



# Phase 5 of the ‘Good’ Police Custody Study - Putting recommendations into practice in one police force area: An evaluation study

Dr Layla Skinns, Reader, School of Law, University of Sheffield

July 2021

## Summary

The implementation and evaluation project was originally due to take place in five police forces in March to July 2020. This entailed five key dignity-related measures being implemented in a test site (Brightfields), with quantitative data being collected pre- and post-implementation in the test and a comparator site (Highpoint) in the same police force area to examine the outcome of the implementation measures on perceptions of dignity. This was accompanied by a qualitative process evaluation in the test site during the implementation period to examine the implementation process. The five measures implemented were: handover sheets, custody information leaflets/posters (see the [‘good’ police custody project page](#)), good practice example sheets, discretionary decisions about personal effects and routine access to various material goods.

Owing to Covid-19 this project was delayed and then scaled back to one police force (Force A), with data collection taking place in November and December 2020. The latter stages of the data collection in this one police force area was then further disrupted by Covid-19 in December 2020, meaning that post-implementation survey data could not be collected from detainees nor from staff in the test site. All other data collection was completed. Nonetheless, this limits what the research is able to say about the outcomes of the implementation process, and greater reliance has been placed on the process evaluation and staff and detainee descriptions of the implementation measures and their value.

### Key findings:

- The pre-implementation staff survey showed that in November 2020, overall, Brightfields, the test site, was slightly above average on key measures of dignity compared to the suites in which data were collected in Phase 3 of the ‘Good’ Police Custody Study (GPCS) in 2016-17. By contrast, the comparator site, Highpoint, was below average on these same measures.
- This helped explain the finding that, when it came to affording detainees dignity, staff in the pilot site tended to say that “we do that already”.
- Nonetheless, there was still scope for further encouraging dignified treatment of detainees in the test site, for example, because of below average scores on particular survey items including measures of treating detainees as a person of value and of treating detainees according to their individual needs when compared to suites from Phase 3 of the GPCS.
- Of the five implementation measures, from the outset, one was not taken up at all (the good practice example sheet), whilst another was implemented to a very limited extent (the handover sheet), even though changes were made to try to encourage take up.
- Two of the other implementation measures had already been adopted to some extent prior to the implementation and evaluation work taking place in November and December 2020, which provides a further explanation of why staff felt that “we do that already”.
- One of these measures was greater discretionary and case-by-case decision-making about detainees keeping personal effects in the cells. The research showed broad support for this new policy which had been introduced in October 2020. There had hitherto been an unofficial policy of removing most items (belts, shoes, shoelaces, necklaces cords), according to one police participant. The change in policy in October 2020 brought Force A into line with Authorised Professional Practice guidelines. Had the research taken place in Spring/Summer 2020, as originally planned before Covid-19, then the project would have been better positioned to fully assess the effects of such a change.
- Since this policy has been introduced, interviewees described staff as having taken “baby steps” towards fully putting it into practice. This broad support for the change was because staff recognised its benefits. They saw that the keeping of personal effects, particularly those of a sentimental value (e.g. wedding bands or necklaces) or economic value (e.g. watches), or items which helped maintain someone’s personal appearance (e.g. hair ties), or items such as stress beads could all help de-escalate situations and enable detainees to feel calmer. In some cases, by keeping these limited

personal effects, this also prevented the police having to use force to remove them or to “roll around” as one interviewee said, if a detainee were to refuse to give them to the police.

- Like the decision to enable detainees to keep personal effects on a case-by-case basis, the provision of ‘distraction box’ items (e.g. Sudoku, word searches, colouring books, puzzles, soft balls to throw in cells or the exercise yard) had also been implemented prior to the implementation and evaluation starting, in January 2020. Staff recognised the benefits of these items, in terms of reducing anxiety, stress and worry through distraction and sometimes their ability to provide catharsis, which was in turn seen as reducing the risk of self-harm in detainees and violence towards staff. This had helped staff to overcome their initial resistance to this initiative due to concerns about police custody being seen “like a hotel”. Detainees also pointed to the value of these items, for example, in taking their mind off their worries. In spite of this, staff also pointed to limitations on the resources available to them, both in terms of the availability of appropriate books and other distraction items, but also in terms of staff availability to provide them, recognising that busyness could sometimes prevent staff from attending to detainees’ needs for distraction.
- However, the implementation measure that was valued the most by staff was the information sheet, which provided detainees with information about dignified treatment, key rights and entitlements, welfare and vulnerability, and safety and security. Staff reported that they gave this to the majority of detainees, though saw it as of most benefit for those experiencing police custody for the first time. They saw it as valuable because it consolidated and condensed information that was communicated to detainees verbally on booking-in and they particularly appreciated the sections on detention reviews, and on access to food and drink. Staff also reported occasions when detainees made use of the information provided to request further assistance, in one case from an appropriate adult. That detainees read this information sheet and made use of the information illustrates the potential of this information sheet to encourage greater autonomous decision-making and to support notions of dignity rooted in autonomy. The provision of these information leaflets to detainees was also the implementation measure that staff most wanted to retain in the future.

In terms of continuing to grow the focus of staff on detainee dignity it is recommended that:

- Custody information leaflets be provided in the future potentially across England and Wales, with some adjustments in the longer-term (e.g. to make them more accessible).
- Decisions about the keeping of personal effects should continue to be taken on a case-by-case basis as per Force A’s policy introduced in October 2020. The adoption of such a policy is also something that other police forces should consider implementing in the future.
- The *routine* provision of material items, including distraction items should also continue into the future and staff should have the necessary resources (time, books, reading and writing materials, soft balls etc.) to enable this to happen.
- To bring it into line with Brightfields, staff in Highpoint should be encouraged to increase their focus on detainee dignity.

In terms of future iterations of the Phase 5 project in other police force areas, it is recommended that:

- The poster accompanying the custody information sheet be adjusted to make it briefer and more of an ‘advert’ for the custody information leaflets.
- Police forces taking part in Phase 5 of the research who have yet to adopt formal policies of case-by-case decision making in relation to personal effects should use the present findings to reassure operational staff about the potential value of implementing this measure.
- Police forces in subsequent parts of Phase 5 consider trialling not just case-by-case decision making about personal effects, but also decisions about access to other items such as toilet paper.
- Careful thought be given as to which custody blocks are used for trialling the recommendations from the GPCS.
- As far as possible, as many elements of the research should be conducted face-to-face.

## Introduction

Between 2013 and 2018, a research team collected a range of data, as part of an ESRC-funded “‘Good’ police custody? Theorizing the ‘is’ and the ‘ought’”, hereafter referred to as the GPCS. The primary aim of the research was to robustly examine what is meant by ‘good’ police custody. These data have been used to explore preliminary ideas about good police custody (Skinns et al., 2015) and the importance of detainee dignity (Skinns et al., 2020), the delivery of police custody (Skinns et al., 2017a), staff-detainee interactions and the use of ‘soft’ power (Skinns et al., 2017b), detainees’ emotional reactions to police custody (Wooff and Skinns, 2017), the pains of police detention (Skinns and Wooff, 2020), as well as police-academic partnerships during research on police custody (Greene and Skinns, 2017) and the use of appreciative inquiry in police custody research (Skinns et al, forthcoming).

In Phase 3 of the research, in 2016-17, the research team surveyed nearly 800 staff and detainees in 27 custody facilities in 13 police forces. These data were used in Phase 4 of the research to formulate good practice recommendations, which were launched in October 2019. It was recommended that dignity - linked to equal worth, autonomy and decency - should be priorities that police custody practitioners, managers, national leads and policy makers should take account of in relation to the operation and strategic direction of police custody, alongside existing priorities such as safety, security, risk, cost effectiveness and the demands of the law and the criminal justice process. It was also recognised that such changes may yield benefits for detainees and for staff, through increased detainee cooperation, for example. In pursuit of these goals, it was recommended that changes be made to police attitudes and behaviours; policies, training and line management procedures; detainee expectations; and the material conditions of police custody.

From September 2019, work began on Phase 5 of the GPCS, in which the research team facilitated the implementation of these recommendations in a small number of police forces, who volunteered to take part. The two main aims of this project were to:

1. Facilitate the implementation of the good practice recommendations derived from the good police custody in up to six police force areas (though this aim had to be scaled back to a smaller number of forces due to the effects of Covid-19);
2. Evaluate the impact of the uptake of these recommendations on police officers’ experiences, and on their attitudes and behaviours towards detainees, as well as on the experiences of detainees.

This phase of research was therefore concerned with making changes to police custody practices and to the experiences of detainees, and to measure the extent of this impact and the process by which this impact came about. These changes were based on good practice recommendations from the GPCS. Here we report on findings from the implementation and evaluation process in one of these police forces, Force A. The project took place in two suites in November and December 2020. In order to maintain anonymity of staff, they have been given the pseudonyms, Brightfields (test site) and Highpoint (comparator site).

This report has three main purposes:

1. To describe the implementation and evaluation methods employed in Force A in Phase 5 of the GPCS;
2. Critically examine the (perceived) effectiveness of the measures implemented;
3. Set out recommendations for future practice and for subsequent iterations of the evaluation and implementation project in other police force areas.

## Implementation and evaluation methods

In Phase 5 of the GPCS, the custody suite in which the measures were being implemented in Force A (Brightfields) was compared before and after implementing the recommendations from the research

with a comparator site (Highpoint), where no measures were implemented. The research was conducted in four stages to fit around the implementation work, as follows:

- Stage 1: Pre-implementation staff and detainee quantitative survey in Brightfields and Highpoint (2-3 November);
- Stage 2: Brief staff survey using open and closed questions in Brightfields and Highpoint in response to 'I am Human' animation (9-16 November), which was used to create a good practice examples sheet;
- Implementation work in Brightfields (23 November – 18 December);
- Stage 3: Process evaluation in Brightfields (14-16 December), involving semi-structured interviews with staff and detainees and participant observation;
- Stage 4: Post-implementation quantitative survey in Brightfields and Highpoint (21-22 December).

During the implementation stage, staff were asked to give greater overall emphasis to detainee dignity in all that they did, recognising that every interaction matters. In particular, staff were asked to:

- Adopt a new handover sheet with dignity as a standing item.
- Offer custody information sheets to all detainees and to display custody information posters in the custody suite in places where detainees were likely to spend time looking at them e.g. in the holding area, consultation rooms, fingerprint rooms.
- Make use of a good practice examples sheet to guide their day-to-day practices and their discussions during handover. This sheet was developed from the Stage 2 survey, in order to give staff a sense of ownership over the project.
- Give greater consideration to dignity in decisions about the keeping of personal effects, risk assessments permitting (staff were to discuss these decisions with managers if they were unsure)
- Enable *routine* access to various material goods (e.g. reading and writing materials, other distraction box items, blankets, food and drinks, range of clothing)

In terms of the data collection tools, the Stage 1 and 4 questionnaire was adapted from the GPCS questionnaire used in Phase 3 of the research in 2016-17, adding questions about the material conditions of police custody and about detainee socio-demographic information. Otherwise, the questions were the same as in Phase 3 of the GPCS, enabling comparisons with this older data set. Due to Covid-19, these comparisons proved to be essential. As explained in the next paragraph and later in the report, Stage 4 of the Phase 5 research was limited by Covid-19, meaning that comparisons had to be made with data collected in Phase 3 of the GPCS. The semi-structured interview guide used in Stage 3 of Phase 5 was also adapted from the one used in Phase 2 of the GPCS. In particular, questions were added which focused specifically on detainee perceptions of the measures being implemented. The Stage 2 survey tool was developed specifically for Phase 5 of the study. It included questions which gaged staff responses to the 'I am Human' animation, with responses then being used to compile a list of good practice examples.

The data collected in Phase 5 are summarised in Table 1 below. The study was intentionally small in scale, though Covid-19 also added to this compactness. As found in previous Phases of the GPCS, there were challenges with collecting data from detainees, owing to relatively small numbers in custody on the days that the researcher was in custody and the need to ensure that only suitable detainees were approached (e.g. with respect to suspect vulnerabilities and therefore their capacity to consent to the research and potential risks to them and the researcher). In addition, not all of the detainees approached were willing to participate in the research. Since all the Phase 5 data were collected under Covid-19 restrictions this also impacted on the amount and quality of data that could be collected. In order to minimise Covid-19 risks to staff, detainees and the researcher, where ever possible data collection with

staff was done remotely (e.g. using an online survey, or telephone interviews), which thus limited opportunities for face-to-face discussion with staff about the questionnaire or the purposes of the research, which may have aided the implementation process. The researcher wore a mask at all times in custody, which impacted on the quality of communication with all participants e.g. in the ability of the researcher to build a rapport with potential detainee participants. Stage 4 of the project was particularly disrupted as, on the day of the data collection, Force A was suddenly and unexpectedly moved from Tier 2 to Tier 4 restrictions and one of the custody suites, Highpoint, was closed due to staff sickness, thereby putting more pressure on staff in Brightfields. As such, in Stage 4, the researcher was unable to attend either custody suite and data could therefore only be collected remotely from staff and no data could be collected from detainees (as this had to be done face-to-face). In fact, in Stage 4, only staff from Highpoint filled in the survey, presumably because staff at Brightfields were too busy. Given the relatively small numbers of participants in Stage 3 of the research, in order to protect their anonymity, they are referred to throughout as police participant 1, 2, 3 etc. and without reference to their role.

Table 1 data collected in Force A in November and December 2020

Stage of the data collection	Site	
	Brightfields (test)	Highpoint (control)
<b>Stage 1 Pre-implementation Survey: Staff</b>	14	14
<b>Stage 1 Pre-implementation Survey: Detainees</b>	3	3
<b>Stage 2 Brief Survey in response to 'I am Human'</b>	5	
<b>Stage 3 process evaluation: Staff</b>	3	n/a
<b>Stage 3 process evaluation: Detainees</b>	4	n/a
<b>Stage 3 process evaluation: Observation</b>	17 hours	n/a
<b>Stage 4 Post-implementation Survey: Staff</b>	1	6
<b>Stage 4 Post-implementation Survey: Detainees</b>	n/a due to Covid	n/a due to Covid

## Pre-implementation

The pre-implementation survey was completed by 14 staff of approximately 45 at each site, meaning a response rate of 31% and 3 detainees at each site. Owing to Covid-19 restrictions preventing the researcher from travelling to the two suites, the closure of the Highpoint custody suite at the time of the proposed post-implementation data collection and additional pressures therefore on staff at Brightfields, as discussed above, post-implementation survey data were only collected from 6 staff at Highpoint and from no detainees. These difficulties with data collection therefore limited data analysis and what can be concluded from the implementation and evaluation work. It is, however, possible to reflect on what the pre-implementation data reveals about staff attitudes towards and detainee experiences of dignity at prior to the implementation work.

To do this, we compared the pre-implementation survey data collected in November 2021 with the data collected from 27 custody suites in 2016-17 as part of Phase 3 of the GPCS. This was possible because, as noted above, the questionnaire used in the implementation and evaluation research was virtually identical to that used in Phase 3 of the GPCS, with the exception of some additional questions about materiality and participant demographics. Since the implementation work aimed to impact on staff attitudes and behaviours and detainee expectations with regards dignified treatment, we compared staff and detainee responses in Brightfields and Highpoint with staff and detainee responses to key survey items in Phase 3 of the GPCS. These survey items were identified by first looking for those items that

loaded by 0.4 or more on the dignity factor in the phase 3 detainee data and then identifying corresponding items in the staff data. Averages of staff responses to these survey items were then compared by ranking the 27 custody suites in Phase 3 of the GPCS and the 2 suites in Phase 5, with a lower rank indicating a higher average score on the dignity-related items in the staff data.

Across all of the key survey items included in the analysis, Brightfields scored a little above average, ranking 18 of 29, whilst Highpoint scored below average, ranking 23<sup>rd</sup>. However, as shown in Table 2 below, there was also some variation in terms of scores/ranking for each of the individual items. The figures highlighted in green show the items where suites were above the average. Brightfields' ranked better for items connected to having due regard to detainee welfare. They were ranked 8<sup>th</sup> on 'All staff are concerned about the welfare of detainees in this custody suite' and on 'Staff in this suite treat all detainees fairly regardless of background', and 10<sup>th</sup> on 'I always look after detainees in this custody suite with humanity'.

Brightfields was ranked better than Highpoint on all measures, except for 'Each detainee in this custody suites is a person of value' and for 'Staff in this custody suite treat detainees according to their individual needs'. Highpoint and Brightfields were ranked the same for both these items and for Brightfields these were the two items where staff perceptions of their dignified treatment of detainees dropped below average.<sup>1</sup>

It is only possible to speculate about why Brightfields was above average with regards the key measures of dignity (whilst Highpoint was not) and why staff there already saw themselves as affording detainees dignity. If it were the case that national policy emphasising dignity (e.g. the National Police Custody Strategy) has been effectively cascaded down to operational staff via senior officers and custody managers, then a similar effect would have been seen at both Highpoint and Brightfields. However, perhaps there were other supporting contextual factors in Brightfields that were missing in Highpoint, such as more favourable material conditions. Brightfields was notably lighter and brighter (though this was not due to natural light), cleaner, newer and a more pleasant environment to work in than Highpoint and some of the other suites in Force A, which was also something that was commented on by staff, noting the effects on them and on detainees. Police participant 2 described Brightfields as "the best custody centre in Force A", in relation to the material conditions. Another remarked:

[G]oing into custody at [name of suite in Force A not included in the Phase 5 project] would feel possibly more intimidated or more sort of threatened by the environment than here. It just make a difference, doesn't it? ...[name of suite] looks to me like something from the 60's or 70's, it's proper old school (Police participant 3).

This corresponds with findings from Phase 3 of the GPCS, where it was shown that where staff regard the material conditions in which they work more favourably, and similarly where detainees judge these conditions more favourably, detainees are significantly more likely to regard their treatment as dignified (Skinns et al., 2020).

In summary, the pre-implementation survey conducted in November 2021 showed that the pilot site in Brightfields was slightly above average in terms of staff perceptions of the extent to which they afforded detainees dignity, compared to the suites in which data was collected in Phase 3 of the GPCS in 2016-17. Brightfields also ranked higher on nearly all items measuring staff perceptions of dignified treatment

---

<sup>1</sup> In terms of the scores themselves, as shown in Table 2 below, given that any score of 2 or less indicates agreement with an item and any score of 4 or more indicates disagreement, with 3 being neutral, staff responses to these two particular items erred only just towards agreement with the importance of recognising individual needs and towards neutrality with regards to 'seeing detainees as a person of value'. This is somewhat surprising for the 'Staff in this custody suite treat detainees according to their individual needs' item, given the introduction of a formal force policy in October 2020 to encourage staff to make case-by-case decisions about whether detainees could retain some of their personal effects. This is discussed further below.

of detainees compared to Highpoint. This suggests that Highpoint not Brightfields may have been a more appropriate location for the implementation work in order to encourage staff there to develop similar kinds of attitudes to those in Brightfields. That said, since Brightfields scored slightly below average on some items and also because the level of agreement with some of the survey items suggested more disagreement than agreement there was still scope for further emphasis on dignity in staff's day-to-day practices in Brightfields.



Table 2 – The average scores and ranking of Brightfields and Highpoint on staff perceptions of whether they afforded detainees dignity<sup>2</sup>

Factor	Item	Brightfields' score	Brightfields' ranking	Highpoint' score	Highpoint' ranking
Kindness and the valuing of detainees	I always treat detainees with kindness	1.86	14	2.14	23
	Each detainee in this custody suite is a person of value	2.50	=20	2.50	=20
Fair and respectful treatment	Staff in the suite treat all detainees fairly regardless of what they are alleged to have done	1.50	16	1.71	26
	Staff in this custody suite treat detainees with respect	1.64	14	1.71	19
Acting with due regard for the welfare of detainees	I always look after detainees in this custody suite with humanity	1.36	10	1.64	27
	All staff are concerned about the welfare of detainees in this custody suite	1.50	8	1.79	23
	Staff in this suite treat all detainees fairly regardless of their background.	1.29	8	1.5	21
Kindness and the valuing of detainees	Staff can be trusted to make decisions that are right for people in this custody suite.	1.86	11	2.21	29
Acting according to legal rules	Staff in this suite treat people according to their individual needs.	1.79	=21	1.79	=21
Fair and respectful treatment of detainees	Staff in this suite always talk politely to detainees.	2.21	12	2.5	24

<sup>2</sup> In Table 2, a score of 2 or less indicates agreement and any score of 4 or more indicates disagreement, with 3 being neutral.

## Perceptions of the implementation measures

### “We do that already”

In general, staff interviewed and spoken to informally during the course of the project indicated that with regards to affording detainees dignity, “we do that already”. Indeed, as the comparison to the Phase 3 data show, there was a measure of truth to this in that Brightfields was a little above average on most measures of staff affording detainees dignity, with the exception of valuing detainees and treating detainees according to their individual needs. As a result of this, some staff felt irritated, frustrated and resentful of the research because they felt they were being judged, unfairly, as not already affording detainees’ dignity. One participant said:

Okay so I’ll be honest with you, so when I heard about your study, I was a little bit irritated because to me it felt like there was a judgement on us that we weren’t treating people with dignity and we weren’t ... not presuming everyone to be guilty of what they are here for ... I think I speak for everyone when I say that we don’t do that ... it wasn’t the leaflet or anything that was irritating it was just the fact that I felt that we already do most of these things and you know it felt to me, you know, was there an assumption that we are not actually treating people with dignity already, you know, which we do (Police participant 1).

As one participant remarked, this view of the implementation and evaluation project made staff reluctant to participate in it. Staff felt that “I do this already, so I don’t need to participate in that because I already do it, I’m already practicing what they want to see.” (Police participant 2). Another police participant noted during the participant observation that the pre-existing knowledge and skills sets of staff developed whilst working in other areas of policing, in his case whilst doing child protection work, not the implementation measures being trialled, were what would make a difference to him affording detainees dignity. Even though staff felt that “we do that already” and that dignity was “always at the forefront of my mind”, they also recognised the scope for doing more, saying also that the implementation work had made them think more about dignity. They said of the implementation work: “I think it’s a good thing to do because if you don’t, things can slide, can’t they, you know, so I think it’s a good thing to do but I think on the whole we are pretty good to the people that come in here” (Police participant 1).

On the whole, though, the project met with resistance perhaps reflective of a reluctance to change. As is well-documented in the research, police organisational change is challenging, including in police custody it would seem. Though the agentic power of individuals can be a driving force for change, whether practitioners or researchers, there are other factors at play. Chan (1997: 92), for example, points to the equal importance of the field (i.e. structural factors such as the law, police policies and guidance) but also the habitus (i.e. the cultural knowledge of the police, its beliefs, values). Hence, if police culture is not attended to, even transformational and self-possessed police leaders may be hamstrung by it (Cockcroft, 2014).

Perhaps the implementation and evaluation work did not do enough to tackle all of these three prongs required to bring about organisational change in the police. In terms of the field, one participant noted that the hierarchical ‘chain of command’ approach to the police meant that custody staff might have been more responsive to requests for participation from middle managers in Force A. Such requests might have had “more weight” and more gravitas, albeit that if those requests had come from too high up in the organisation then there was also a risk that they would be seen as coming from someone in the “ivory towers” of police HQ who was disconnected from the realities of the “sharp end” of day-to-day custody practices and the way the research was likely to impact on staff (Police participant 2). In terms of habitus, suspiciousness towards the researcher owing to their ‘outsider’ status presented a further set of barriers. Indeed, one police participant equated the researcher with an independent custody visitor, alluding perhaps to the researcher’s similarly outsider status. This status meant that staff were concerned that the research would be used to judge them as not treating detainees with dignity or to

present them as “doing a bad job”, as one police participant remarked (Police participant 2). Hence, participants enquired about how the report of the findings would be used and who would see it. Ultimately, it came down to staff being “suspicious or concerned with the study and how it may reflect on them” (Police participant 2), and this impacted not only on their willingness to implement the dignity-focused measures but also on the willingness to complete the surveys.

On a more practical level, the delays and then the limitations imposed on the project as a result of Covid-19 presented another set of challenges. The pandemic meant that the research team was halved and so was the capacity of the team to attend the suites to meet staff to explain the project, address concerns, ease the passage of the implementation measures and generally to attach a “human face” to the project. As this police participant said:

Having a human face [attached to the project], it alleviates some of that concern because people, some people may be more comfortable sending an email but I think the vast majority of people, this is a person orientated job, being in police custody, I think people feel some comfort in being able to see an individual and have a human conversation (Police Participant 2).

This underscores the fact that the project was undertaken in unprecedented times. Though the implementation measures required staff to make relatively minor changes to their day-to-day practices, the effects of the added pressures of Covid-19 on staff and thus on the project are unknown and probably unknowable. In many respects, it was remarkable that the project proceeded at all. As one police participant said, “I suppose what learning can you take from that, don’t do a study during a global pandemic but ultimately life goes on, we have to continue operating and developing and I think it's been good that we have still been able to pursue the study” (Police participant 2).

### Perceptions of individual measures

The sense that “we do that already” made some staff reluctant to participate in the project by implementing changes to handover sheets and processes, using a good practice example reminder sheet, making case-by-case decisions about personal effects, providing an information sheet and routine access to reading, writing and distraction box items by staff to participate in it. From the outset, as conveyed by the key gatekeeper facilitating the research, there was no inclination to use the good practice example sheet, so this was dropped from the project. Similarly, the handover sheet proved difficult to implement because of concerns about it not being user-friendly enough and the limited time available to make use of it and to relatedly have conversations about affording detainees’ dignity at the end of one shift when staff were tired and wanting to go home. Though the handover sheet was adjusted, based on feedback received, as discussed below this did not appear to impact on staff’s willingness to try using it.

### Information sheets and posters

Information sheets were provided to detainees on arrival at the suite, provided they wished to have one and there were no reasons not to provide one (e.g. if someone was intoxicated they were not provided). This was a measure that staff were, on the whole, more willing to implement and, moreover, to retain in the future. In formal interviews and informal conversations staff said that they had given the information leaflet to the majority of detainees when they were booked in, though acknowledged that they were of use for some detainees more than others. Staff and detainees talked about the information sheets being of particular use with first-time detainees, rather than with those who had been multiply arrested. The view that the leaflet was of use to first-time detainees was confirmed by this participant:

So I think with people, it might be their first time in custody, I think they will, they maybe even latch on to that and it may, it will probably, may even, help to ease their apprehensions and things like that but you get the regulars that come in and I don’t think they will take any notice of it. It will just be another form that they are getting, just another piece of paperwork

and they might not even register that it's not another Police form that we are giving them, you know and it's for their benefit (Police participant 1).

During observation, a woman suspect who was intoxicated on arrival the previous night was given an information sheet whilst she was at the custody desk. She had a number of physical and mental health conditions and had been arrested before. In fieldnotes, it was noted that “she meekly takes the custody information leaflet, but I am not sure that she reads it. Later, I talk to the Detention Officer on the hub about this and he says, glancing at the CCTV monitor “well, it is just lying untouched next to her in the cell”.

Nonetheless, staff say that they had given the leaflet to the majority of people being booked-in. For two police participants, this was because of its value in condensing and consolidating the information detainees would have been provided with verbally. One interviewee also noted that detainees did read the information leaflet in their cells and they recounted an occasion when one detainee specifically asked about their right to an appropriate adult as a result of reading the information leaflet. This participant noted their utility especially for first-time detainees and that she especially liked the sections on detention reviews and the availability of food and drink. This participant said:

I think some have read it and I like the booklet because I think it gives them the information that I need because when they are being booked in, although that information is explained to them, not necessarily all of it, they are probably not taking it in because they are just thinking about being booked in, so they can read that after. I especially like the bit about the [detention] reviews because it gave more understanding on their detention times and being reviewed and that they can have food and drink when they want, so I actually like the booklet, whether it helps the detainee I don't know. I think someone new to a custody suite, 100% it would help them because it's the first time that they have been arrested and they probably don't know what is going on ... I did give one to someone and they like later on referred back to it and said well I've read this, it says here that I should have this, this and this, or something ... I think it was about the Appropriate Adult bit ... Yeah, it was about the Appropriate Adult bit, they were like oh I should have an Appropriate Adult... My only concern was that whether they could use the leaflet to harm themselves because it is quite sharp at the corners ... That was my only concern but the actual information in there I think is perfect to give them. It doesn't bombard them with loads of information like the PACE book (Police participant 3).

Detainees also reported that they read the leaflet whilst in the cells or whilst standing at the booking-in desk to help pass the time. Detainee 2 said “I read something, just to kill some time when they was filling up the paperwork”. Similarly, a police participant noted that detainees:

might not read it immediately but I'm sure they probably do, I have no doubt that when you are in a bland cell and you have got a piece of paper with some information on and there's not a lot else to do you will read that piece of paper to pass the time and again that informs people and give them information that they can help to support them in making some decisions or ask some questions themselves, so I think that's a good thing (Police participant 2).

That detainees reportedly read and sometimes made use of the information leaflet to request additional help and support, for example with accessing an appropriate adult demonstrates a further potential benefit of them. They potentially enable and support autonomous decision-making in relation to their due process rights, in circumstances in which autonomy is limited. This may have been particularly so for those experiencing police detention for the first time and for whom staff indicated that they were more likely to offer the leaflet and who in turn were more likely to take the leaflet offered. In other words, the information leaflets potentially support autonomy as a form of dignity which prior research in the GPCS has shown to be important (Skinns et al., 2020).

However, it was also noted that the information sheet was not suitable for some and was therefore not provided on occasions. Staff said that they were not given immediately to detainees who were intoxicated, which was confirmed by Detainee 2, nor were they given to those experiencing a mental health crisis or where someone was agitated or upset to the extent that the edges of the leaflet, noted by one police participant, could be considered a risk. During participant observation staff informed the researcher, with some amusement, that a colleague on another team had told them about a detainee who had eaten the information sheet he was provided with. The leaflet was also unsuitable for detainees who were unable to read or who spoke English as a second language. This was particularly apparent during the participant observation, when the researcher observed a Romanian suspect who spoke minimal English being booked-in via a telephone interpreter on speaker phone. Understandably, he was not offered the information leaflet by staff. Were the leaflet to be rolled-out more widely, consideration would need to be given to whether/how the leaflet could be provided to suit the need of a range of detainees (e.g. in different languages or to make it more accessible for those who have difficulty reading) and perhaps also digitally to eliminate the risk of a detainee eating it or hurting themselves with it.

For a minority of probably more experienced detainees, though, the information leaflet, indeed none of the implementation measures mattered to them as their primary focus was on leaving police custody as quickly as possible, as this interviewee explained:

I'm not going to lie, I just want to either get charged, go to Court or released under bail or further investigation or I want a cigarette but apart from that I'll be honest with you ...I don't need no information, I would rather just be in the cell, just wait until the Police needs to handle them matters and then I'm just about my business ... I don't need to read anything. It's all right, I know the rights but I know like the outlines of my rights though and I don't feel like the Police has broken any of them, so yeah (Detainee 4).

Anything else, beyond this, was seen as peripheral, which is a salutary reminder of the limitations of affording dignity to detainees – even dignity linked to autonomy - in circumstances where their liberty has been temporarily taken away. For this last detainee, who “just did not want to be there” in police custody, it seemed that nothing other than release from detention would restore his sense of dignity.

The information leaflet was accompanied by a poster which presented the same information but in a larger format at key locations around the custody block, for example, in the consultation rooms, in the holding area, in the fingerprint room etc. These posters were seen as of more limited value, with their value depending on their positioning. Staff regarded them as most use in the holding area, given that detainees could spend sometimes lengthy periods in there waiting to come into the main charge area and in the consultation rooms when meeting with their legal advisor or appropriate adult. However, they felt there was little point them being positioned in the charge area or in the corridors as detainees would not be stood for long enough in these areas to read them. As one police participant commented, “whilst I wouldn't want to see every single wall emblazed in information, I think it breaks up the monotony of the white wash, having information up but it is also useful information for them, so yeah, that's important” (Police participant 2). As discussed below, staff also made a number of suggestions about how these poster could be improved, in terms of their content, design and positioning in the future (see the section on continuing with the implementation measures).

### Case-by-case decision-making about personal effects

The police force in the research introduced a new policy requiring greater discretionary and case-by-case decision-making about detainees keeping personal effects in the cells in October 2020, shortly before the implementation process began. There had hitherto been an unofficial policy of removing most items (belts, shoes, shoelaces, necklaces cords), according to one police participant. The change in policy in October 2020 brought Force A into line with Authorised Professional Practice guidelines, which states that:

Officers must justify removal of clothing for safety or investigative purposes and record this in the risk assessment and custody record. Any item of clothing can be used as a ligature. Belts, ties, cords and shoelaces are obvious and more readily available.

Officers should make the decision to remove such items after conducting a risk assessment. The custody officer must balance any risk with the need to treat detainees with dignity (College of Policing, 2020)

For example, this police participant said:

[W]e have recently changed from having this cart blanche and it was never a formal written policy about taking belts and jewellery off of detainees when they were booked in but it was something that was kind of operational practice and that was contrary to APP and actually we have reinforced it with a management decision now to say actually, case by case, you need to exercise discretion here and I think people are, initially everyone was going oh we are acting outside of this and we are not comfortable with that, we have always done it but actually I think as time's gone on people have realised that not everyone is going to kill themselves and actually we can kind of, you know, with belts or shoelaces, we can kind of exercise a bit of professional judgment and I think confidence grows as time goes on, we get more experience to it (Police participant 2).

Another said:

We do have discretion. I think it's becoming slightly more, I think management are sort of saying to staff please use it, you know exercise your discretion, you are all professionals, you are all supervisors as Sergeants, you know, feel free to do it, just rationalise it and make sure it is appropriate you know and I think people are becoming as I said more comfortable with it as time goes on and they get more experience (Police participant 1).

Therefore had the research taken place in Spring/Summer 2020, as originally planned before Covid-19, then the project would have been better positioned to fully assess the effects of such a change. As it was, at the time of the project, the implementation work merely supported a change which had already been introduced across all custody blocks in the police force area, both in the test and comparator site. It is also worth noting that according to interviewees these discretionary powers did exist prior to the change in policy in October 2020, but the policy change had formally recognised this discretion and therefore encouraged greater use of it. Indeed, one police participant said that staff found “comfort in having a policy that you can fall back on” (Police participant 2). During the course of the observation, detainees were observed to have personal effects with them in the cells (e.g. coats and jumpers) which may not have been permitted prior to October. Detainees also commented on having these items with them and were pleased by the extra warmth they provided, given that they were sometimes reportedly cold in the cells. Detention officers were also keen to point out, though, that such decisions about risk/the keeping of personal effects were decided by the custody officers not them.

The “baby steps” taken in adopting this new policy in practice were because staff recognised its benefits (Police participant 2). They saw that the keeping of personal effects particularly those of a sentimental value (e.g. wedding bands or necklaces) or economic value (e.g. watches), or items which helped maintain someone’s personal appearance (e.g. hair ties) or items such as stress beads could all help de-escalate situations and enable detainees to feel calmer. In some cases, by keeping these limited personal effects, this also prevented the police having to use of force to remove them or to “roll around” as Police participant 1 said, if a detainee were to refuse to give them to the police. During observation a custody officer described a recent occasion when he had allowed a detainee to keep a very expensive watch with him the cells:

He noticed that the detainee was becoming very upset and agitated at the thought of his watch being taken away temporarily and so [the custody officer] followed the new policy and let him keep it in

the cell. He said due to its sharp edges and its cost the detainee would never previously have been allowed to keep it, but he risk assessed the detainee and there was no indication that he would harm himself with it, so it was retained by the detainee. Rather than adding to risk it helped de-escalate the situation.

However, as with any discretionary decision, there is always the possibility of varied and potentially unequal treatment of detainees from staff member to staff member or team to team, depending their tolerance for risk and their interpretation of warning markers, particularly historic ones. As one interviewee said:

I might, in my head, rationalise allowing you to keep your belt and your shoe laces and your coat for example but the shift then coming on might have a much lower tolerance or appetite for risk ... I think it is better that we are doing it on a case by case basis but by the same token, because everyone's view and ability to rationalise risk is different and everyone's got a different perspective, or take on things, it can cause inter-rotas or inter-Sergeant conflict because what decision I make, another Sergeant might overturn or disagree with and then if they then have the next interaction, it might be a different decision and I can't stop that because they are a practitioner in their own right. I would like to think we would have a conversation and try and discuss it, again it's not always the case (Police participant 2).

Not only is there a risk of conflict between staff on these complex decisions, but where such conflict arises there is also a possibility of detainees perceiving their treatment to be unfair, with all the potentially negative outcomes that might come from that in terms of perceived legitimacy and the cooperation of detainees.

#### Handover sheets

In Force A, handovers only involved custody officers not detention officers, with the former communicating the relevant information to the latter once they had all arrived for their shift. This necessarily limited the number of people for whom this particular implementation measure was of relevance. As one of the DOs said during participant observation of handovers, "Oh, we don't have involvement in those, so I don't even know what they [the handover sheet] would look like." In combination with the good practice example sheet, the intention was for handovers to include an opportunity for staff to share stories about circumstances in which detainees had been afforded dignity during their shift. This approach was intended to capitalise on the storytelling elements of police culture, which is seen as shaping and re-shaping beliefs and values (Van Hulst, 2013: 638; Shearing and Ericson, 1991; Holdaway, 1983: 154), but also on the power of storytelling for the co-creation of police values (Macaulay and Rowe, 2019). That is, the handover sheet and the discussions that were supposed to accompany it were intended as a way of further embedding dignity in police practices.

Some staff recognised these intentions. For example, one said of the handover sheet that by using it:

we are trying to prompt a conversation and the more we do that, the more it becomes engrained in people to sort of go right, okay, we have got that at the back of our minds, dignity and potentially in the future, you could remove it and actually those conversations you would like to think would still go on because it's kind of just part of the process (Police participant 2).

However, even after some adjustments to the handover sheet to add an extra column to make it more user-friendly and therefore appealing to staff, the handover sheet did not take off, with Police participant 2 describing it as "a change too far for some staff". This was in part due to a lack of time and staff's need to leave the custody block as soon as their shift had ended. In Force A, the nature of the shift patterns was such that there was no overlap between shifts, meaning that as soon as the incoming shift arrived, the outgoing shift would leave and as quickly as possible after "an incredibly tiring" 12 hours at work (Police Participant 2). As such, as Police participant 2 said, all that staff wanted to discuss

during the handover was “if anyone is going to kill themselves, anyone going to hurt me, is there anything else I need to know ... that’s all I want to know”.

The lack of implementation of this measure was confirmed during observation. During one handover, the detention of a highly vulnerable woman suspect provided an opportune moment to discuss detainee dignity. However, the handover discussion focused on her many different physical and mental health conditions and progress with her case given the likely shift of her status from suspect in a common assault (domestic abuse) case to victim, but the dignity of her treatment did not come up at all. The lack of uptake of the handover sheet and associated discussions was also confirmed by checking what had been written on the handover sheets during the implementation period. The key person facilitating the research noted that they had dip checked the handover sheets and found that “‘leaflet given’ was recorded in the dignity section on only a couple of occasions, along with an entry in the case of one detainee who subsequently ate it. I’m sorry that this measure doesn’t appear to have been widely taken up by staff, despite being a standing item on the handover sheet.”

### Reading, writing materials and other distraction items

Like the decision to enable detainees to keep personal effects on a case-by-case basis, the provision of ‘distraction box’ items (e.g. Sudoku, word searches, colouring books, puzzles, soft balls to throw in cells or the exercise yard) had also been implemented prior to the implementation and evaluation starting, in January 2020. They had been introduced by a custody inspector who, having done some research on the benefits of ‘distraction boxes’, decided to implement them as part of her promotion goals. These benefits included the alleviation of anxiety, stress and worry through distraction but sometimes catharsis, which was in turn seen as alleviating the likelihood of self-harm in detainees and violence towards staff. This police participant says:

I think it's made a difference in people self-harming, so you have got – if you are anxious throwing this ball around and trying to channel that anxiety or that frustration, anger, whatever it is, against a soft ball on a hard target, there’s no damage and it's just that repetition of throwing something, just channelling that energy in a more constructive means, I think that’s a massive benefit and I definitely believe that the soft balls have achieved that. It's almost taking someone out of the situation they find themselves in the cell and just focusing energy on or their mind on something else, so the Sudoku, you know, I think it's been really beneficial, I really do (Police Participant 2).

Similarly, Detainee 3 did see the benefits of having something to take his mind off being in a cell, but at the same time, he saw sleep as providing the best form of escapism. Indeed, on and off, he had slept continuously through his time in detention as a way of coping with it (see also Skinnis and Wooff, 2020). He had not used any reading, writing or distraction items as a result and had tended not to use such items on previous occasions that he had been arrested either. He said that:

Obviously it [reading/writing materials] just gives you something to do, don’t it, do you know what I mean, when you’re here but to be fair, I’ve just been sleeping to be honest, like, you don’t really sleep that well because you just hear people walking about with their keys, that’s all you hear, you think is it me, you know what I mean, then you have to go back to sleep again (Detainee 3).

Similarly, Detainee 4 rejected distraction items, but he did so in favour of the escape provided by the inner world of his mind. He said: “I don’t want to read and write, I’m alright in my mind, my mind’s, I don’t want to read, I’m alright.”

Perhaps because of the perceived benefits of distraction items, though they had been initially met with resistance by staff - e.g. on the basis that they did not want to reinforce the idea of police custody being like a hotel – they had slowly been accepted and increasingly adopted. Of particular importance to this process of adopting distraction items was the possibilities of using distraction items to manage detainee



risk, though there was a limit to this. Staff were not prepared to go as far painting goal post or set of targets on the exercise yard as one police participant had wanted to do:

I think people were initially like seriously we are going to give people soft balls, what is this, is it a Hotel? It's not a gym and all this sort of stuff because I even went a step further and I suggested let's paint a goalpost in the exercise yard, let's paint a basketball, obviously we can't have real hoops, a ligature point, so let's give them targets to do and make better use of the yard. They stopped short of that in this point in time ... but people have seen the benefit of it because actually when we deployed that, not always but a lot of the time, people haven't then self-harmed and we have managed to keep their care plan at a reduced level without having to physically intervene, we haven't had to get cops off the street to do constant observations ... I think now they realise that it's not designed to, you know, basically give all these facilities so that it becomes a great place to be but actually it is designed to help manage risk, make conditions better for them so that in turn, tensions don't go up ... (Police participant 2).

A further limitation when it came to distraction items was resources, both in terms of the availability of appropriate books and other distraction items, but also in terms of staff availability to provide them, recognising that busyness could sometimes prevent staff from attending to detainees' needs for distraction. One police participant remarked, for example, that the books and magazines available to detainees had slowly diminished over time, as staff would sometimes give them to detainees to keep when they left if they were particularly absorbed in what they were reading. He said "we are quite soft, as I said to you yesterday, if someone's read most of a book ... quite often we would let them take it away but it needs to be something a little bit better organised for reading materials and stuff" (Police participant 1).

### Continuing with the implementation measures

In terms of which of the implementation measures the staff would keep in the future, staff talked about the value of retaining most of the main measures, but particularly the information leaflets. This participant said:

[T]he leaflets, yeah, good thing because some people will benefit from them, so yeah there's no reason why we can't keep giving them. Letting them keep their personal effects, yeah, good idea (Police participant 1).

Staff were also in favour of retaining the posters, though with some amendment to the content to make them briefer and more of 'an advert' for the leaflet, thereby making them more accessible. This participant said:

I think if there was an opportunity to do a reiteration of the posters to condense it, as we discussed, just to kind of do the headlines, I think that would just improve the prominence of the poster but also the accessibility to the wide range of people that we get in here (Police participant 2).

The poster could also act as a visual prompt/reminder which might encourage detainees to ask questions of staff, perhaps even to ask to see the full information leaflet, or to seek additional support, such as legal advice, if they had not asked for it on arrival. Providing this information in a "punchier" and more concise fashion might also be beneficial given the possibility of some detainees having learning disabilities and also given that some detainees may be feeling overwhelmed by the information that has been presented to them on booking-in (Police participant 2). It was believed that short visual prompts on a poster could be used to reinforce detainees' key rights and entitlements in ways that promote autonomous decision-making as already discussed earlier in relation to the information leaflets.

Staff also regarded the positioning of posters could be improved. Staff noted that the posters worked well in the holding area, but also suggested that they be placed in police vehicles used to transport suspects to police custody. This participant said:

Maybe they [posters] could put them in a different form, not just a piece of paper because it gets ripped up in no time, maybe behind some Perspex, in the police vans because they could be having a trip here from quite a long way away and they will have time to sit there and read that (Police participant 1).

## Conclusions and recommendations

In Phase 5 of the ‘good’ police custody study quantitative research was used to compare two custody blocks – Brightfields (the test site) and Highpoint (the comparator site) - before and after the implementation of key measures aimed at supporting greater detainee dignity, targeting staff attitudes and behaviours and detainee expectations. This was combined with qualitative research during the implementation process to examine perceptions of the implementation process. This project was undertaken in the midst of Covid-19 restrictions, which impacted on the quality and quantity of data collected. Since not all the post-implementation data could be collected, it was particularly difficult to measure the impact of the implementation measures on staff attitudes and detainee expectations about dignity.

Nonetheless the project demonstrated the *perceived* value of making detainee dignity a greater focal point in all that staff do in police custody. Staff appreciated the information sheets that were implemented as part of the project, particularly for those entering police custody for the first time. They were a useful tool for encouraging greater autonomy in relation to the decisions that detainees may make for themselves. There were also signs in Brightfields that operational staff were adapting to recent formal changes to police custody policies and practices in Force A about the need for individualised decision-making about detainee personal effects and the need to ensure that material items (e.g. distraction items) were routinely provided to detainees. This was primarily because staff saw the benefits of these changes to policies and practices in terms of de-escalating fraught encounters with detainees and in supporting the mental wellbeing of detainees. Though the implementation of these policies and practices had begun before the formal period of implementation and evaluation, the present project lends further support to their importance and to the need to continue to implement them in the future

Staff clearly articulated the view that they “do this already” in relation to affording detainees’ dignity, which to some extent was true in Brightfields, given it was above average on key measures of dignity compared to custody blocks in Phase 3 of the GPCS. This suggests an established drive in Brightfields to orient police custody around concepts like dignity and a cultural acceptance of dignity as reflected in the attitudes and behaviours of staff. The present project therefore enabled staff to do more of what they were already doing in Brightfields in terms of affording detainees dignity, with potential benefits for detainees’ sense of equal worth and autonomy and for staff in terms of greater cooperation. However, this cultural acceptance of the need for detainee dignity requires further realisation in Highpoint, with a view to bringing it into line with Brightfields and other custody suites and forces in England and Wales. This underscores the importance of recognising varying staff attitudes and behaviours *within* not just between forces when it comes to detainee dignity, as noted in earlier stages of the GPCS and in other research studies.

This report set out to describe the implementation and evaluation methods employed in Force A in Phase 5 of the GPCS and to critically examine the (perceived) effectiveness of the measures implemented. Its last set of aims was to explore the implications of the research and make recommendations for future practice and for subsequent iterations of the evaluation and implementation project in other police force areas.

In terms of continuing to grow the focus of staff on detainee dignity it is recommended that:

- Custody information leaflets be provided in the future potentially across England and Wales, with some adjustments in the longer-term being to make them more accessible for a wider range of detainees and by creating a digital format (e.g. a short video or audio clip). Further work is needed with regards when, where and how such digital information might be best relayed to detainees.
- Decisions about the keeping of personal effects should continue to be taken on a case-by-case basis as per Force A's policy introduced in October 2020. The research shows that staff recognised the benefits of this policy and that there was growing acceptance of it as a result. The adoption of such a policy is also something that other police forces should consider implementing in the future, subject to local conditions and considerations in relation to risk management.
- The *routine* provision of material items, including distraction items should also continue into the future and staff should have the necessary resources (time, books, reading and writing materials, soft balls etc.) to enable this to happen.
- To bring it into line with Brightfields on measures of dignity, staff in Highpoint should be encouraged to increase their focus on detainee dignity (e.g. through providing the custody information leaflets trialled in Brightside, alongside greater encouragement to routinely provide material items and make case-by-case decisions about detainee personal effects).

In terms of future iterations of the Phase 5 research in other police force areas, it is recommended that:

- The poster accompanying the custody information sheet be adjusted to make it briefer and more of an 'advert' for the custody information leaflets, so that detainees know to ask for the leaflet if they want more information.
- Police forces taking part in Phase 5 of the research who have yet to adopt formal policies of case-by-case decision making in relation to personal effects should use the present findings to reassure operational staff about the potential value of implementing this measure and in order to encourage staff to implement this recommendation in the Phase 5 trial.
- Police forces in subsequent parts of Phase 5 should consider trialling not just case-by-case decision making about personal effects, but also decisions about access to other items such as toilet paper.
- Careful thought should be given to which custody blocks are used for trialling the recommendations from the GPCS. On the one hand, newer and more pleasant custody facilities may enable staff to be more amenable to implementing changes to their day-to-day working practices. On the other, custody blocks with less appealing working environments may also be those where more persuasion is needed to encourage staff to afford detainees dignity, given the links established in Phase 3 of the GPCS between material conditions and detainee dignity. Therefore in order to drive up standards across a police force area, it may be better to trial recommendations from the GPCS in sites where the material conditions are perceived as worse by staff.
- As far as possible, as many elements of the research should be done face-to-face in order to provide a "human face" to the project, which staff recognised as of importance.

## Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the support and generosity of custody staff in Force A, who participated in the research, as well as those who played a role in facilitating it. I am also grateful to detainees who participated in the research and, furthermore, colleagues on the project Research Advisory Group who read and commented on the summary and full version of the report, including Katie Kempen, Andrew Wooff and Angela Sorsby. With thanks also to Angela Sorsby for her assistance with analysing the quantitative data.

## References

- Chan, J. (1997) *Changing Police Culture: Policing in a Multicultural Society*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Cockcroft, T. (2014) Police Culture and Transformational Leadership: Outlining the Contours of a Troubled Relationship, *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 8(1), 5–13.
- Greene, A. and Skinns, L. (2018) Different ways of acting and different ways of knowing? The cultures of police-academic partnerships in a multi-site and multi-force study, *European Journal of Policing Studies*, 5(3), 55-75.
- Holdaway, S. (1983). *Inside the British Police*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Macaulay, M. and Rowe, M. (2020) Happy ever after? Making sense of narrative in creating police values, *Public Management Review*, 22(9), 1306-1323.
- Shearing, C. and Ericson, R. (1991) ‘Culture as figurative action’, *British Journal of Sociology*, 42 (4), 481-506.
- Skinns, L., Wooff, A. and Sprawson, A. (forthcoming) “My best day will be my last day!”: Appreciating Appreciative Inquiry in police research’, under review by *Policing and Society*.
- Skinns, L., Sorsby, A. and Rice, L. (2020) “Treat them as a human being”: dignity in police detention and its implications for ‘good’ police custody, *The British Journal of Criminology*, 60(6), 1667–1688.
- Skinns, L. and Wooff, A. (2020) Pain in police detention: A critical point in the ‘penal painscape’? *Policing and Society*, 31(3), 245-262.
- Skinns, L. Rice, L., Sprawson, A. and Wooff, A. (2017) Police legitimacy in context: An exploration of ‘soft power’ in police custody in England, *Policing: An international Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 40 (3), 601-613.
- Skinns, L., Sprawson, A., Sorsby, A., Smith, R. and Wooff, A. (2017) Police custody delivery in the twenty-first century in England and Wales: Current arrangements and their implications for patterns of policing, *European Journal of Policing Studies*, 4 (3), 325-349.
- Skinns, L., Wooff, A. and Sprawson, A. (2015) ‘Preliminary findings on police custody delivery in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Is it “good” enough?’ *Policing and Society*, 27(4), 358-371.
- Van Hulst, M. V. (2013) Storytelling at the police station: The Canteen Culture Revisited, *British Journal of Criminology*, 53 (4), 624–642,
- Wooff, A. and Skinns, L. (2017) The role of emotion, space and place in police custody in England: Towards a geography of police custody, *Punishment and Society*. 20 (5), 562-579.

## Appendix

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Date and location</b>	<b>Actions</b>	<b>Description of actions</b>
1. Pre-implementation survey	Highpoint (11am -8pm 2 November ) Brightfields (10am – 7pm 3 November)	Survey staff and detainees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff survey will be emailed and filled in online, where ever possible</li> <li>- LS to collect survey data from detainees in the suites</li> <li>- LS will go with DOs doing cell checks to invite detainees to participate in the research and will collect the data from detainees using a tablet in an interview room if available</li> <li>- LS will take advice from custody staff about which detainees to approach, based on their assessment of risk</li> </ul>
2. Brief staff survey	Online only (9-16 November)	Brief online survey of all in Brightfields and Highpoint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff watch 'I am Human'</li> <li>- Staff complete brief survey</li> <li>- LS use response to produce a sheet of good practice example of detainee dignity</li> </ul>
Implementation	Brightfields (23 November – 18 December)	Staff implement recommendations from the research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff give greater emphasis to dignity in all they do and recognise that every interaction matters</li> <li>- Staff adopt new handover sheet with dignity standing item</li> <li>- Staff offer custody information sheet to all detainees and put up custody information poster in the custody suite</li> <li>- Staff make use of good practice examples sheet in practice and in discussions during handover</li> <li>- Staff give greater consideration to dignity in decisions about personal effects, risk assessments permitting (Staff to discuss with managers if unsure)</li> <li>- Staff enable routine access to various material goods (e.g. reading and writing materials, other distraction box items, blankets, food and drinks, range of clothing)</li> </ul>
3. Process evaluation	Brightfields (14-16 December)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- LS observe in Brightfields custody suite</li> <li>- LS interview staff and detainees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where ever possible interviews with staff will be done remotely (e.g. over the phone)</li> <li>- Interviews with detainees will take place after at least 4 hours in custody</li> <li>- LS will go with DOs on cell checks to invite detainees to participate</li> <li>- The research interviews will take place in interview rooms</li> </ul>
4. Post-implementation survey	Highpoint (21 December ) Brightfields (22 December)	Survey staff and detainees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Staff survey will be emailed and filled in online, where ever possible</li> <li>- LS to collect survey data from detainees in the suites</li> <li>- LS will go with DOs doing cell checks to invite detainees to participate in the research and will collect the data from detainees using a tablet in an interview room if available</li> <li>- LS will take advice from custody staff about which detainees to approach, based on their assessment of risk</li> </ul>