “Oh, that’s not how I’ve done things in the past” or “Have I been doing it wrongly or incorrectly” Yes, I think challenge would be the best word to describe it for me (Alex, inspector).

Alex tended to move between the first and second person in describing his feelings. What was evident for him was a ‘disjuncture’ (Jarvis 2012, p.21) or a sense of disequilibrium where what has been known, understood, practised is put into question in response to new information and/or new and different experiences. A sense of puzzlement, or ‘state of perplexity’ is produced that needs to be resolved (Dewey 2014, p.68). Alex saw that this required a course of action.

You have to try and make some sense because as human beings we like to be ordered and creatures of habit, so when things are thrown out of whack like that there’s quite a lot of ... there’s often a big push to get it back into order ... to make sense out of it (Alex, inspector).

Alex’s reflections of the challenges of learning were powerful and telling, made more so by his lack of insight. The challenge for him was a sense of uncertainty and disequilibrium when his existing (and potentially long-standing) knowledge, values, and practices were questioned or challenged. He was keen to ‘get back into order’, re-establishing equilibrium, and certainty. But as has been noted in previous chapters and discussions, for police officers to express doubt about her/his thinking and practice might well be judged as a character flaw and a significant weakness. Another challenge for some police officers might be a lack of critical thinking applied to the disjuncture and instead acceptance of conventional wisdom (or vernacular wisdom), that which is already comfortably within one’s frame of reference and offering easy solutions (Dewey 2014).

The significance of the language used by Charles, Fred and Alex in describing learning cannot be under-estimated. It indicated a fundamental lack of understanding of the purpose and process of learning and when learning is perceived to be ‘uncomfortable’, ‘a struggle’ and ‘challenging’, the implication is that it is preferably avoided. Such an attitude and perception of learning does not
bode well for an embodied, reflexive approach to professional development and learning and consequently to practice.

**Conclusion: Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice**

The narratives of police officers in my research revealed pedagogies producing and reproducing ‘gendered knowledge and experience’ that align with disembodied approaches to practice and responses to learning. The masculine nature of policing is ever-present and it has constructed notions of rational versus emotional labour and established the body and sexuality as products and resources of gender-power relations.

The literature has shown that gender discrimination and harassment and the suppression of stress and emotional response (disembodied practice) are unquestioned in policing and limited by virtue of having the same cultural drivers. In my research, there were no overt statements from female police officers claiming discrimination. It has become imperceptible and, instead, they contended with masculine prejudice either by reconfiguring it as personality clash or jealousy (e.g., Gabby) or, as Bea revealed, by playing semi-masculine games to gather acceptance. The only overt acknowledgement of continuing gender discrimination came from a male officer, Hugo, who then rationalised it as being typical and more general attitude outside of police.

These results suggest a persistent, strong and complex set of gender power relations that largely go unacknowledged. Masculinity remains the dominant driver and expertise in policing is derived from masculine characteristics. The traditional masculine definition of appropriate response continues to drive attitudes to emotionality in police work. Both male and female police officers eschewed emotional acknowledgement and defined an impassive detachment as most desirable. Empathy and understanding were seen as techniques to be used as opposed to acceptable personal (and professional) responses. There existed a
definition of competent police officers in keeping with a historically masculine practice and definition of policing.

**Where to Next**

In Chapter 6 I deconstruct the pedagogical linkages between knowledge, training and practice in policing. The relevance of formal training as perceived by police officers to practice is discussed along with the de-emphasis on the relevance of the academy. Issues such as the place of trial and error learning and imitation also feature and create confusion for police officers in their practice and learning.
Chapter 6

Finding Otherwise

Practice and Knowledge: Aporias and Lacunae

There’s a tendency for us to focus on what rather than why and how (Fred, inspector).

... most people learn by fear of not wanting to do the wrong thing, which I don’t think builds on solid foundations at all (Oscar, sergeant).

Practice and Knowledge

This chapter parallels Chapter 4, and a good point to start identifying and disrupting the production and reproduction of the pedagogies of practice and knowledge is Billett’s (2010, p.2) consideration of practice and its relevance to learning.

... practice is that which occurs through the usual or everyday exercise of the occupation that is practice comprises the enactment of the kinds of activities and interactions that constitute the occupation ... it is assumed that practice is enacted through access to and the exercise of forms of conceptual, procedural and dispositional knowledge that underpin competent practice.

The narratives of police officers in my research, depicted policing as a craft or trade with them as artisans ‘remaking occupational knowledge’ through practice (Billett 2010, p.28). This depiction of their artisan status did not meet Billett’s ‘requirement for individuals to engage in an extensive period of practice prior to being accepted as a tradesperson or professional’ (2010, p.1). This further reinforces the need for a reflexive, relational, agential and embodied police officer
(Edwards 2010; Green 2009) as opposed to one driven by instrumental, behavioural imperatives. Complicating and promulgating this conception of policing is the training with its enduring focus on content and behaviour (i.e., the what and how) resulting in the reproduction of knowledge and the replication of practice, as opposed to contestation that has the potential to change the thinking and practice of police officers, Conundrum and for the practice of policing. As mentioned in Chapter 4, pedagogies are the means by which power and forms of knowledge are established and remade (Foucault 1977; Gore 1993; McNay 1994). Of concern is what appears to be a fundamental lack of understanding by many police officers of what constitutes learning. This was a feature of narratives in the previous chapter and continues to be exposed in this chapter. Such an attitude can be attributed to the ‘pedagogic work’ that has inscribed and habituated discourses and practices of training, learning, and policing for police officers in Conundrum (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977, p.31).

**Aporias and Lacunae**

Applying multiple theoretical lenses to the deconstruction of the data significant aporias and lacunae have emerged. Police officers’ perceptions of the knowledge required to inform practice are produced by and embedded in what constitutes training and learning in Conundrum. Data revealed that training and practice in Conundrum are simultaneously interconnected and disconnected. On the one hand, they enable the reproduction of knowledge and the replication of practice while on the other hand they are dysfunctional, working against each other to inhibit possibilities for change involving transformative learning and practice. Conundrum as a ‘site of struggle’ is further emphasised as the pedagogies of practice, learning and knowing are deconstructed (Bourdieu 1990b, p.14).

**Ways of Knowing: Sit and Get**

Training can be seen as the source of social and symbolic capital, constructing and reproducing language, meaning and practice, the outcome of which is cultural
capital that is developed in the academy and matures throughout the police officer’s career (Bourdieu 1990a,b).

Oliver, George, David and Joe each described training, as distinct from learning in terms of skill acquisition, repetition, and a technical process.

I see training as skill acquisition, a process that you do to train to do something. It can be formal and structured. While I see learning as lifelong and more important than training, I see the two as being inter-related. Learning for me is about what I see, what I hear, what I touch. Learning changes my thinking, my knowledge; the way I behave; the way I respond (Oliver, inspector).

I think training is about repetition, still with improvement but with lots of repetition. While I see learning being about difference, something new, learning new stuff (George, inspector).

Whether it’s learning information or learning a skill. You learn things cause you’re told things, you know it, but that’s more knowledge, but then you learn other things which is knowledge as well but it’s skills-based cause you’re learning how to do something whether it’s a new procedure or new piece of equipment or whatever (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

Oliver’s description of training as ‘skill acquisition’ in order ‘to do’ police work reflected the behaviouristic nature of police training. Of particular note is his description of learning involving the senses, which signified embodied learning that has the potential to transform his ‘thinking’ and his behaviour, albeit determined by the doxa of the habitus of policing in Conundrum where thought and knowing dismisses what it must in order ‘to think as it does’ (Britzman 1995, p.156).

George on the other hand saw training involving ‘repetition ... lots of repetition’ to ensure the acquisition of skills along with adherence to the rules and procedures of police work. In contrast to training he saw learning offering ‘difference, something new’. The inference being that there was nothing new in training, only repetition. This further highlighted a lack of understanding of learning and the potential for learning from and through work. While David defined knowledge (cognitive) and skills (psychomotor) as distinct domains of learning, he maintained a view of learning as training from a passive reception of information.
Joe’s statements that learning, as opposed to training, involved cognitive, analytical domains was similar to David’s distinctions and was therefore ‘more important than training’ emphasised the distinctions made between training associated with skills and doing the job, devoid of any opportunity for learning.

Yes, I see a difference between the two. I tend to think of training more as a process. So I see it as being about learning ways to do things. Whereas, I see learning as being more analytical, more thinking about things, more critical, more using the brain to come up with a solution as opposed to coming up with a process as a solution. I think learning is much more important than training, in my view, but again, I think this [Conundrum] is in a position where we don’t know where we are. The Manual [police manual] was so prescriptive and so process-driven. For us [Conundrum] to move forward we have to let managers manage and understand they’ll make mistakes. Currently, I think we say one thing and do another (Joe, senior police officer).

I note Joe’s reference to the police manual, which has been very prescriptive with ‘orders’ outlining strict procedural practice for a range of situations and incidents. Joe’s comments about ‘let[ting managers manage]’ and the likelihood of ‘mistakes’ was indicative of what Elizabeth commented on in Chapter 4, giving police officers more autonomy to apply critical thinking to their practice, however, Joe’s additional comment about ‘say[ing] one thing and do[ing] another’ reflected the tensions associated with efforts to change thinking and practice in Conundrum. It also implied that while learning can come through making mistakes, such behaviour will be censured. Similar comments are made by other police officers later in this chapter.

Harry’s preference for training (and learning) was in line with the military approach, as per his previous military experience.

I suppose I go back to the army: explanation, demonstration, imitation and then practice it. That’s how I like to learn practical things. But if it’s things that are kind of more theoretical, basically reading, writing and practice exercises (Harry, constable).

This approach sits comfortably in the technical rationalist framework and with similar approaches adopted by police. This is especially significant given the large percentage of the recruit curriculum committed to practical operations of policing.
and associated instrumental knowledge (Bradley 2005, 2009a). Harry also acknowledged reading as a means of learning theory, albeit balanced with ‘practice exercises’, likely to involve repetition of actions and procedures.

Oscar, David and Elliott’s comments introduced notions of passivity in their attitudes towards training and learning.

Being provided with new information, new skills, and new processes and then for myself to be able to conform with that set of skills, information or knowledge (Oscar, sergeant).

I think some people are a bit ambivalent about the amount of effort they put in themselves cause they expect learning to be brought to them and laid in front of them, and in work time, and they expect to be paid to learn ... cause back then [my generation] there wasn’t a focus on tertiary education and pretty much all training was provided (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

You can read the books and can read all this tricky legislation that has all these funny words through it. I can read it but I’ve got to look and think twice and break it down and think what are they trying to say. But if someone who has the concept can get out and teach it plain and simple to people that is the best way to know. It’s the best way that I learn and I mean is to just get rid of all that, you know, jibber jabber, and tell me simply how I do it or should I do it (Elliott, constable).

Oscar’s focus on being ‘provided with’ information, skills and processes and ‘conform[ing]’ to these represented a passive approach to acquiring the functions of policing and typically featuring instrumental knowledge and technical rationalist practice. David’s descriptions of police officers’ expectations towards learning reinforced Oscar’s comments of a passive approach.

David referred to learning ‘brought to them’, ‘laid in front of them’. He acknowledged the influence of historical and traditional police training practices, replicated in the training in Conundrum by police trainers who base their practice on their own experience of learning in the academy.

Elliott found legislation ‘tricky’. It confounded him and instead of reading and endeavouring to comprehend the legislation, he preferred the ‘plain and simple’
approach of someone telling him how to implement it. This brings the focus of
learning and practice very much back to the common sense, technical approach to
policing. It is about what and how of police work. There was no mention of
wanting to understand how legislation translated to action or was enacted in
particular ways. There was no notion of examining how aspects of law (drug
enforcement, domestic violence) might impact on the individual, how Elliott
might feel about it. The implication was that everything of relevance to a
practising police officer could be taught in such as manner.

Accompanying notions of passivity in learning was a concern about the amount of
effort required to learn. Policing, as a craft or trade, and even under the cloak of
professionisation, involves technical rationalist notions of simple solutions to
problems and notions of practical solutions being easy, which is at odds with
practice being messy and confusing and requiring more than technical solutions
(Schön 1983). As Edwards (2010) and Hutchings and Jarvis (2012) asserted,
practice is more than technique and instrumental knowledge, and this is especially
the case for practitioners and professionals in this century. These notions of
policing are a poor fit with postmodern notions of mimesis whereby ambiguity
rather than certainty prevails and where the meaning of policing is in a state of
flux in the twenty-first century but remains anchored to the modernist notions of
law and order (Derrida 1997; Schweiker 1988).

**Knowing What: Simple as That**

As mentioned in Chapter 1, content and behaviour, representing the micro-
objectives of learning, are key elements of police training in *Conundrum* (Bradley
2005, 2009a; McLaren 2009, p.62, emphasis in original) and are ‘authorised and
recognised’ by all police officers (Bourdieu 1990a). Such a focus requires a
‘minimal sense of understanding’ that enables adherence to rules and procedures
of particular practices (Beckett & Hager 2000, p.33), as opposed to deep learning
that integrates technical, cognitive, affective, social and meta-cognitive
dimensions of practice. O’Loughlin’s work (2006, p.11) showed that reasoning and
cognition were not the central features of learning and instead stressed the need for a depth of emotion and ‘emotional involvement’ to ‘enable assessment of one’s own situatedness as a learner’. Overlaying and impacting the training is the prevailing power relations and knowledge claims (discussed in Chapter 4) perpetuated by a reliance on the vernacular wisdom of those who purport to, and are assumed to, know. This also reflects the tenacity of the doxa of the habitus of policing (Bourdieu 1990a). Young’s research of police exemplified this:

All of these tales on how to do the business … contain the minutiae rarely available in the official account, for this is unwritten material handed down from the past by those whose mastery was put to the test of practical experience, and was found to work (1995, p.152).

Police officers’ narratives in this chapter provided insights to what police officers feel they need to know and to learn and how training in Conundrum enables the production and reproduction of knowledge that informs practice. Len’s comments about recruit training mirrored training in other professional development programs in Conundrum.

I think police need to learn the basics. I think we’re going in the wrong direction. I think we’re going too academic too early at the recruit level. They’re coming out and they may be able to write an essay and speak academically but relating to people from lower socio-economic backgrounds, they haven’t got a clue what they’re doing. There’s a lot of gap between those who did the normal recruit course and the academic recruit course (Len, constable).

Len contrasted what he described as the ‘normal recruit course’ with the ‘academic recruit course’ signifying a binary of normal / abnormal, therefore, superior / inferior. He saw the academic focus of recruit training as erroneous (‘the wrong direction’) because it did not equip new recruits for work in the real world across socio-economic backgrounds. Such a binary emphasised the significance and value afforded to practice-based knowledge as opposed to theory-based knowledge; keeping policing very much in the realms of a trade or craft where knowing and expertise comes from doing the job. It also highlighted the recruit socialisation process that requires recruits to acquire ‘a feel for the game’ (the illusio). His comments also pointed to the traditional working class background of
police and policing as a craft or trade, which are at odds with the current push to a tertiary-based profession.

Edward and Fred voiced similar sentiments, rejecting the relevance of academic abilities.

Academic qualifications mean absolutely nothing. You can’t teach common sense and that’s the most important element of police work (Edward, sergeant).

I think if people are using common sense and good logic and with a conscious thought to how their actions might be perceived then they’re demonstrating a professional approach to their business, whether or not they are technically compliant with rules and regulations or policy and advice, as long as they have applied that type of thinking to it and their judgement is sound ... if mistaken but sound. They are demonstrating some professionalism in the way they go about their business (Fred, inspector).

Instead they preferred common sense, but acknowledged it was not possible to teach common sense, despite its importance to policing. It is the quintessential ‘vernacular wisdom’, a natural state of being and knowing, accessible to everybody (Geertz 1993, p.787; Rescher 2005). An individual who demonstrates a low quotient of common sense, however defined, is not suited to police work.
Common sense was discussed in Chapter 4 as it related to power relations and knowledge claims and will be addressed later in this chapter for its impact on practice.

Gracie commented that police officers needed to learn to identify ‘good role models’, have ‘trust and confidence’ to ‘ask questions’, which reinforced pedagogies of practice-based knowledge and power relations.

This is a hard question. One of the critical things is finding good role models and feeling that you have trust and confidence and can go and ask advice. It’s kind of a balance between respecting, but challenging and it’s getting them in the right order. If you think it’s not right that you do [something], you also feel comfortable to ask questions about what you are doing (Gracie, constable).

The hierarchical, command structure is ever-present as noted in Gracie’s references to balancing respect for, or perhaps more aptly, deference towards, others with power and prestige and street credibility. Risks exist for the individual
asking questions that might be perceived as challenging and critical of current
taking and practice. Gracie’s comments raised concerns about how individuals
distinguished between appropriate and inappropriate practice in the workplace.
Learning in the workplace in Conundrum occurs more by default rather than by
design (i.e., without formal mentoring) and therefore the impost is on the
individual police officer to identify and access opportunities. This requires agency
and an awareness of one’s self and one’s practice, and raises questions as to how
that might be achieved given how police training is perceived and delivered in
Conundrum.

Gracie referred to outcomes and processes connected to the demands of the
contemporary Neoliberal and Managerial regimen with priorities in the
workplace. The why knowledge, underpinning behaviour, was de-emphasised in
favour of what and how.

The argument is that when you’re out there you’re achieving an outcome, it’s just
that you’re going through a process, but there is an expectation that you put
emphasis on the process to make sure you’ve at least followed important things
regardless of the outcome because we debrief more on what’s been done and
there are more avenues of inquiry on how you’ve done what you’ve done, there’s
more observation on how you do things cause there are video cameras and
goodness knows what in charge rooms, interview rooms, so you’ve got to be so
much more consciously aware of how and what you’re doing, rather than just
doing (Gracie, constable).

The Royal Commissions of Inquiry (Fitzgerald 1989; Kennedy 2004; Wood 1997)
and recent the inquiry of Victoria Police by the Victorian Equal Opportunity and
Human Rights Commission (2015), along with the advent of state-based integrity
commissions provide impetus for increased accountability and public scrutiny of
police and policing. A process-driven approach to policing mandates training that
centres on content and behaviour, following procedures and looking good. This is
in direct contrast with the practice of an autonomous, reflexive professional in the
twenty-first century.

Joe identified legislative knowledge as the very substance of policing and law
enforcement.
They [police] need to understand the law because they have to comply with it. They’ve got to enforce law, so need to understand it. That’s the key one for me. I think we’ve put too much emphasis on knowing policy and procedures over legislation. Most of that is just common sense (Joe, senior police officer).

Joe pointed to the need for understanding legislation to be able to enforce it. Here he differed from Elliott (in Ways of Knowing) who just wanted to be told the law. There was a tension here emphasised by Joe’s concern that understanding was de-emphasised in favour of procedural knowledge as rules to be followed. This fitted with Gracie’s previous issues about scrutiny-driven practice.

The preceding narratives of Len, Edward, Gracie and Joe reinforced the focus in training on content and behaviour, driven by traditional, technical approaches to training and interpretations of learning in Conundrum. They also reflected contemporary Managerial agendas that support the status quo. Hugo, Sally, Zak and Monty, however, provided different and somewhat critical perspectives of what police officers needed to know and to learn.

Hugo offered a perspective that was contrary to Len and Edward’s points of view.

I think they need academic learning. We don’t tie our progression through the organisation with recognised formal learning and where we do, it’s lip-service (Hugo, sergeant).

He proposed that progression (i.e., promotion) in Conundrum needed to be aligned to a formally recognised and supported qualification framework. While efforts were being made to establish learning and qualification pathways in recruit and professional development (promotion) programs, theory-based knowledge, as opposed to practice-based, has been and to varying degree continues to be viewed as peripheral, non-essential and judged to have, at times, limited value (if any value) to everyday policing.

In considering the professionalisation of policing and current practice, Hugo mentioned police working in general duties with limited supervision and was concerned about police officers’ ability to reflect on their practice and make
necessary changes (or corrections) to their practice rather than continue ‘thinking everything’s great and dandy’.

I have a real concern about the calibre of some of the people we’re bringing in. Because we work so independently, if you don’t have the ability to sit back and say “Gee I could have done that better or I’ve let myself down there because that’s really not what I should have done”, and because there is so much scope and very little supervision for our GDs [general duties] that that never gets fixed. If they go on blissfully thinking everything’s great and dandy, we’re not doing the best we can (Hugo, sergeant).

We won’t become professional until we have every individual person doing general duties is doing some sort of analysis of what they’re doing as they go and that comes from professional practice (Zak, sergeant).

The implication of Zak’s statement was that there was no room, intellectually or organisationally, for even rudimentary reflective practice wherein only what and how were considered. Police image of self does not include emotions, which are seen as antithetical to competence, and when they inevitably occur, they need to be hidden (Hochschild 1997, 2012).

Sally raised an occupational or professional perspective of policing that she aligned to distinctions between a police force versus a police service.

There needs to be attention to detail and I think they need to learn that this organisation is a service and it is not a force. There are those who joined the job, or are still in the job, because this is just about kicking arse on Friday night or locking people up or just resolving burglaries. I mean it is about all that and it will always be about that, and that’s a good thing, but there’s more to this job than that. And that needs to be driven home I think. It needs to be at the recruit or pre-recruit phase because I think some people come out and they’re often young and they probably don’t have that worldview, so it needs to be emphasised (Sally, constable).

Sally presented the contrast between the two models – command and control (traditional) and community-oriented (contemporary) policing – and highlighted the conflict between these two at the workplace level when only one is inculcated at the recruit level.

From his perspective, Monty acknowledged the need for a reflexive approach to practice that required deep learning, the synthesis of knowing how and knowing
why. Unfortunately, this was antithetical to what police training engenders and what was supporting it organisationally.

This is a job you never feel like you’ve totally got on top of. There’s always something to learn and you’ve got to accept that. I have to look beyond the façade, I have to look beyond what I’m seeing, and ask why, and realise that the system will probably not help me (Monty, sergeant).

My research has shown that police officers have some understanding of the need to go beyond the how and what of knowledge to inform their practice. Reflection, albeit rudimentary and not fully understood, was desirable to some police officers. They were aware, however, that the Conundrum did not provide space for such analysis. For the other police officers the ‘sit and get’ approach (Timperley 2011) was all that was needed. More academic, theory-based understanding was rejected. The nexus between the two models of policing – command and control and community – highlighted the emerging conflicted debate about the role of policing in the twenty-first century and the impacts on the police officers’ sense of identity and purpose.

Back to Basics: Telling it like it was and still is

Training is integral to how knowledge is reproduced and practice replicated in Conundrum. It was of little surprise to me that the majority of responses by police officers focused on instrumental knowledge relevant to the practice or craft of policing. This reinforced how policing is acquired, framed and applied as a craft or trade, rather than learned in the sense of achieving a deep, critical understanding of themselves, policing, and their practice. A degree of passivity on the part of the learner has been evident in how training has been envisaged and delivered in Conundrum, which is applicable to prescriptive conceptions of what constitutes relevant content for police work and behaviour for police officers.

Pivotal to how training and learning are perceived by police officers in Conundrum is the status afforded to training (and learning), and this was reflected in Gracie’s comments.
I think the negative is that we don’t recognise learning as a speciality in itself. It’s “I’m a police officer, I’m here to tell you what I know” rather than “I’m a teacher and I’m responsible for helping you learn about policing” (Gracie, constable).

She acknowledged that training and education was not afforded the value and status it deserved. Instead, it has been relegated to a liminal space in *Conundrum*, taken-for-granted and, in the main, the trainers lack relevant qualifications and expertise. They train in accordance with their own experiences and notions of what has constituted training. Gracie’s comments – ‘I’m a police officer, I’m here to tell you’ – illustrated how the story-telling and war stories, as products of the doxa and the *habitus* of policing, were incorporated into the pedagogies of training. It also highlighted the power relations at play where the trainers have the scope to tell what is needed to know based on what they know from experience.

Gracie’s descriptions exemplified and amplified Bradley’s (2005, 2009a) claims of the inadequacy of police training.

The status and value afforded training in *Conundrum* has been the product of its history and culture, as exemplified by Hugo, Charles and Edward’s narratives. Hugo described the influences of the military-style training regime on life in the academy when he was a recruit.

It was like military training when I went through. We were treated like grunts on the recruit course. You weren’t taught to think, you weren’t encouraged to think. You know, right down to the accommodation arrangements, you know, you showered with 20 blokes. You all lined up and you lined up for everything ... you lined up to clean your teeth and have a shave. That’s how it was ... you didn’t speak unless spoken to (Hugo, sergeant).

Hugo’s description gives a profound insight to the life of a recruit. Again, the initial learning in such a directive, chain of command environment that discouraged independent thinking and different perspectives and socialised recruits as a cohesive group (not individual thinkers), who became the organisation’s compliant and disciplined bodies and minds (Foucault 1977). While some of the practices have changed in terms of accommodation arrangements, the hierarchy still exists and the effects of its power relations are still at play. Moreover, the majority of the trainers are themselves products of that system. I frequently heard
trainers say such things as ‘It didn’t hurt me’ as a recommendation for such socialisation.

Charles’s description of training involving the what and how (doing) resonates with the literature (Birzer 2003; Birzer & Tannehill 2001; Bradley 2005, 2009a) and the narratives of other police officers in this chapter, further reinforcing an enduring focus on content and behaviour.

The more practice and the more formative stuff that we do in this organisation the more confidence you gain. It was quite military based when I joined the Department. There was an environment of fear in some of the courses that were run. I think most people are hesitant when they start learning new things (Charles, sergeant).

He also identified the paramilitary influence when he joined Conundrum and the fear associated with training. The literature also emphasised how education and training in police organisations has reflected traditional pedagogical practices suited to the paramilitary nature of policing (Birzer 2003; McCoy 2006; Panzarella 2003). As others have noted, fear in terms of punishment, humiliation and failure has been a feature of training, but also a feature of the culture: the habitus of the field of policing and training and education in policing (Bonifacio 1991; Frewin & Tuffin 1998). The concept of fear will be discussed again later in this chapter.

Edward spoke about challenges he saw, based on his experience.

When I asked questions, they were not well received. When I started, senior people, some police officers were very resistant to change. We do things because ... a lot of people in the job like structure because they like the safety net of a structure and a set of procedures and guidelines because they know if they follow that they’re not gonna get smackked. I find that very limiting because you can’t make a guideline for every possible scenario. I’ve always decided to make decisions on common sense and rational objective decision-making. Sometimes I’ve stepped outside that and been willing to take the kicking because I could not justify why I came to that decision and what frustrates the hell out of me in this job are people that I call the train-track thinkers (Edward, sergeant).

Edward’s comments were deeply layered. They summarised a number of issues named throughout my research. Firstly, the risk in asking questions in an
organisation where power relations are structured along authoritarian chain of command model and where the majority of the knowledge, which informs practice, is taken-for-granted. Those who ask ‘why’ questions are labelled as ‘troublesome and may risk being marginalised’ (Høyrup & Elkjaer 2006, p.36). Reflection is not encouraged or understood. He also referred to the punitive control and negative reinforcement of learning: his willingness to make an error even when he ‘gets a kicking’. Learning by mistakes is considered later in this chapter.

Edward fell back on common sense as the pre- eminent guide to practice. This was in contrast to Beckett’s (2008, p.21) portrayal of common sense or ‘intuition’ as ‘low status knowledge’ refining practice based on professional education and training. As described by police officers in my research, however, it is the dominant source of knowledge informing practice. Of particular concern, it therefore informed the exercise of discretion as said by Edward (above), which as Bronitt and Stenning (2011) argued opens police behaviour to wide scrutiny by the organisation, the courts and ultimately the public. As seen in Chapter 4, common sense as knowledge is a source of power in separating police from police and police from the public. Edward aligned it with ‘rational objective decision-making’. Neither is a product of training but depends on the inherent qualities of the individual.

Finally, Edward described the ‘train-track thinkers’ who personify compliant, docile recruits and police officers seeking security and certainty in rules and procedures, which make their job more straightforward, more about doing than thinking. Wrapped around that and ensuring compliance was the threat of a punitive response (e.g., ‘get smacked’, ‘take the kicking’) for those who did not follow procedure, who flouted the rules by default or by design.

Alex balanced formalised learning at the academy with fieldwork.

There’s the formalized learning at academy, which is important for training staff in the ways that are needed. But the other side is the informal stuff that happens
in the field, which is equally as important. There are those who would argue that one is more important than the other. They are both equally important. The practical, on the job stuff that needs to happen is just as important. There are those who probably couldn’t pass a course, but could go out and do it anyway. The key thing is getting the balance right (Alex, inspector).

The implication of his reference to providing training ‘in the ways that are needed’ reinforced the function of training to develop recruits and police officers who become ‘compliant technicians’ (Timperley 2011, p.8), conforming to occupational and organisational pedagogies. There was also a suggestion that training was not always needed in being a police officer, e.g., ‘could go out and do it anyway’. Given Alex’s seniority and openness to learning, this statement was particularly telling. It strongly reinforced the perception of policing as a craft or trade with minimal requirements for formal training and almost solely dependent on the qualities of the individual.

We’ve got material that has got to be delivered to recruits, a tight time frame in which to do it. I get a little bit concerned about where the rubber meets the road in that what they [recruits] are taught and learn during the course, and how that translates to when they actually start applying it in field (Alex, inspector).

I was interested in Alex’s comments and concerns about ‘material that has got to be delivered’ within a ‘tight time frame’. They exemplified the cursory nature of police training that is prescriptive and ‘delivered’, involving a passive and docile learner response and requiring ‘minimal … understanding’. Alex also expressed concern about how academy-based training was applied and assessed in the field. As mentioned earlier in Chapter 4, learning in the field was described as ad hoc, dependent upon the calibre of supervisors and other role models. This further exemplified how training and learning, including workplace learning, in Conundrum were neither understood nor integrated. This links back to the pedagogies that encompass social, cultural beliefs and discourses of police work, police training and the police officer that hold steadfast to traditional, modernist conceptions. It also reflects the impact of Neoliberal and Managerial regimen to prescribe practice as a consequence of attention to outcomes and measurement of individual and organisational performance. Commitment to these pedagogies
can be seen as accepting Neoliberal, Managerial, modernist conceptions as ‘mak[ing] no difference’ (Derrida 1997, p.xviii).

With reference to the recruit training, Holly and Charles said:

The training that’s delivered for police generally is limited, especially for the role that police undertake. If you consider it takes less than 12 months to qualify to go out and to look after other people’s lives is really, really limited, when you think to go into a profession you have at least four years and then on top of that most workplaces deliver additional training (Holly, constable).

You know, it was a fairly steep learning curve for an 18 year old to go into the academy and be equipped with all the legislation and powers and everything and to go with it an 18 year old has an attitude and I certainly had it ... when I joined the academy my ego was way too big (Charles, sergeant).

Holly and Charles raised pertinent points about the limited scope of training for police and the short time frame in which a recruit can become qualified as a police officer undertaking social, regulatory and judicial responsibilities while equipped with weapons and with state-based authority to use appropriate force – ‘to look after other people’s lives’ – a demand that could be encountered a day after graduation. Charles’s comments, along with Holly’s previous comments, highlighted how naive and impressionable young recruits were ill-equipped to discriminate between the types of learning and the consequences of different learning opportunities and how powerful the pedagogies of training and learning were based on the habitus of policing (Bourdieu 1990a).

The lack of agreement about what training is required to qualify police constables was relevant here. Holly’s comments pointed to a lack of ‘what‘ knowledge to guide practice let alone how and why considerations in looking after ‘other people’s lives’. This typified a negative network of power and knowledge that constructs a sense of oneself (one’s agency) in accepting what is “taught” and what is expected of a police officer (Foucault 1977; Gore 1993).
Another aspect of training and learning in the organisation that concerned Hugo was what he referred to as the ‘ridiculous game’ one has to play in response to the rank structure and complying with the rules of the game.

When you do courses, even though you’re learning stuff, you’re playing this ridiculous game because of this rank structure and because of the way the courses are set up; you are having to play this personality game and pander to their [trainers’ and course directors’] egos, just to get through the courses. Having said that, I was pleasantly surprised by the most recent development course. There seemed to be a change of attitude. It was undermined by a couple of people. You could see that the thinking had been done, whether they [the trainers] agreed with it or not, and they were giving it their best shot (Hugo, sergeant).

Hugo’s comments demonstrated the power relations and their impact on how one knows, understands and achieves a ‘feel for the game’ (the illusio). He also reflected on the surveillance of learners by the trainers. This represents ‘disciplinary power’ that consolidates power relations and compliance to established rules and regimes of truth (Foucault 1977, p. 175). As already noted, police trainers are police officers deemed to be good operators in the field who impart their experience as knowledge and make subjective judgements of the performance of recruits and police officers participating in training. Hugo’s guarded comment about experiencing changes that make power plays less problematic, albeit describing an attempt to change the traditional approach noted that the trainers were not completely comfortable – ‘giving it their best shot’.

**Back to Basics: Doing it like it was and still is**

In keeping with reproducing knowledge and replicating practice, Oliver, Elliott, David, Len and Joe emphasised a focus on the basics, of which experience and practice-based knowledge were integral to effective training and therefore policing.

I learn through practice and demonstration. So if I can see something, watch something and then be shown how to do it, I learn better. I beg and steal by watching people, seeing how they do the job. I don’t have to reinvent the wheel (Oliver, inspector).
I think the biggest learning experiences have been the hands on, being involved, or being mentored because everything’s always new sometimes. It’s best to be mentored or shown the ropes. I think that’s the biggest impact for my learning. The best experience is to be involved, observe or to be mentored. The hands on approach again (Elliott, constable).

I guess, I learn best ... if it’s skills-based, active participation, seeing other people demonstrating things is how you learn more quickly (David, senior police officer and corporate manager).

I learn through exams plus the hands-on. Get some documents and remember them parrot fashion, I can still retain most of it if I’m putting it into practice. It is handy having someone to demonstrate and then doing it or doing something and then reflecting and thinking about what I did and if I could do it differently (Len, constable).

I learn by doing and discussion. I’ll debate. So often I’ll have an opinion that changes or I’ll be doing something and by doing, challenging, discussing, reflecting on it or thinking about what I’ve done and how I could have done it better ... that’s how I learn (Joe, senior police officer).

The acquisition of actions appropriate to practice were supported by a combination of watching demonstrations in training, doing tasks, observing others at work, mimicking others’ practice, and being informally mentored. This is very much in keeping with modernist notions of ‘mimesis’ that denotes realism and security as truth claims in the mimetic act (Derrida 1981, p.193; Schweiker 1988). Len’s preference for rote learning combined with practice (doing) was typical of how training has been delivered and how learning has been perceived. Exams are a significant feature of training and are used as a gate-keeping mechanism to promotion across the ranks (Bradley 2005, 2009a). Joe’s preference for discussion and reflection, albeit restricted to analysis of action, represented positive approaches to learning that have the potential to transform behaviour and thinking. Elliott’s phrase of being ‘shown the ropes’ positioned police work as a technical practice that necessitates mimesis. In a great deal of learning a police career, the academy has little if any function.

A consistent message or theme was of knowledge being generated from and by practice, and therefore policing as a craft or trade, something to do done with
regard to particular procedural requirements often learning through sitting at the feet of other work colleagues. Conspicuous by its absence was mention of theory.

Leo explained that he learned best when he linked content with practice.

I prefer to learn from experience. For me, the delivery of theory initially requires something practical. I need to be able to put it into some sort of working perspective. I like to actually become involved in it, particularly stuff that you have to do as opposed to stuff you have to retain. So, I’m active, and I think that suits my style of learning. I listen to instruction and then of course I reflect on my own performance and my own experiences and a previous practice just to see where I can improve and, and learn from those (Leo, sergeant).

Leo’s preferred concept of theory was not atypical in my research. Theory was something abstract, needing to be remembered as opposed to something that has to be done: a perception of knowledge relevant to an artisan. Theory as that which needs to be memorised also reflected an enduring use of written examinations to test knowledge and learning in police training (Bradley 2005, 2009a).

Rose spoke about general duties policing as a forum for learning.

I like the actual doing. A lot of things you do, particularly with general duties policing, there are no rules. It does rely on initiative and a bit of common sense and I suppose, being able to ask for some guidance. I mean even when you’re in an acting role, which I was a fair bit out there, you’re left to your own devices and you’ve gotta try and make those decisions (Rose, constable).

Her focus on ‘the actual doing’ of general duties policing and the place of common sense and initiative in making decisions aligns with other research. Rowe (2008) and Kleinig (1996) referred to police regularly working independently of supervisors and questioned how they use their discretion in making decisions and taking action. For Rose, common sense (knowledge) and initiative (character) were key to her ability to work independently in general duties and in higher duties even when she felt ‘there are no rules’. There was a strong implication of a lack of structure in the workplace, at least at the constable practitioner level, to learn and to practice, despite the process-driven approach in Conundrum’s formal training regime and prescriptive management processes.
Stories and an oral tradition are at the very heart of the development and maintenance of culture (Shearing & Ericson 1991) as noted in previous chapters. In keeping with these oral traditions, Monty identified listening to the stories of others’ experiences as central to his ongoing learning and practice.

Learning is developing knowledge but also developing skills and for me I really like learning that allows me to do things better, or smarter, cleverer. I really like hearing other people’s experiences. I get a lot out of that, especially from other investigators (Monty, sergeant).

I really like verbal presentations ... listening to them with a level of visual aids. Textbooks I find boring, even though I like reading. I take a lot out of verbal presentations. I used to take a lot of notes, but it’s discouraged lately. I see the value of taking notes (Monty, sergeant).

Monty’s opinions of textbooks as ‘boring’ reflected a lack of the use of books in police training (Bradley 2005, 2009a). Monty has been in the job for 17 years, so his recruit training would not have included set textbooks or reading of material other than case law, legislation and the police manual. In considering his comments about note taking, I recall many police trainers who actively discouraged note taking because they perceived students were not listening, attending and therefore unlikely to be learning.

Eleanor, who came to policing with previous tertiary qualifications described herself as:

... an academic learner. I’m what was traditionally known as a rote learner. I can memorise things and regurgitate them, if that’s what’s required. But I like to do things and if I do them wrong, I’ll never do them that way again. In doing, I like to do it my way first and if it’s wrong, I’m happy to go back and do it another way. I like to use initiative to do it my own way first (Eleanor, constable).

Of particular note was Eleanor’s alignment of rote learning with academic learning exemplifying misunderstanding of learning and one that reflected police officers’ notions of training that occurred at the police academy. She was confident in her abilities to ‘memorise’ and recall things. But she was also very clear about preferring to attempt to do things. She also preferred to use her initiative and make necessary adjustments along the way. There are risks for
Eleanor in her approach because initiative is not welcomed in the culture and organisation. The fact that an experienced police officer can honestly say she preferred to do it her way first emphasised the on-the-job, experiential nature of police learning and the focus on results as opposed to practice at the constable level.

Eleanor’s perception of herself as an academic learner was in contrast to Oscar’s concerns that he struggled more with ‘academic’ components of training and learning rather than the practical matters.

I have struggled with learning on the academic front. If you’re saying learning generally, I still learn quite freely. The academic has been harder, and it’s probably because for me I probably put too much pressure on myself … fear of failure and expectations (Oscar, sergeant).

What Oscar meant by ‘academic’ was not clear, but might be assumed to be associated with essay writing and text book-based learning requiring conceptual understanding. He also attributed self-imposed pressure – ‘fear of failure and expectations’ – to his struggles with academic learning. Such concerns are also reinforced by the power relations and the pedagogic work (Bourdieu & Passeron 1977) that has constructed how training and learning are perceived and delivered in Conundrum, along with a culture that still does not tolerate acknowledged mistakes and overt failure. To Oscar, a feature of the academy learning was passing or failing, a feature he did not attribute to workplace learning.

Varies depending on what I’m learning. If it’s a task that I have to learn, a protocol or a set way of doing things, I often find I learn best by doing. If it’s information and stuff that’s intellectual, it’s through reading and talking (Zak, sergeant).

Learning is just part of who I am, if I think about it. Even outside of work, the things I’m interested in are history and politics. They’re things I read heavily about. It’s just part of me. I can’t imagine being in an environment where I’m not learning something, cause I’d be bored. Sounds a bit corny. I think, as soon as I’m in a role where I’m not learning anything, I very quickly become bored and disengaged (Hugo, sergeant).

Zak applied different strategies to learning practice and theory. Overall, his comments highlighted someone familiar and comfortable with learning. Hugo, however, admitted he easily becomes bored if or when he is no longer being
challenged to learn. Rather than adapt, explore and augment what he is doing currently, he would prefer to move to a different role with a new set of challenges. In part, this might reflect the challenges motivated police officers face if attempting to change or improve work practices. There is more reward in maintaining the status quo than instigating change.

Hugo’s references to ‘becom[ing] bored and disengaged’ reflected a tension between the intrinsic and extrinsic motivators within policing and Conundrum, the repetitive practice, driven by procedure, with limited opportunities to critique practice and propose and implement changes.

If I have to learn it by rote or learn the concept and the words, then it doesn’t stay in as well. The learning is not as embedded. So I think from doing, understanding, doing, working through it and the application of it, I think is better for me. Not just the what, but the why and how, and yet there is a tendency for us [in this organisation] to focus on the what (Fred, inspector).

I think there’s a fall back too for us ... in times when we have to get through something and we have to do it fairly quickly and we tend to learn the what and the understanding might come later if we’ve got time (Fred, inspector).

In line with other police officers, understanding matters at the conceptual level was difficult for Fred. Instead, concepts needed to be tangible, concrete and contextualised in order to be better understood and applied, and he noted ‘doing, understanding, doing’. A cognitive dimension to learning was evident in Fred’s words – ‘it stays in’ – as an indicator of understanding something. This showed a focus on procedural, or instrumental knowledge – police ‘tend to learn the what’. The comment that understanding ‘might come later if we’ve got time’ was pertinent. Understanding or deeper learning is not to be guaranteed, especially if the situation was successfully resolved. This reinforced the assumptions that a hectic pace of police work does not allow time and space for reflection nor does Conundrum structure time for reflection into everyday practice as commented previously by other police officers in this chapter.

Historically, artisans have learned much of their practice from the wisdom of those who have gone before and who have the reputation for excellence in what
they produce. I have already touched on the importance that police officers place on in-field (real world) learning, but I now give it attention as it impacts on learning and practice.

**Getting Wisdom: I like the look of that**

In considering the perceived importance of the concepts of common sense and practice wisdom, I was reminded of Westmarland’s (2001, p.83) description of policing as:

> ... an occupation based upon experientially gained expertise and officers often have a high regard for almost anyone who can display knowledge based upon experience.

Although learning from others has been touched upon, the following narratives specifically focus on the acquisition of knowledge from others.

Frank described his preferred mode of learning.

> I just think I learn, I get the basics at the course that they provide and then I learn by doing it and working with senior people (Frank, sergeant).

Frank included reference to ‘senior people’ and learning from them. The power lies with senior ranks having credibility, expertise and influence by virtue of their position and reputation. There was deference to those with more and different experience to oneself; respect was demanded and expected. This is a significant feature of how learning has occurred in *Conundrum* and is supported by the narratives of other police officers, but it is arbitrary and does not occur within a formalised mentor program.

Similarly to Frank, Charles identified learning from experienced others as a significant means of learning for him. Again, however, learning depended on Charles finding one of the ‘personable ones’ to learn from.

Yes, watching the practices of others ... I learnt most from the personable ones, the ones who had street cred’, the ones who were held in high regard, who had experience and who I guess led by example both in their behaviour and their professionalism (Charles, sergeant).
You pick your mentor. Try to align yourself to them and what they do. Then you’re practising with them. You don’t want to go shadowing someone too closely, so I think observation initially then when you’re a little bit more comfortable with your ability and with the person, ask them if they’re happy to mentor you, you know on a more personal basis (Charles, sergeant).

Most of the training we get is really prescriptive and rote learning and, as a result, I’ve learned more from senior officers and through doing than I’ve learned on courses (Hugo, sergeant).

In-field learning was seen as more formative and instrumental in a police officer’s learning than what could be achieved at the academy, as Leo noted:

Learning is a practical thing. People who want to learn gain the most from working with experienced people and gleaning the experience from them. The Academy provides you with a foundation for learning, but it’s developed out on the field after leaving the confines of the Academy (Leo, sergeant).

When I asked Charles how he felt having a mentor, he said:

You certainly feel less isolated; I think you feel as though learning is being shared perhaps a little bit. You don’t feel quite so hung out to dry in a situation. You can always rely on not necessarily someone to help you out but certainly someone to bounce ideas off or get some feedback, some critical feedback or be able to critique your performance a little bit. A lot of areas I’ve worked in, I would be more comfortable having a mentor with me than just coming in and being left to flounder, sort of thing (Charles, sergeant).

I don’t think there’s lots of learning at the lowest levels. You’ve got new recruits coming out ... but there are limited mentors for them. You learn from those you work with and you say, “I like the sound of that” and then adapt it for yourself. I think we’re lacking mentors (Eleanor, constable).

Collapse these narratives and remove all reference to police and they depict a craft occupation essentially basing its practice on the reproduction of the wisdom of practitioners with experience and above all reputation. Police officers, however, are more than artisans manipulating materials to produce a product of high quality. They are required to not only enforce the prescription of the law, but also, as shown earlier, to interpret, decide about, intervene as ‘social workers’ and ‘odd jobs man’ in a myriad of dynamic situations. All the police officers in this section of this chapter and other chapters seemed to agree that they were not given requisite knowledge or skills at the Academy to independently practice. The aportia is self-evident. Police officers must seek out and learn from their respected
elders. The system, however, is ad hoc. It depends on the individual officer being able to find a mentor, being able to access that mentor and being assured that the information passed on is appropriate and not reinforcing a hidden curriculum or unauthorised curriculum (e.g., Roger Rogerson). The challenge is the individual does not have a gauge or a framework with which to evaluate the efficacy of what they are seeing and being told. I am reminded of David’s comments in Chapter 4 about training recruits to be ‘uniformed constables’ before ‘unleash[ing] them on the public’, and Charles’s comments (above) about being ‘hung out to dry’ and ‘you feel less isolated’ when learning from the experience of a mentor as a constable in the early stages of one’s career.

Learning from others has more value than formal training. It is as if true learning about the craft of policing does not take place until an officer is in the field modelling oneself on the attributes of respected others. What one learns and from whom is not organised or validated. It is arbitrary and not determined by intellectual rigour, instead it equates to ‘I like the sound of that’ (Eleanor, constable.) Given that newly qualified police officers might not have the capacity to discriminate between erroneous or good, ethical practice it is at best a risky education experience.

**Experiencing Practice**

In attempting to explore how training informed practice, for many of the police officers, including Len and Zak, it was not the training per se, but rather the accumulated experience in the field that contributed to their practice.

I guess it’s when the training relates to something practical (Len, constable).

The training to start with was adequate, not outstanding. I gained more in the first twelve months after leaving the Academy through practical application (Zak, sergeant).

---

14 *ABC News Online* reported on convicted criminal and former police officer Roger Rogerson: ‘Once a posterboy for good policing ... [t]hroughout his career, Rogerson received at least a dozen bravery awards’. He was quoted as saying, ‘I was a young fellow, I worked with older men, senior men, I learnt from them’ and that ‘everything was done in the line of duty’ (*ABC 2016*)
Bruce reflected on how he managed a fatal crash, he said:

What I did came more from having been to other fatal accidents. Like I remember it took me five or six years before I went to my first one and then I had three in about six months, and I was first on the scene in all of them as well. And, also... I went to the first one and I had no idea what I was doing. Um... I parked my car over the top of where the accident occurred [chuckle]. It was things like that... you’re just not aware of what the specialist squads require. You were given your basic run down on what to do at a fatal crash when I first went to the academy, but those days, you’re not really concentrating... you’re concentrating on getting through, and then dealing with what you need to do in your first 12 months walking the beat (Bruce, constable).

I tend to blank those things out, which is wrong because I should be reflecting on them (Bruce, constable).

For Bruce, the academy-based training delivered the information necessary to work in the field. Information about experiences he would most probably not have in his first 12 months was quickly forgotten. His true learning therefore came from the experience of doing the job and his errors along the way. A side issue but still important was his handling of difficult confronting situations that he admitted to ‘blank[ing] those things out’ when he ‘should be reflecting on them’.

Bruce’s disembodied practice fitted with the general police culture which began at the academy where the main concern was ‘getting through’, i.e., passing exams and surveillance. Emotional management was not taught. The previous discussion promoted emotional detachment as a desirable skill. Cotton’s (2016) inquiry highlighted the dangerous inadequacies in the prevailing attitudes towards emotional expression by police officers.

I guess it’s when the training relates to something practical (Len, constable).

The training to start with was adequate, not outstanding. I gained more in the first twelve months after leaving the Academy through practical application (Zak, sergeant).

For Ralph training did not inform their practice instead they saw previous experience, a sense of responsibility, and relevant practical application as sources
guiding their practice. Ralph’s responses were made within the context of a specific incident involving the fatality of a young man.

I don’t think the training kicked in but rather the responsibility I had kicked in (Ralph, constable).

I think I did a good job for what I had and for what I did but if I had more experience and knowledge and training I would’ve tackled the situation better as a policeman, not as a person, as a policeman (Ralph, constable).

Ralph’s sense of responsibility guided his response to the incident rather than his training. Worthy of note were his comments about how more ‘experience, knowledge and training’ would have equipped him to operate as a ‘policeman’ rather than a ‘person’. The distinction was note worthy as it seemed to say that being a police officer disconnected one from being a person with attendant frailties of emotion.

**Mucking Things Up**

A recurring theme in my research was the tension between the crucial role in police officers’ learning of everyday experience – learning as you do the job – and the impact of the inevitable mistakes.

I learned by making mistakes and realising, ‘Gee, I was lucky there’ (Hugo, sergeant)

People need to learn by mistakes. That would be the most important thing because we are about doing, we look and learn (Eleanor, constable).

I learn better if I muck it up (Joe, senior police officer).

Learning occurs via error. Most people learn by fear of not wanting to do the wrong thing, which I don’t think builds on solid foundations. We want people take responsibility for their actions, but a large chunk of my time in this job has been with the fear of making mistakes, and it’s hard to get rid of it (Leo, sergeant).

We’re so used to catching baddies that we look at our own people in the same way. It can hamper positive learning. It’s almost like thrashing your dog so it won’t get up on the couch … it’s just not positive reinforcement (Oscar, sergeant).

The most significant learning comes from stuff-ups. When you know you’ve done something wrong and you learn from your mistakes (Len, constable).
If I do make a mistake, I’m able to modify my learning, rectify it. You modify your capabilities, and get to know what you can and can’t do. You’ve got to have that “can do” attitude (Ronnie, constable).

Taken together, these quotes painted a picture of a learning environment that was essentially trial and error in the absence of an organised mentor program. In the process of learning any skill, as in a trade, the effect of mistakes on knowledge and practice is important. Most trades, however, are learned in a master-apprentice environment with guidance after error. Professions introduce members to practice in a controlled and supported environment, e.g., internships. Police in my research described none of these features. On the contrary they can be left to their own resources to discover their practice parameters. At best, they look and learn; a comment that further emphasised the modernist notion of mimesis as imitation and very much about keeping practice or particular practices in the present. To observe and mimic practice was considered a reliable, valid approach to learning the craft of policing because what was done (in practice) represented best current practice. It was the ‘norm’, ‘order’, ‘law’ (Derrida 1983, p.193) and needed to be replicated and reproduced. It also reinforced traditional notions of experience as the foundation of knowledge and knowing (Beckett 2004, p.502). Overlaiding this is a socio-cultural context that requires commitment to the other, the team, the group and preferred and established ways of thinking, seeing, doing, and being.

Lurking in the shadows is the fear of punishment. Oscar drew a powerful connection between the job of policing – ‘catching baddies’ – and the organisational response to poor performance and making mistakes. He described a regime founded on negative reinforcement with a de-emphasis on positive learning. For Oscar, this was ingrained in him and his perception of his practice and learning; fear was a constant companion and consideration. It further highlights the strength of the habitus and doxa associated with being and presenting as a competent, professional police officer, one who does not make mistakes, whose judgement is sound, whose loyalty is consistent, who is resilient. This interfaces with features of the Tough-love family and Perfect self D/discourses
(see Chapter 1.) Again, this raises the function of surveillance and judgement of police by police as a form of ‘disciplinary power’ (Foucault 1977, p.175).

The discussion so far underscores a tension in the practice space. Joe (earlier in this chapter) referred to the inherent inconsistency when dealing with managers. He considered that he learns better when he makes mistakes but he admitted that Conundrum, of which he is a senior officer, sends double messages to its employees – ‘We say one thing and do another’. If Joe is confused by this one can only wonder what a new constable must feel.

Learning, despite the negative regimen, does take place but it was telling that reflecting upon learning from positive experiences was not mentioned by any police officers. The focus was solely on doing what they judged to be the job and accepting the consequences.

It’s just a feeling ... You go, “That’s not right”. I ask my peers or if I’m on my own, I’ll sit down and have a think about what I’ve done and maybe do some research into legislation (Len, constable).

There was some reflection by Len on action but with a focus on external and controllable sources of practice, e.g., legislation as opposed to the meta-cognitive emotional competence. Monty described a special circumscribed setting in policing where punishment was openly acknowledged as a path to developmental learning.

The forum for detectives is the courtroom. I tell the young guys they will get a belting at some point and you’ll learn from it. You will not have met the standard, whether that is the standard of proof or the expected standard of your investigation. It might even be small things, like your [interview] video (Monty, sergeant).

In the Supreme Court they’ll play a video of an interview you did at 2 am in the morning and you’ll remember the clanger. You can see it coming and everyone’s going to see it and they’ll look at you. The courtroom is a hard taskmaster (Monty, sergeant).

Monty’s narrative reinforced the ‘us’ versus ‘them’ inherent in policing.
Punishment did not come from within CIB, but from the court and the public gaze. As well, the practice was about prescriptive behaviour – how to present evidence,
how to question a witness. Analysis of one’s values or feelings was not necessarily part of the learning process. He acknowledged that mistakes were likely. It was how one managed oneself when mistakes were made and critiqued in a public forum such as a courtroom.

I’ve learned that you’re always going to make a mistake. There’ll always be something. It’s the way you handle your response to it (Monty, sergeant).

Joe should have the last say as a summary of the issues confronting positive learning in Conundrum.

I think that it is important for us as an organisation to allow our people the autonomy to make decisions within guidelines, to make decisions and make mistakes, but not to be belted for it. Rather to see is as an opportunity to develop and to learn as opposed to, for a long time in this organisation, we have had a culture where people are scared of making mistakes so they don’t do anything, they don’t make decisions, they just push it up, and I think we’re now suffering that significantly at the rank of sergeant and certainly at the rank of inspector and in some cases higher up where all you are is a post office to the next level above you (Joe, senior police officer).

As a senior police officer, he acknowledged hesitancy at the ranks of sergeant and inspector to be accountable (i.e., make decisions, take actions, accept mistakes) and instead there was the practice of avoiding potential punishment by passing the responsibility up to the next rank and beyond. It typified the negative aspects of a hierarchy where it becomes difficult to delegate or devolve responsibility to other ranks. It has been noted by a number of police officers such a negative regime can immobilise thinking and practice, keeping in play the status quo as opposed to opening up to something other or new learning, and it certainly does not represent a professional practice. The absence of critique and silent acceptance of punishment was significant.

**Being Honest is Being Good**

Not one of the police officers in my research mentioned knowledge and application of knowledge to practice. In particular, there was little mention of ethical considerations in practice and, instead, emphasis was on ‘doing the job’ of
policing. Charles and Fred in this instance, and previously Alex and Oliver, were the only police officers to refer to integrity and ethical practice.

I think it’s important to have quite a strong ethical background and base and I think that Integrity Commissions or Internals [internal investigations] are important, if for nothing else than for clarity to the public (Charles, sergeant).

It is a challenging profession. I see a lot of hard work and desire to do good. Another thing I’ve seen a lot of is restraint in the face of adversity. You see people often confronted with, you know, abusive, violent situations and sometimes I marvel at the restraint that I see. It requires a lot of maturity, and I think you’ve got to have the right character to sustain that sort of restraint in those circumstances (Alex, inspector).

Integrity is a huge part of that professionalism ... in the way that they conduct themselves, I think is really important as well. Being aware and conscious of it shouldn’t impinge on, restrict or inhibit what they are doing. It should guide it, rather than a knee-jerk reaction (Fred, inspector).

It was especially significant that each saw ethics and integrity as externally controlled and determined, e.g., Integrity Commissions and Internal Affairs. Ethics and integrity were part of the public persona and not guiding internalised principles. There was no suggestion of reflection or critique of an individual’s values, beliefs and biases. Alex touched on an internal quality – maturity – but it was only significant to practice in terms of his public presentation. Fred’s statement that integrity should not inhibit action was telling. During my work in Conundrum I recall police officers regularly referring to the Code of Conduct and the SELF Test\textsuperscript{15} as the mechanisms for ethical police practice. There was little if any reflection and critique of an individual’s values, beliefs and biases.

\footnote{Each police jurisdiction’s Code of Conduct is contained within relevant legislation to regulate professional and ethical standards of practice. Further to this, a one-page document titled the ‘SELF Test’ is used as a simple and quick guide to everyday practice and decision-making. The mnemonic is Scrutiny, Ensure Compliance, Lawful, and Fair. It is described in literature from VicPol (2015) as ‘a decision making framework’ with acknowledgement that police will encounter many, varied and complex situations. Whatever the circumstances, you need to be able to make lawful, informed professional and ethical decisions’. In QPOL (n.d.) it is described for use ‘when [you are] confronted by a number of options or when you need to make critical decisions’ that will withstand scrutiny, comply with policies, practices, procedures, have regard to laws, regulations, rules and human rights, and be fair to community, colleagues, your family and others.}
There were very few comments about ethical considerations and personal values. Perhaps worthy of note is that both Alex and Oliver are inspectors with many years in policing and Conundrum, and their personal agency and capacities as relational, agential police practitioners have developed over time. But whether this is a reflection of the individuals rather than the system or organisational learning is open to conjecture.

I guess for me it probably means being honest. It means being fair and equitable. They’re two or three things that are really important (Alex, inspector).

Your values, like being honest and ethical and your behaviour – on and off duty – shows that you are professional (Oliver, inspector).

Elizabeth, a police officer and a member of the corporate management group gave a positive perspective of increased scrutiny and external oversight, seeing it as a means of engendering a ‘professional approach to policing’.

I think the fact that every jurisdiction now has an external oversight body [integrity commissions] … can only enhance the professional approach to policing.

Whilst we have quite a good mechanism to review our own complaints, it is not just complaints; it’s our practice. But that’s not an acceptable way of demonstrating your professionalism and improving your service. Only making comment internally is not enough, I think you need that third party, that external review and that creates an opportunity for us to expand our transparency and openness and accountability, and that’s what the public pays for and expects. These things will only enhance the professionalism or professional approach of policing (Elizabeth, senior police officer and corporate manager).

Here Elizabeth has tried to move the debate away from only dealing with the negative aspects of reviews (e.g., dealing with complaints) to examining the whole of police practice by a third objective party. Her opinion is contrary to Prenzler and den Heyer (2013, p.90) who claimed that many officers saw third party scrutiny as a ‘threat’.

**Practice with Potential**

The reflections of Alex, Fred, Joe, Reg, Bruce and Ralph pointed to the potential for self-motivated deeper learning to occur around practice. I also got a sense
from the police officers’ words and descriptions of experiences a potential for the full use of senses, but they were quickly suppressed or cast aside as a function of a lack of training, particularly noted by Ralph towards the end of this chapter (Bendelow & Williams 1997).

Alex included attitudes and beliefs in his perception of learning.

I guess it’s about broadening your knowledge base, developing your attitudes, informing your beliefs (Alex, inspector).

His reference to attitudes and beliefs highlighted a deeper form of learning and one that is very rarely acknowledged in police training and education, where there is little room for individual attitudes and beliefs to be expressed and to influence practice. Instead, training attempts to construct a ‘group-think’ rather than an individual approach (Conti & Nolan 2005).

Fred has many years’ experience of policing in Conundrum and his comments added further texture to what Alex said. They are both inspectors with similar numbers of years in the job, and it is likely they operate within or across the ‘proficient’ and ‘expert’ practice domains where context and an ‘internalized’ intuition, involving the interplay of body, mind and emotion, form the fabric of the individual (Flyvberg 2001, p. 21).

For me, learning is about new things. It means expansion. It means constant challenge, in some ways, and constant movement in my own sense and expansion, like a progression, cause it’s easy to become a little stagnant and a little stuck in a rut whereas you know new challenges and new things tend to engage and give me, if not excitement, certainly a feeling of interest and challenge (Fred, inspector).

Fred touched on the energy associated with learning when he spoke of ‘expansion’, ‘constant challenge’, ‘constant movement’ and ‘progression’. These words resonated with notions of transformation triggered and supported by deep learning as a remedy to being ‘stagnant’ and ‘stuck in a rut’; a very real potential in a cultural context that is resistant to change or requires passive compliance and commitment to learning and professional development. A contradiction or paradox was evident in that while legislation and policies change on a regular
basis, the cultural fabric of policing is essentially suspicious of change. The practice of policing remains the same and is applied to new legislation and policies.

Joe offered a similar perspective to learning from experience, but also expanded on the notion and practice of reflection.

Learning for me is about experiences. It's not just academic qualifications. Learning is about using knowledge, experiences, however you might have gathered it, to do something in a different way, better or even to do it the same way but be more informed why you're doing it (Joe, senior police officer).

So I think it's about being informed and being able to critically analyse what you're doing. One of the key things about that is being able to reflect in a way that allows you to look at something from someone else's perspective. For example, I thought that was OK but from a victim's perspective or an offender's perspective or the court's perspective ... (Joe, senior police officer).

Joe's understanding of learning was nuanced and reflected a deeper sense of learning that led to doing 'something in a different way' or 'better' way or importantly, doing something in 'the same way' but from an informed position; appreciating 'why you're doing it'. In many respects, Joe's years in policing and Conundrum were at the very heart of his appreciation of the potential for deeper learning. Crucial to his understanding and practice was his ability to reflect and to consider implications and consequences of his actions from others' perspectives, including victims and offenders. His approach to learning and his practice appeared to be intertwined with each informing the other. Joe conveyed agency and sense of self.

Fred's comments indicated reflection-on-action, efforts to learn from critiquing experiences. Fred spoke with extensive experience upon which to draw and to develop his practice as he spoke of realisations that occurred at times in work and personal life.

Yes, those pivotal points in your life where you turn around and because of an experience or exposure to something you say, "From this point on I'm going to do something different. I'm going to approach things in this way or that way". That's both within the job and external to the job. More so something that's an incident or event or a series of things that have occurred to you where you very quickly go,
“Ok, well, I’m never going to repeat that again or I’ll make sure I do this in future” (Fred, inspector).

Reg saw exposure to contemporary thinking and practice as a trigger for learning.

Learning informs you and keeps you up to date and exposes you, exposes me to more contemporary practices, I suppose (Reg, sergeant).

He adopted a positive attitude towards learning that was underpinned by an intrinsic motivation as he reflected on what he had seen in his years in *Conundrum* and policing.

I’ve seen throughout 30 years how we’ve changed how we go about our business and I like to put myself up there to do as much learning as I can ... cause learning’s free. I think any opportunity that you can have to learn is brilliant (Reg, sergeant).

To add texture and depth to the data knowledge, practice and learning, I interviewed Bruce and Ralph about their experience of immediate, on-the-job learning and response.

Bruce talked to me of a fatal accident where a person was hit by a train. As he spoke of his experience his language moved between first and second person. The first person was associated more with his actions and decisions. He used the second person when he was reflecting on and justifying his actions and decisions.

His description of his response demonstrated his ‘feel for the game’ (the *illusio*) (Bourdieu 1990, p.195). He followed procedure and essentially approached the incident in a habitual, routine manner, as he would any accident scene.

I was the first on the scene. It was horrific. The victim had been dragged 200 metres on the track and there was pretty much nothing left of him. I just shut the scene down. It was one of those situations where you didn’t think of what you were doing. It was almost like you were on automatic pilot (Bruce, constable; Ryan 2012, p.4).

Bruce’s description of not thinking what he was doing and being on ‘automatic pilot’ reflected the spontaneity associated with ‘knowing-in-action’, or ‘knowing-in-practice’ (Schön 1983, pp.50, 59). This is a feature of common sense and
'practical knowledge' (Schön 1983, p.54), involving the 'application of knowledge to instrumental decisions' (Schön 1983, p.50, emphasis in original). He continued:

Yeah, I took control of the scene until AIS [Accident Investigation Services] arrived. Cause we had the driver stuck 200 metres up the train track, and I made sure he stayed in the cabin and then you’ve got 200 metres of scene to manage. In this instance, we had 35 body pieces. I won’t go into the details (Bruce, constable).

I got on the radio and said I want anyone arriving to stay down at the road. No one is to come near the scene. You’ve got to control who comes in; expose as few people to the scene as possible (Bruce, constable; Ryan 2012, p.6).

Habits can be understood as ‘the formation of intellectual and emotional disposition as well as an increase in ease, economy, and efficiency of action’ (Dewey 1916, p.48). Habits are important for growth and coping with experiences through the application of routine ways of thinking and behaving (Dewey 1916; Jarvis 2006). For growth to continue, habits need to be scrutinized, critiqued and open to adaptation. Habits that are closed, fixed and habituated are problematic in that they removed from ‘conscious deliberation and decision’, and may well result in erroneous solutions or outcomes (Dewey 1916, p.49). For police practitioners, the ease of solutions through habituated ways of thinking and behaving represent institutionalisation of knowledge and practice might well reduce or limit their attention to detail beyond what can be known, understood, expected and spoken (Bourdieu 1977; Maton 2012).

Bruce then talked about the scene and his ability to detach himself from what he saw.

I was walking up the train tracks and I just saw a hand sitting there and then I found the rest of him. I can take things like that and they don’t seem to worry me. It’s not a case of tuning out. This person is a victim and has to be treated with courtesy. It happened in front of his girlfriend and family members, so you’ve got to act professionally and portray that image to them. That’s what some police officers can’t do (Bruce, constable; Ryan 2012, p.4)

An appearance of composure, equated with professionalism, was upper most in Bruce’s thoughts. Also of significance to him was his management of the scene and the situation, which was understandable given the imperative to maintain the
integrity of the scene for investigation and future coronial inquiry. Bruce explained:

I was able to do that [be professional]. If you want to talk and joke about it, de-stress later on. It’s like perception and reality. You’re very conscious of the perception of the people when you’re at those scenes. I think it was the calmness of everyone at the scene. I was giving everyone directions to do what they needed to do and there were no questions asked. It was all under control and there was no mass hysteria, so to say, and um it just felt right. It just flowed so smoothly. It’s nice when something like that happens (Bruce, constable).

Bruce prepared himself to deal with a routine incident, which he managed appropriately and with confidence, however, he encountered something he had not anticipated, which created a ‘state of disjuncture’ for him, raising questions as to how he should respond (Jarvis 2006, p.19). For Bruce, this could be seen to reflect the power of institutionalised knowledge and practice, regulating routine and procedural response, rather than being attuned to his own intuition or gut reaction (Bourdieu 1977). The procedural practice had not prepared him for uncertainty.

Then we were just sitting there, it was the middle of the afternoon, and there was a crow dragging a foot away. And all of a sudden we were laughing. Instead of bringing more people onto the scene, I did crow patrol, walking up and down the tracks for the next 3 hours, shooing the crows away.
They’re the little things ... the unknowns that are gonna crop up and you think, “Fuck! Why didn’t I think of that?” (Bruce, constable; Ryan 2012, p.4)

The actions of the crows did not fit within Bruce’s ‘repertoire of expectations’ (Schön 1983, p.60), based on his practice at previous accident scenes. It was unexpected and took him by surprise. When actions and decisions become routine and repetitive, there is the potential for inattention to differences, to the unanticipated that do not align with ‘knowing-in-practice’ (Schön 1983, p.62).

You can go to every single type of incident and you think, “I’ve dealt with these before, I know what’s gonna happen.” You can’t just draw the conclusion that this is how this scenario is gonna play out. There’s always gonna be something that is going to explode in front of your face that you’re not going to expect, but you’ve got to be ready for something like that to happen. You’ve got to manage it in some way (Bruce, constable; Ryan 2012).
Bruce acknowledged his reliance on his practice-based knowledge of incidents and the assumption of ‘know[ing] what’s gonna happen’. He realised the flaws in adopting this set of expectations and assumptions and took away from this situation a learning for future experiences: to be alert to, or ‘ready for’, the unexpected.

Bruce showed a capacity for ‘reflection-in-action’, initiated by the element of surprise. In this situation, Bruce’s reflection, response and action – ‘doing crow patrol’ – seemed to be appropriate and made a difference to the situation; it preserved evidence and maintained the integrity of the scene, and he made a conscious decision to do this and not to expose other personnel to the scene.

For police, suspending judgement and stopping and thinking about a situation are contrary to notions and images of the competent, decisive, technically expert problem-solver. It is antithetical to taking control through quick and decisive action.

Ralph reflected on an experience that he said he found challenging. He described:

It was like being on the moon. They may as well have sent me to the moon. It was a massive job, pretty bloody stressful (Ralph, constable; Ryan 2012, p.2).

I had just finished a shift when I got called out and dispatched with ambos [an ambulance officer and one volunteer ambulance officer] at three o’clock in the morning. I was driving along, but not really knowing where I was going. We were being led to a place by drunken youths at the end of a phone. When I got there the situation was just unbelievable (Ralph, constable; Ryan 2012, p.2).

Ralph’s initial comment that ‘it was like being on the moon’ created a sense of the unreal, and his descriptions of it being a ‘massive job’ and ‘stressful’ presented a situation that was different from other incidents he had attended and managed in his years in policing. The expectations of him as the police officer in charge of the scene were no different.

The initial report was of an accident where a kid had been injured. Then we got radio communication just before we arrived at the scene telling us that the kid was dead. This meant I [police] was the lead and it was just like, “Oh shit” (Ralph, constable; Ryan 2012, p.2).
Ralph was entering what Schön (1983, p.3) referred to as the ‘indeterminate swampy zones of practice’ characterized by ‘uncertainty’ and ambiguity (Schön 1983, p.6). The indeterminacy of situations and problems are at odds with the technical rational practitioners as ‘instrumental problem solvers’ applying the most appropriate technical solutions (Schön 1983, p.3). In today’s society, problems are often ‘messy’ and ‘indeterminate’ (Schön 1983, p.4). In this instance, Ralph needed to ascertain what had happened.

We hit the ground to find 30 very drunk, very distraught young people. They were on an end of year football trip, went four-wheel driving drunk late at night in a very remote area. They tried to snig a car out of a bog hole, the tow ball snapped off, flew through the car and a freakish type of thing happened; a kid was scalped (Ralph, constable; Ryan 2012, p.2).

Nobody knew ‘cause they’d done it in the pitch dark, except for one set of headlights, so nobody knew what happened, nobody knew where the tow ball came from. They didn’t realise the kid had been hurt ‘til about 10 minutes after the incident. Then they found him (Ralph, constable).

My main concern was to contain the scene. To do that, I had to get rid of them [the 30 young people] (Ralph, constable).

Similarly to Bruce, Ralph was drawing on his ‘knowing-in-action’, following procedure to contain the scene and manage those within the scene. But he acknowledged challenges associated with achieving this, one of which was poor communications.

It was fine but it was freezing cold. It was in a very, very remote area. We had no comms [communication]. To make a phone call, I stood about 200 metres from the scene on top of a little grassy knoll, with my hand above my head and my phone on speaker (Ralph, constable; Ryan 2012, p.2).

After I’d cleared the scene, the ambulance officers and I just sat there and waited in the freezing cold until Forensics turned up (Ralph, constable).

I really dislocated myself from it. Like looking at the body and stuff like that didn’t matter, didn't bother me (Ralph, constable).

On the one hand, a “dislocation” of himself from the situation afforded Ralph some distance and protection from the experience: adopting the rational, unemotional, competent police officer’s persona. On the other hand however, he
was aware of himself as a person, a human being in a very difficult, confronting and emotional situation. A tension can exist between the personal and the professional, simultaneously, keeping the person (personal, private, emotional, embodied) out of the scene and replacing it with the police officer (public, unemotional, disembodied, controlled and in control). Research has shown ‘dissociation’ (a distancing or depersonalisation) from ‘thoughts, feelings, or memories of stressful events’ is a common coping mechanism of police officers (Aaron 2000, p.438). While the strategy ‘is an understandable response’, it is ‘maladaptive’ (Aaron 2000, p.446).

Studies and clinical experience have affirmed negative consequences of such a strategy. Dr Thomas (a recently retired police psychologist, pers com., on Thursday 24th January 2013) explained that:

Unlike the person on the street, emergency service workers such as police encounter traumatic, stressful situations today and very likely the next day or the next shift. The public expectations that they will be competent, responsive, calm, and controlled are magnified by their own expectations – don't lose control, be aware of how you are presenting, fake it till you make it. For some police officers to dissociate themselves from the situation and associated memories is a form of protection. They can go about their work. They can think about the situation but not feel any pain, in the short term. As a preferred coping mechanism, a way of life, the long-term implications are serious, personally and professionally.

Bruce and Ralph’s sharing of their experiences and responses to the situations showed a capacity for reflection-in-action. Schön’s (1983, p.69) assertions that technical rationalist thinking and practice is inadequate for messy, indeterminate situations are evident in Bruce and Ralph’s narratives.

Of relevance to Bruce and Ralph’s experiences is Joe’s reference to formal and informal debriefs to address issues in incidents. Operational debriefs are intended to be positive appraisals of incident management leading to enhanced learning and practice development. Joe’s comments indicated the obfuscation around mistakes and criticism of practice.

What happens at formal debriefs is that people will say all the good things and gloss over the bad things or put a bit of a band-aid over it (Joe, senior police officer).
Schön’s (1983, p.69) quote resonates:

Many practitioners, locked into a view of themselves as technical experts, find nothing in the world of practice to occasion reflection. They have become too skilful at techniques of selective attention, junk categories, and situational control, techniques which they use to preserve the constancy of their knowledge-in-practice. For them, uncertainty is a threat; its admission is a sign of weakness. Others, more inclined toward and adept at reflection-in-action, nevertheless feel profoundly uneasy because they cannot say what they know how to do, cannot justify its quality or rigor.

Neither Bruce nor Ralph were offered debriefs of their incidents. They were judged to have handled them well, so there was no perceived need for review.

**Conclusion: Practice and Knowledge**

The police who contributed to this chapter were in general agreement that formal academy based training did not equip them for reflective practice. At best they learned the basics, sufficient (perhaps) to walk the beat. Real learning of how and what takes place in the work environment by trial and error, imitation (mimesis) and/or informal mentoring. The theoretical foundations were almost non-existent and limited to legislation and procedure and therefore theory in general did not figure in their learning. Culturally endorsed approach to learning was to do the job in the same way as it was done with experience and reputation, thus the reproduction of knowledge and the replication of practice were assured. Overlaying this was accountability driven by ‘techno-rationalist’ thinking – producing and produced by procedural and instrumental knowledge – that is easy to scrutinise and measure against a set of standards (Higgs, McAllister & Whiteford 2009, p.104).

Policing is expanding in its reach into new, less process driven areas where traditional practice does not fit. The traditional identity of police officers is *sous rature*: being constructed and reconstructed. I recall Patsy’s fractured sense of self and her multiple subjectivities in Chapter 4 as she responded to the changing expectations and roles. More than ever, police need to be reflexive practitioners,
which means moving beyond technical rationalist frameworks of thinking and instrumental knowledge drawn in the main from practice and “doing” to more nuanced and critically evaluative professionals. The challenge is though that an enduring commitment in training to content and behaviour is not likely to guarantee deeper learning involving a critique of values, biases, and ethical considerations, and the development of a socio-political theoretical framework or a barometer that enables purposive, considered responses to the increasing social responsibilities of policing (White 2006).

A tension exists where on the one hand, a focus on process is in keeping with the traditional and modernist notions of policing where practices were prescribed by a set of guidelines and procedures, creating a sense of certainty in terms of one’s identity and practice. On the other hand, it also reflects the imposition of Neoliberal, Managerial regimen to control public services such as police and to secure efficiencies. In part this reflects the very dynamic space of policing in this century and where, as is noted in previous chapters, the roles and responsibilities of police is becoming far more diverse and blurred.

All of the police officers in this chapter were to some degree open to informing their practice by forms of learning other than behaviour and content orientated teaching. The major issue to be faced is explicating these processes and convincing Conundrum to endorse them.

**Where to Next**

In Chapter 7 I draw together the implications of the data presented in police officers’ narratives featured in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. I review and disrupt a number of aporias and lacunae that are simultaneously problematic and point to the potential for different thinking about learning and practice.
Chapter 7

Finishing Otherwise

Unheard and Un-thought Remains

Catching baddies, locking up the baddies,
Looking as if you know what you’re doing.
Policing is confused, driven by stats, fixing the ills of society
Being less like a police officer.
Look professional, dress appropriately, the way we do the job
With a can do attitude.
Common sense, rational decisions, not taught to think
Understanding comes later, if we have time.
Learning brought to them, learn better if I muck it up,
Learn by fear, get belted, ask no questions.
Give them a taste of operational policing
Unleash them on the public.

A Moment ...

The pastiche of police officers’ voices (above) (re)present the narratives of the police officers who participated in and contributed to my research. My experience of working in Conundrum and policing revealed numerous aporias and lacunae and the purpose of my research has been to bring them out of the shadows of the swampy lowland and into focus. The police officers’ narratives in chapters 4, 5, and 6 have exposed the ways in which they live with, work within, and are impacted by pedagogies driven by prevailing discourses and (sub)cultures.

Introduction

Buerger (2010) and Mazeika et al (2010) both commented on the quality of police research in that the majority is conducted by outsiders, who are seen as lacking
the requisite inside knowledge, and do not get the degree of access they require. On top of this, very few involved talking to police officers freely and openly about their experiences. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Mazeika et al (2010) recommend research conducted by those on the inside and immersed in the environment. My insider knowledge and acceptance by police officers allowed me to have free and open conversations with these officers, albeit with some distance having not been a police officer myself.

My aim has been to disrupt and deconstruct pedagogies that impact on police officers’ notions of and engagement in professional practice and learning. Complexity surrounds the site of Conundrum and the landscape of policing generally in response to a variety of often conflicting agendas. In order to achieve my aim, and to address a gap in research, I was keen to gain insights to how police officers deal with issues on a daily basis, how they reconcile their practices, how they perceive the complexities of their practice as professionals or technicians and artisans, and how they learn.

Their narratives reveal ‘indeterminate swampy zones of practice’ (Schön 1987, p.3) that reflect contradictions and uncertainties between the traditional, enduring notions of police and policing and the ill-defined, shifting boundaries of policing in the twenty-first century. Paradoxically, indeterminacy and repetition were consistent features of the narratives and reminded me of Britzman’s statements of the promise of experience, which I have rewritten as a question, and which sits at the very centre of the lived experiences of police officers in Conundrum:

Traditionally, it is thought that experience makes meaning ... [but] what happens when experience cannot deliver its promise: competence, clarity, and confidence? (2003, p.19)

Britzman’s quote resonates with the police officers’ narratives in that practice, in the real world, is accepted as the essential source of their learning, with the academy only providing ‘the basics’. On-the-job learning is not formalised and supported; it is ad hoc and therefore cannot guarantee ‘competence, clarity, and confidence’.
A broad overview shows that police officers in my research are subjected to a number of entrenched power relations as they relate to the production of knowledge, the measurement of performance and the inconsistency of acquiring learning through practice. Threading through these are gender power relations, regimes of truth about police practice and behaviour and the emergent blurring of the role of the police officer (Butler 1993; Foucault 1977, 1980). Overlaying it all is the rising zeitgeist of professionalisation that is confused in and of itself and confusing to others.

In this concluding chapter, I provide a brief review of the aporias and lacunae evident in the three data chapters with a view to synthesising the findings of the data. A continuing feature in a number of areas – expansion of role, power and gender relations, attitudes towards emotional expression, quality of learning in the workplace – was an unquestioning acceptance. Despite changes happening around them and to them, the police officers seemed to behave as if these were not making a difference (Derrida 1997).

I also present the contribution my research makes to policing, in particular, to training, education and practice. There was repetition within and across the three thematic frameworks of power and knowledge, gender and (dis)embodied practice, and practice and knowledge. In disrupting and deconstructing police officers’ narratives, I made a number of significant findings in the areas of role clarity, power relations, knowledge, training and learning, gender and disembodied learning and practice, integrity and ethics, and professionalisation. I also include recommendations for practice, learning and future research.

**Aporias and Lacunae**

**Power and Knowledge**

Socialisation of recruits establishes regimes of truth through the delivery of the ‘accepted drill’ based on the doxa and the bodily *hēxis* of policing in *Conundrum*.  
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The ways in which training is ‘delivered’ in *Conundrum* engenders docile bodies and a negative, passive agency that results in a lack of understanding of what constitutes learning. The training continues to promote traditional policing practices (command and control or incident management) as opposed to broader educational intent that suits the moves to community-oriented policing. The training constructs the external power relations encompassing us (police) versus them (public). It also perpetuates dimensions of the internal relationships with the police family (i.e., peers and organisation), regulated by prevailing D/discourses and subcultures. Confusion reigns as police find their role and functions shifting to encompass greater social responsibility alongside law enforcement. They are finding themselves working with other agencies and professions, often outside of the parameters of police powers, and for which they are not trained. They see their role as more diffused and diluted and consequently impacting on their identity and agency as a police officer.

**Gender and (Dis)/Embodied Practice**

The hegemonic status of masculinities is ubiquitous in policing establishing what constitutes the thinking and behaviour of a police officer and the accepted and revered practice of policing as heroic, risk taking, authoritative and action-packed. This has affirmed the challenges and implicit and explicit resistance confronting women’s entry to policing. The binary of rational (unemotional) / irrational (emotional), read simultaneously as strong (men) / weak (women), operates as a measure of an individual’s value and worth. Sexual harassment and discrimination are products and tools of gendered knowledge and experience, even though most police officers did not openly name these, they were implicit in their narratives. Tacit acceptance, based on the invisibility of gender power relations, was evident. Wrapped up in that acceptance are the efforts of police women to adopt various styles (e.g., semi-masculine) to gain respect, trust and to be accepted. Gender relations and attitudes towards management of emotions have the same drivers orientated around weakness and a perception of risk to the masculine performance.
Practice and Knowledge

The portrayal of police officers’ work in my research resembled that of a craft or trade. There was a distinct lack of understanding of what constituted being professional and being a member of a profession. Their narratives reflected superficial dimensions of being professional and were marked by an emphasis on looking good, presenting as competent, maintaining a reputation of being authoritative, calm and in control. The training in Conundrum focused on content and behaviour representing the micro-objectives of learning relevant to technicians or artisans. In-field or on-the-job learning had greater value than formal learning at the academy. It was, however, ad hoc with no oversight. The individual police officers sourced their own practice. As a consequence, the learning came mainly from the wisdom of others and the quality of information and practice was not monitored. Significantly, mistakes were identified as offering opportunities for learning in the face of a regime of punishment for error.

Significant Findings: In-coming of the Other

As a preface to discussing the findings, the influence of police culture needs to be noted. The Royal Commissions of Inquiry (Fitzgerald 1989; Kennedy 2004; Wood 1997) and the recent independent reviews of Victoria Police by the Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission (2015) and Cotton (2016) have individually and collectively found police culture informed the attitudes that allowed a number of adverse findings to be realised. A significant consideration is that similar concerns of the effects of police culture have spanned 27 years from Fitzgerald (1989) to Cotton (2016).

A repetitive theme in my data was the comfort that police found in their traditional roles as artisans of command and control (i.e., ‘hard’ policing) and their discomfort in, and almost resistance, to the expansion of their role into community-oriented policing requiring greater social responsibility (i.e., ‘soft’ policing). Wrapped up in notions of hard and soft policing is the essentially masculine nature of policing and gender power relations. Soft policing has been
gendered with more policewomen assigned to or choosing to work in community-oriented areas of practice.

**Role Clarity**

Lack of role clarity is both a cause and effect of the results of my research. The perception of police officers in my research was that the power relations between themselves and the community, the organisational hierarchy and the government, within the context of traditional policing, were clearly understood. The job they had to do was straightforward: ‘catching the baddies’, ‘locking up the baddies’, and their sense of power and identity was clear and reliable. The expectation of the community and governments of police officers have significantly broadened without commensurate education and training. While at first blush, the shrinkage of distance between police and the public is an *aporia* that might seem a positive development. It is clear from my research that police officers did not see this as such rather they saw themselves becoming the ‘odd job man of problems’ (Edward, sergeant). Their agency and their image being reconfigured, their real role denigrated and diminished. They felt at odds with working alongside the community and other agencies while being obliged to accumulate a pre-determined number of traffic infringement notices. On top of this, they were aware that it would most likely be the latter activity that would measure their worth as a police officer.

A thread running through the lack of clarity is the tension and conflict between the enduring modernist conceptions of law, order and policing, along with Neoliberal and Managerial regimen, and the potential for an ‘injection of postmodern scepticism’ (Waters 2007). Modernist notions of policing can be seen to represent *logos* – the logic and certainty that perpetuates traditional features of policing. The *mythos* would have a greater potential to expose what underlies the *logos* and disrupt and open these traditions to critique. A salient point in the interplay of *logos* and *mythos* is that for operational police officers the expanding and ill-defined role of policing causes resentment and anxiety as it takes police away
from their preferred hard policing role. Nevertheless, it was not described as a problem by more senior officers in my research, instead they were ‘act[ing] as though this makes no difference’ (Derrida 1997, p.xviii).

**Power Relations**

Power relations exist in many layers and are played out in many ways in *Conundrum*. The external power relations are perceived to be under threat due to increased public scrutiny and accountability. Central to police officers’ concerns about their perceived role is that their work in community-oriented policing is less likely to involve the enforcement of their police powers and the exertion of their role in command and control. Instead, they are sharing responsibility with other agencies and professions and these require a more nuanced approach to practice, one that is inclusive, collaborative as opposed to directive and authoritative. Police officers in my research had a strong focus on external features as demonstrating their worth and reinforcing their preferred image as action-packed and authoritative.

The rigidity of the internal power relations is evidenced by Alex’s (inspector) salient point, ‘... because we have this hierarchical structure, there is this “us and them” mentality between the commissioned and non-commissioned officers’. This has the potential to limit how knowledge might be shared and new knowledge produced. Literature reveals that in hierarchies where power is ‘centralised, negotiation may be limited to key figures of authority’ and the ‘voices’ of some in the organisation might be ‘muted’ (Roberts 2006, p.628; Woodcock 1991). Expanding on this is the disciplinary power of organisations such as *Conundrum* to establish discourses and practices that are essentially imperceptible to recruits and police officers and function to regulate thinking, behaviour and practice.
Training and Learning

Police training is central to knowledge and learning. Its enduring focus on content and behaviour, however, is inadequate to equip police officers for policing in the twenty-first century, let alone preparing them for the exigencies of a professional status if and when policing is professionalised. A significant finding was the tension between training for instrumental knowledge versus learning that transforms. An underlying layer of tension was associated with a passive rather than an agential approach to learning. Learning needs to be ‘intentional, guided’, and supported to prepare for the exigencies of police practice (Billett 2010, p.39), however, training is inadequate because it is ‘delivered’ (Alex, inspector; Holly, constable), ‘laid in front of them’ (David, senior police officer and corporate manager), and involves ‘repetition’, ‘observation’, ‘imitation’, and ‘hands-on’ (George, inspector; Charles, sergeant; Len, constable; Harry, constable). Learning in Conundrum is predominantly via workplace practice and is random and dependent on good will and with no evaluation of quality.

Pivotal to training and learning is socialisation, masquerading as qualification, which is most marked at the recruit level. Young and mature recruits are equally susceptible to the insidious and persuasive pedagogies that mould recruits to the perfect employee, the perfect constable, and an accepted member of the family in accordance with the Tough-love family Discourse (Bonifacio 1991; Ryan 2008a,b,c). How this occurs in Conundrum is reflected in other research, for example, Conti (2006) and Conti and Nolan (2005). The recruits are ensconced in the academy and ‘bombard[ed] with a lot of information’, ‘training up to be uniform constables’ (David, senior police officer and corporate manager) within ‘tight time lines’ (Alex, inspector). Socialisation constructs passive learners. Learning is therefore left to the individual to find appropriate role models and mentors. It begs the question: who are these role models and how are they defined by the culture rather than a codified and measurable set of criteria?
The frame of reference for learning that was academic and tertiary-based (i.e., reading, writing essays, text-book theory) was not perceived as pertinent to policing, as Fred (inspector) said, ‘Academic qualifications mean nothing’. A noteworthy blind spot and finding was that training and learning were viewed as separate and distinct concepts and activities. Police officers found learning ‘challenging’, ‘a struggle’, and akin to being ‘thrown in the deep end’ (Alex, inspector; Fred, inspector; Charles, sergeant). These tensions and distinctions do not establish a positive and adequate platform for learning that is deep and transformative, and capable of engendering critical reflection relevant to members of a profession and their ongoing professional practice and development. Like traditional artisans, police accumulate their knowledge in the field of practice – watching, mimicking, and shadowing others – but this is a source of tension because of its arbitrariness. There was limited evidence of the ‘remaking [of] occupational knowledge’ but rather the reproduction of knowledge and replication of practice, and no contestation because asking questions (e.g., why) was not permitted. Doubt and conjecture therefore surround the efficacy of the practice of others in Conundrum, given the inadequacy of formal training at the academy and then it is further complicated as practice is modified by trial and error (by mistakes) which is then modified by punishment.

In most craft and professions there is a period of practice before entry is given to the occupation (Billett 2010). Very clearly, the reverse takes place in Conundrum. Recruits are given training, which was described by police officers in my research as rudimentary if not inadequate for more than basic police duties. Two points need to be made about this. Firstly, those at the bottom of the hierarchy (constables) are in the field and armed with the greatest discretion (Skolnick & Fyfe 1983), and a junior constable carries the same powers as a twenty-year senior constable. Police officers work in the field at a distance from direct supervision and are therefore reliant on their discretion and subjective judgement. This typifies, at best, a risky, if not dangerous, practice. Learning from others in Conundrum might well lead to the adoption of erroneous, high-risk, or unsafe
practices, and a recruit or newly graduated recruit will have little capacity to discriminate between desirable and undesirable practice.

Knowledge and Common Sense

Practice, processes, and doing were synonymous with training, resulting in the reproduction of knowledge and the replication of practice. A further finding was the practical wisdom of others (i.e., experienced, reputable police officers) which was key to replicating practice drawn from the individual’s unevaluated, untested practices in the field and based on the ‘sit and get’ (Timperley 2011) training they were given at the academy. An implication of the police officers’ comments was the potential to expose police officers, including newly graduated recruits, to great uncertainty underscored by expectations of the public, the government, and the police hierarchy that they will perform appropriately. They are more likely to make judgements based on the reputation of the experienced other, further exemplifying internal power relations. (See Appendix A.)

Common sense is pivotal and pervasive in understanding police practice and learning. Every occupation has an element of common sense, but for police it is integral to their daily practice – yet ‘it cannot be taught’ (Edward, sergeant). This is a blind spot for police. They ostensibly seek more and better learning, perhaps becoming a profession, and yet the basic knowledge informing practice is not training or education – except for technical matters – it is an inherent quality. This is indicative of the lack of coherent body of knowledge. The serious implication is that if Conundrum chose recruits with inherent common sense, gave them a little training (e.g., legislation, accountability), they could go and do the job with little further development.

Significantly, common sense aligns with technical rationalist thinking and practice, eschews theory over vernacular wisdom, dismisses emotion over an impasse response, and therefore supports disembodied practice and learning and establishes and maintains the gender-power relations.
Double Messages

Another significant finding that exemplifies the confusion over expectations of police officers and how and what they learn were double messages given in *Conundrum*. It was telling when Joe said – ‘We don’t know where we are’, ‘... we say one thing and do another’ – this in relation to practice, making mistakes and learning, as the organisation moves police officers’ reliance away from the Police Manual, which is ‘prescriptive’ and ‘process-driven’, to more independent thinking and use of initiative. The challenge exists, however, where there is no option but to learn from mistakes, yet making mistakes incurs punishment. Police cultures are steeped in the discourse of punishment for mistake – you’ll ‘take a kicking’, get ‘belted’ (Monty and Edward, sergeants; Joe, inspector) – represent the common discourse. The punishment is metered out to police by police. Interestingly, the concept of police work as ‘catching baddies’ is also applied to police by police, as noted by Oscar (sergeant) – ‘We’re so used to catching baddies that we look at our own people in the same way’ – and he acknowledged it was not conducive to positive learning. Another *aporia* and lacunae for police officers in *Conundrum* is that they rely so much on learning from others in the field – the experienced and wise ones – yet, as already noted, asking questions that challenge or are perceived to challenge another’s authority (or rank) and existing thinking and practice, is not welcomed and especially for newly graduated recruits who lack power and are still being moulded into compliant, obedient employees.

Gender

The results of my research replicate and reinforce other research of the gender-power relations in the masculine enterprise of policing. I found that a central and concerning feature was the profound silence and invisibility, along with the tacit acceptance, of women’s place in policing and *Conundrum*. This was starkly evident in Gabby, Patsy and Bea’s narratives of their experiences as police officers in *Conundrum*. The hegemonic status of masculinity as the norm upon which identity, performance, and membership are measured and determined was profound. It is part of the masculine norm of viewing people as weak or strong,
rational or emotional, and it therefore also drives how practice and learning are perceived: unemotional, rational, logical, commonsensical.

**Disembodied Learning and Practice**

In essence, all of the preceding *aporias* contribute to disembodied learning and practice and reflect a persistent theme of the lack of contact and recognition of the reality of feelings and the need for feelings. This denial threads through learning and everyday practice. The de-legitimisation of emotion begins at the academy as part of the socialisation process. Associated with this is the lack of embodied learning. Police learn with their heads. Feelings do not take part and do not inform practice. Phrases such as ‘harden up’ and ‘dry your eyes princess’ were comments I heard with regularity. In my research, Ralph showed the impact of this discourse when he commented that he should have been more like a police officer rather than a person. Suppression of their emotions is not sustainable and at the very least prevents deeper understanding of oneself and one’s practice.

The masculine norm is one key to this as it provides the measure of what constitutes a good, rational, logical, and authoritative police officer, even the most positive view of emotional expression in my research was described by Elliott (constable) as ‘girly’. There was consistent denial of emotions, however, when police officers were compelled to acknowledge their own feelings they saw it as inadequate practice, for example, Bea’s (constable) comment that the job ‘didn’t go well emotionally’.

A significant aspect of the assessment of emotional expression is that it involves the judgement of others and also self-assessment. Further evidence of the impact of disembodied practice is in Cotton’s (2016) independent review of mental health in Victoria Police. Associated with this for police officers is the disconnection between the police officer and the person without regard to the undeniable fact that a major selection criterion for police is being human.
Integrity and Ethics

A compelling example of the power of the disembodied learning and practice was found in police officers’ limited and off-hand comments about integrity and ethics, with the responsibility of decisions handed over to external standards (e.g., Integrity Commissions). I especially noted Fred’s (inspector) comments that ethics ‘shouldn’t restrict or inhibit what they are doing’. There was little if any reflection on values, biases and their impact on police behaviour and practice, back to non-reflective learning and practice. This attitude could be summed up in a hypothetical statement: ‘Tell me what’s right’. Although Elizabeth promoted the benefits of third party scrutiny to give Conundrum greater transparency and accountability, even she did not touch on the role of values.

A Pause ...

I recall reading recruits’ essays on ethics. I was struck by the consistent regard and authority given to documents – the Code of Conduct and the SELF Test – which, by virtue of their existence, translated to police being ethical in their practice and decision making. Individual, personal values influencing and guiding ethical practice and behaviour were resoundingly silent. The recruits’ written expression throughout their essays was neutral, in the third person, reflecting a depersonalised and essentially disembodied approach to ethics.

Professionalising Policing

A confounding variable in all of the above, and illustrative of the confusion to the occupation and the individual, is the agenda to professionalise. All of the above aporias and lacunae are antithetical to police becoming a profession without significant change. Traditional professions to different degrees introduce practice to their members in a guided and reflective way including an understanding of one’s own feelings and emotions and how to deal with them (in varying ways). Each has a unique and tested and constantly re-evaluated body of knowledge that determines the best practice of the individual practitioner. A further tension is
that police are servants of the state and members of a hierarchy and are not, and
probably could not be, autonomous practitioners. Edwards (2010) maintained that
the effective professional of this century is one that needs to be highly self- and
other-aware and reflexive in practice. For this to be advanced in policing, huge
changes in thinking and practice would be required. A major paradigmatic shift is
needed. It also raises issues for the police officer at the work face and what this
means for them.

A number of pedagogies construct and drive what constitutes professionalisation.
The agenda and the pedagogies abound with contradictions and conjecture. One
driver has been the Standing Council on Police and Emergency Management
(SCPEM) under the auspices of the Council of Australian Government (COAG)
seeking to achieve some consistency for policing throughout Australia, breaking
the rigid state-based borders (ANZPAA 2015). In police officers’ narratives there
was a conflation of professional behaviour with being a member of a profession.
Most of the police officers defined it in terms of externalities, how well you do the
job, looking good, driving the police car. All of these are important to an
occupation but do not define a profession. The elements of a traditional
profession were not recognised. Throughout the interviews, I also detected an
undertone of anxiety about the professionalisation, what it meant to policing and
to the individual and if it was needed. Surprisingly, even at the top levels of
Conundrum, the distinction between the two was not clear. This might well be
due, in part, to police leaders protecting their jurisdictional power and this was
highlighted in my research by David (senior police officer and corporate manager)
and concerns that commissioners of police want to control who they employ as
opposed to being told. Impacts on their power and autonomy are central to these
concerns and resistance. Even if professionalisation amounts to credentialing, it
will require a major concession of the powers of the top levels in Conundrum.

A pivotal issue with regard to professionalisation is the lack of a defined and
agreed upon body of knowledge for policing. The zeal for professionalisation
assumes the possibility of developing a unique and robust body of knowledge. It
ignores the fact, as portrayed in my research, that the knowledge accumulated by police officers is not codified but learned on the streets, by whatever means. The recurring quality that defined a competent police officer was defined by all ranks in my research as being common sense, open to the interpretation of the individual. A police-centric focus has driven efforts to establish tertiary qualifications for police officers in *Conundrum*. Literature has shown a resistance to police education being about anything other than policing.

Fundamental to any profession is an active research platform. The research of policing has been limited in its scope, having a focus on operational policing matters and prescriptive practices as opposed softer aspects of policing, including ethics and integrity relevant to a profession’s practice. There has also been a push to evidence-based research that aims to further prescribe practice based on “what works“. This Managerial approach sits in direct contrast to the ill-defined scope of practice of the police officers in my research with the shift to greater social responsibility and interaction with other agencies and professions.

**Moving Beyond the Swampy Lowland**

Attempting to comprehend the conundrums for *Conundrum* is like disentangling a bowl of spaghetti and deciding which strand to pull first. Police culture weaves its way through all these issues and it cannot be addressed as a monolithic structure to be changed in one fell swoop. It needs a concerted effort and an acknowledgement of the need for change, as has been given publically by Victoria Police. Other jurisdictions have been publically silent on this issue. It is one of the lacunae that to make genuine and lasting changes to learning and practice, gender relations, significant changes in culture need to be made. Culture is not a thing where you can go and buy a new one rather it is an amorphous concept, as Denning (2011) argues:

> Changing an organization’s culture is one of the most difficult leadership challenges. That’s because an organization’s culture comprises an interlocking set of goals, roles, processes, values, communications, practices, attitudes and
assumptions. The elements fit together as a mutually reinforcing system and combine to prevent any attempt to change it. That’s why single-fix changes ... may appear to make progress for a while, but eventually the interlocking elements of the organizational culture take over and the change is inexorably drawn back into the existing organizational culture.

**Learning and Practice**

Police organisations are confronted with a number of inter-related pedagogies, which will impact on the practice of policing in the twenty-first century. The most basic but fundamental is learning and practice. Whether professionalisation takes place or not, for police officers to engage with the broadening range of roles and responsibilities, changes would need to be made to the structure and underlying philosophy of practice and learning. For example, recruits leave the academy with all the discretionary powers of a police constable with 20 years’ experience and yet, as noted, it is accepted by *Conundrum* that they will somehow learn and develop through an ill-defined process of role modelling, listening, mimicking, observing, all of which is beyond the supervision of *Conundrum*. Some of the tenets of learning through practice outlined by Billett (2010), Beckett (2008) and other researchers will need to be addressed. At the very least supervised and directed programs of mentoring, or the like, would need to be developed, endorsed and supported by the organisation, and constantly evaluated. Along with this, the cultural practice of learning by trial and error in an atmosphere of fear has to be addressed. Ideally, learning by mistakes should take place in an environment where the impact of these mistakes is not profound. The right of a very junior police officer to decide to deploy lethal weapons and deprive citizens of their liberty underscores the need for a more structured and controlled entry to the workplace.

Other research and police officers in my research agree about the inadequacy of current academy-based training (Birzer 2003; Birzer & Tannehill 2001; Bradley 2005, 2009a; McCoy 2006; White 2006). Major curricula changes are needed for recruit training and all promotion and professional development programs at the academy, with more extensive and structured inter-face with the workplace.
Attention is needed to developing recruits’ and police officers’ conceptual skills and critical thinking, creating greater self- and other-awareness that supports a generative agency for learning and practice, and establishes the foundations for individual police officers to become social, relational, agential, and reflexive learners and practitioners. To achieve this, the curricula will need to stage the learning and to move beyond content and behaviour (i.e., instrumental knowledge with a doctrinal intent) and instead adopt an educative intent, with the aim of police officers being accepted only after a period of deep learning and practice and not the reverse. The ways in which police officers in Conundrum are “taught” in the academy reflects a disembodied learning experience in line with how on-the-job practice is experienced, i.e., disembodied with emotions managed and errors avoided or not admitted for fear of ridicule and marginalisation.

Reflection on positive performances was at best hit and miss – ‘later, if we have time’ (Fred, inspector). There does exist the possibility of the better use of operational debriefs, which currently are purported to review and modify practice. They are, however, full of obfuscation and misdirection. Research exists to show that in related operational areas in peace-making and conflict resolution reflective debriefing practices are ‘not only a process of interaction, but also as a structure that provides a set space and time for processing to occur’ (Greiff, Bricker, Gamaghelyan, Tadevosyan, and Deng 2015, p.254). The purpose of debriefing should be designed to access ‘insights and perspectives gained from the event ... powerful tools that support creativity transforming formal debriefing protocols into generative spaces that buttress deep learning’ (Greiff et al 2015, p.257). The use of debriefs in this manner would enhance deeper learning, and engender a supportive environment with honest sharing of experiences and feelings. It could not work without trust and in an atmosphere of fear of error.
(Dis)/Embodied Practice and Gender

An ambition of debriefing as well as a positive learning experience for operational matters would ideally allow the more open expression of the emotional impact of practice on police officers. This is a lofty ambition and it flies in the face of long-standing cultural stigmatisation of such behaviour. The work of Cotton (2016) is and will be highly influential in providing a framework for police organisations in dealing with this critical matter with regard to practice and learning.

Conundrum is not immune to gender discrimination issues despite there being women in senior positions in the organisation. The inescapable conclusions of the VEOHC Report (2015) and the indicators in my research point to Conundrum and other police jurisdictions having similar issues. The choice is now whether, as Victoria Police has done, they open themselves up to scrutiny by themselves and others or do what traditional police organisations have done and close down and look for scapegoats (Woodcock 1991). A pessimistic note, however, derives from the modernist nature of police organisations. Usher, Bryant and Johnston (2001) argue that modernist organisations exist around a discourse that is indispensable and dangerous because it resists sceptical critique.

Professionalising Policing

If the process of professionalisation gains momentum and clear direction, it should impact significantly on all of the above. My most positive assumption is that the profession of policing will somehow have the requisite body of knowledge. It will need to take a considered approach to the relative position of tertiary educated professionals given the large numbers of police officers currently in the job with little or no tertiary education. If the process is not handled sensitively it will become another inflexible pedagogy. The uncertainties and tensions suggested by my research will develop into a mind field of aporias and lacunae.
Seeing Otherwise: Post Swamp

In my research I kept returning to the issue of practice and learning ‘as indeterminate zones’ (Schön 1983, p.3). The common definition that police could give about the knowledge that drove their practice was common sense, good judgement or perhaps what Beckett (2008) would call intuition. It is worth noting here that it played a different role to that described by Beckett (2008). In Beckett’s (2008, p.22) writing it is the ‘sensitivity to judgements in context’. This is true for police officers as well except it does not sit on the summit of a framework of knowledge and practice, which they experienced prior to being accepted into their craft. Common sense is their body of knowledge. It is what informs their practice, apart from fundamentals of legislation and use of accoutrements (e.g., fire arms). A point that has been made in my research is that there is little understanding as to when, how and where police officers develop common sense. It might be asked: is it a selection criterion? There is a need to examine more closely, along the lines of Beckett’s work with other disciplines and professions, the very nature of common sense in policing.

Related to this is the notion of learning through practice. Billett (2010) has discussed the important role of practice in the development of an occupation or profession prior to the individual being accepted into the occupation. As noted, police do this in the reverse. There is limited practice, if any, prior to being given the rights and responsibilities of a fully-fledged police officer. Serious consideration of the place that practice plays in qualification of police officers would be fruitful. Linked to both of these is the issue deriving from the move towards professionalisation is the need for and development of a defined and agreed upon body of knowledge. A sceptical, even postmodern, analysis of this issue is particularly relevant given the broadening role of policing in the twenty-first century. Aligned with this is a simple question: what is a police officer? Research across national and international jurisdictions about answering this is critical.
My research focused on the experience and attitudes of operational police officers. More research is warranted which involves and gains a deeper understanding of the anxieties faced by these police officers as they do their daily work in the face of blurred role definition and increasing uncertainty of the relevance of their own identity and status should professionalisation take place and with attendant tertiary qualifications as mandatory.

Throughout my research I found evidence of a lack of reflective practice and an emphasis on disembodied learning on-the-job. Having regard to the cultural resistance of deep reflection (i.e., beyond actions), space needs to be found and endorsed by the organisation for the introduction of genuine operational debriefs as outlined by Greiff et al (2015) with an evaluation of the implementation and efficacy. While there would be complications, there would have to be participative research where the police officers engaged were part of the research. The CISM model was introduced successfully into many police jurisdictions (Everly et al 2000). This model could be used as a broad blue print.

**Conclusion: Unheard and Un-thought Remains**

I have had the privilege of speaking with many police officers whose narratives reinforced the complexities associated with their experiences, as noted by Bonifacio (1991) in his Disclaimer to his book (see Chapter 1.) My research of the pedagogies that construct and sustain what constitute professional practice and learning for police officers in *Conundrum* resembles a multilayered fabric complete with tears and knots.

In disrupting and deconstructing the pedagogies, I have exposed the ‘unheard and unthought remains’ (Spitzer 2011, p.3) (the *mythos*) in the form of *aporias* and lacunae. Most compelling has been the power of the *logos*, embedded in the pedagogies and acting as glue, to maintain how power, knowledge, learning, practice, and gender and emotions are understood and realised in the daily practice of police officers. Risks abound. Of particular concern is the risk
associated with learning and education for police in the twenty-first century. I note Biesta’s (2013, p.1) assertions that:

The risk is there because education is not an interaction between robots but an encounter between human beings. The risk is there because students are not to be seen as objects to be molded and disciplined, but as subjects of action and responsibility.

The concept of responsibility resounds for me when I think about the inadequacies of police training and education and the resultant depersonalised and disembodied notions of learning and practice. Police at all levels have one of society’s most profound responsibilities to apply the law. Docile bodies and passive practitioners are not congruent with heightened levels of responsibility and the application of discretionary powers.

It is frustrating that in policing there remains a need for penetrating inquiries into twentieth century issues such as gender harassment and discrimination and mental health and wellbeing. Many of the issues identified in Fitzgerald’s inquiry of QPOL in 1989 are still current. The risk for police and policing is how these issues can be comprehensively redressed. To achieve this, genuine commitment and motivation will be required from those driving the agendas e.g., professionalisation, to make significant attitudinal, cultural, structural and institutional changes particularly in the area of training and education. I am quietly confident of the desire and capacity for individual police officers to embrace and promote change. My confidence wanes, however, when I consider changes at the meso and macro levels. Further and more in depth and critical research of police officers’ training, learning and practice will be crucial to stimulating and guiding much needed change.
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Appendix A

Vignettes: Police in Action

To add further context to my research of police and their work these two vignettes of incidents represent situations police officers encounter in their daily duties. Such situations illustrate the considerable pressure placed on police officers as they respond to risks and perceived uncertainty.

Vignette 1: Death of Brazilian student in 2012

In Sydney in March 2012, 21 year old Brazilian student Roberto Laudisio Curti died after being tasered by police officers ‘14 times – seven times within 51 seconds’ (McNally 2014) while he was handcuffed (Knowles 2015). A Taser releases a 50,000-volt electric shock (Simmons 2012). Mr Curti was tasered in ‘drive stun mode, which involves applying the Taser directly to the skin’ (Olding 2013). Police also deployed Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray on him.

It was reported that the prosecutor argued the force that police officers had used to contain Mr Curti was ‘unnecessary, excessive and unlawful’ (Wells 2014). The coroner described police officers’ interventions as ‘reckless and excessive, and constituted an abuse of police power’ (McNally 2014). Despite recommendations of the Police Integrity Commission, NSW, that the four police officers should face trial for various charges of assault, the final outcome was that the four police officers were not charged (Knowles 2015; McNally 2014).

Vignette 2: The fatal shooting of Adam Salter in 2009

It was reported that the New South Wales Deputy State Coroner found compelling evidence that a police officer accidentally shot a mentally disturbed man (Mr Salter) in the back when she used her firearm instead of her Taser (Bibby 2011). The inquest revealed that the police officer called out, “Taser, Taser, Taser” indicating her use of the Taser, but instead shot the man with her Glock firearm (2011).

Compounding what the coroner described as a ‘terrible mistake’ on the part of the police officer, he also criticised the police investigation of the critical incident, describing it as ‘seriously flawed’. The investigation resulted in a ‘very unreliable’ account of the incident with suggestions that Mr Salter was threatening the police officer and her colleagues. Witnesses however, including Ambulance officers, indicated Mr Salter was more a threat and risk to himself (Hoerr 2012).
While police have the right to use force, accompanying that right is an obligation to use force responsibly and not to use unnecessary or excessive force (Prenzler, Porter & Alpert 2013). Instead, force must be proportionate to the situation and the offence, and, importantly, it must be used after other interventions involving communication and negotiation, aimed at de-escalation and limiting injury, have been deemed to fail. There is evidence of global trends of increasing use of ‘excessive or unnecessary force’ (Prenzler et al 2013, p.343). National and international research also reveals that a range of weapons (including Tasers) are ‘normalised into everyday policing, they are increasingly used to gain compliance, or, sadly, to simply inflict pain’ (McCulloch 2012). Tasers have been seen as a ‘viable alternative to deadly force’ (McCulloch 2012), hence their categorisation as ‘less than lethal’. McCulloch (2012) expressed concern that ‘technological quick fixes such as less-than-lethal weapons’ might see police ‘stop relying on non weapon-based strategies for diffusing conflict and dealing with challenging situations’. The militarisation of policing – its weaponry and associated expectations – compounds concerns of the changing role and responses of police (Balko 2014).
Appendix B

Curricula Development

The following provides an outline of the focus and intent of the changes to curricula and notions of learning in *Conundrum* instigated by Elizabeth.

Course-based Learning Pathway (CBL)

A whole of organisation learning pathway blending course-based and workshop-based professional learning was implemented over a four-year period. The CBL pathway incorporated a range of educational programs for those officers seeking promotion in *Conundrum*. The new curricula for these programs staged the learning through three key units. The first unit focused on the individual and developing self-awareness. The second unit moved to the people, leadership, and human resource management. The third centred on the business of policing, incident management (command and control) and achieving results. The structure of the curricula represented a very different model and approach to previous training, which had a strong emphasis on command and control, in the essence of the traditional model of policing.

A partnership was forged with a local university and iterations of tertiary pathways operated alongside the vocational pathways within recruit education and in-service programs. Lecturers from the university were responsible for the tertiary pathway and the vocational pathway was delivered by police officers assigned to positions as police trainers. The majority of trainers had no qualifications in education and a number of them did not have undergraduate qualifications in education or often in any other discipline. Instead, they operated from an established and essentially untested set of values and practices based on their own experiences of learning in the academy.
Of significance was the juxtaposition of the tertiary and vocational pathways. Each pathway was perceived by the recruits, police, and police trainers as discrete, as opposed to integrated. This raised notions of learning as ‘supplantive’ (replacing or threatening current knowledge and skills) as opposed to ‘additive’ (augmenting knowledge and skills) (Atherton 1999, p.78). Whilst there was potential to integrate the pathways, a number of features – environmental, structural, cultural – coalesced to support the status quo and resistance occurred through the production and maintenance of hidden curricula that sustained tension between the practice / theory binary. In my role, I heard a number of police trainers make the following statements:

- We are producing police officers, not researchers (Trainer, constable).
- Learning police work is more important than learning to write an essay (Trainer, sergeant).

**Workshop-based Learning Pathway (WBL)**

The WBL pathway involved facilitated two-day workshops for all police officers and state service employees. The lead facilitator was a police officer with international accreditation as a facilitator. The workshops encouraged and enabled conversations in open, honest, safe small group work environments. There were a number of aims, but essentially the workshops aimed to enhance self-awareness and to expose participants to alternative or different ways of thinking, working and learning (i.e., democratic, inclusive, collaborative as opposed to autocratic, exclusive).

Formal written feedback and informal verbal feedback from participants of these workshops revealed the majority was enthusiastic towards and accepting of a different approach to professional learning. Whilst some participants entered the workshop with suspicion and a degree of trepidation, they finished the workshop with a positive attitude, pleased to have been able to speak openly, honestly, and safely without repercussions such as negative judgments or even punitive action (e.g., isolated, ostracised, labelled, teased). A measure of the success and positive impact of the workshops was the strength of participants’ commitment to
maintain confidentiality and not to share anything about the workshops, apart from encouraging others to participate. Such a change in behaviour, from showing little or no respect for the privacy of others, to respecting others’ confidence and privacy represented a major shift in thinking and practice, and augured well for future professional learning. But this is moderated by the strength of socio-cultural beliefs and practices that keep training and education in a liminal space, and therefore susceptible to the whim and ignorance of those with power and authority.
Appendix C

Data Collection

Thirty-six police officers – constables, sergeants, inspectors, and corporate manager officers – participated in semi-structured interviews. Refer to Appendix A for details of the cohort and interview process.

The breakdown of the cohort is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Male / Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constables – 17</td>
<td>• Males – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Females – 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants – 12</td>
<td>• Males – 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Females – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspectors – 4</td>
<td>• Males – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Females – 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate managers – 3</td>
<td>• Males – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Females – 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My commitment to maintain the organisation’s anonymity precludes me from providing specific corporate statistical data. I will note, however, as is evident in the breakdown of the cohort, the male to female ratio is weighted more to males, and especially in the ranks above constable. In de-identifying data, I will be using pseudonyms, none of which are correlated to any of the 36 participants.

I gave participants a choice of three activities: (1) an interview reflecting on their experience and practice, (2) a written reflective journal task, or (3) an interview exploring their perceptions of learning. Participants preferred one of the two interviews. This was not surprising to me because police culture is produced, reproduced, and learned through story telling and ‘war stories’ (Shearing & Erickson 1991; Waddington 1999b, p.302).
Each interview and the reflective journal task were bookended with a set of standard questions. I started each interview by asking each participant for relevant background information:
(a) How long have you been in the service?
(b) What age were you when you joined?
(c) What is your current rank?
(d) What areas of policing have you worked in?
(e) What do you like about being a police officer?

In bringing the interview to a close, I asked the following questions:
(a) What are the purpose and functions of policing in the twenty-first century?
(b) What qualities do you believe police officers need to possess and/or develop?
(c) What do you think police officers need to learn?
## Appendix D

### Police Officers’ Voices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Rank / Position</th>
<th>Years in Conundrum</th>
<th>Age as Recruit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronnie</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>18 years</td>
<td>24 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Senior Police Officer &amp; Corporate Manager</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Senior Police Officer</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>5 – Conundrum</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 – policing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gracie</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddie</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bea</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabby</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Senior Police Officer &amp; Corporate Manager</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zak</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>