



RESEARCHING INTELLIGENCE ISSUES IN LAW-ENFORCEMENT

*A NPCC Intelligence Practice Research Consortium
guide to supporting research activity*

February 2021

Jordan Nunan and Ian Stanier
jhnunan@gmail.com and I.P.Stanier@ljmu.ac.uk

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| <i>Introduction</i> | 1 |
| <i>Real World Challenges</i> | 2 |
| <i>Research Planning and Preparation</i> | 2 |
| <i>Understanding Police Governance Arrangements</i> | 2 |
| <i>Consideration of the Police Code of Ethics</i> | 3 |
| <i>Securing Contacts and Building Research Resilience</i> | 3 |
| <i>Academic Points of Contact Within Force Areas</i> | 4 |
| <i>Drafting a Researcher – Law Enforcement Memorandum of Understanding</i> | 4 |
| <i>Access to / use of Sensitive Information</i> | 5 |
| <i>Avoiding Delays and Managing Timescales</i> | 7 |
| <i>Evidence Based Policing</i> | 8 |
| <i>Undertaking Research</i> | 9 |
| <i>Academic Literature</i> | 9 |
| <i>Research Outputs</i> | 10 |

Guidance on Undertaking Research on Intelligence Related Issues Within Law Enforcement

INTRODUCTION

The NPCC *Intelligence Portfolio* oversees the strategic development of UK Law Enforcement Agency (LEA) intelligence. The Portfolio is committed to ensuring that any associated policy and practice development is informed by the best available research. To this end, this guidance has been prepared by the *NPCC Intelligence Practice Research Consortium* (IPRC), a subgroup of the NPCC Intelligence Portfolio. Its aim is to introduce researchers, both academic and LEA personnel, new and experienced, to essential issues that are worthy of consideration when undertaking research into policing. More specifically, the guidance is aimed at those interested in examining aspects of intelligence use and management.

The origins of this IPRC commissioned guidance were rooted in growing concerns that the commission of intelligence related research has lagged behind other policing research areas. Bids to the College of Policing's research funding streams have been limited and those submitted have been invariably unsuccessful. Furthermore, other research intentions have been frustrated and timed out due to the perception of impenetrable data access difficulties and a reluctance of the LEA intelligence communities to engage with research. The reality is that there is a willingness from the intelligence communities to support research, but legitimate concerns do have to be satisfactorily addressed prior to engagement.

While intelligence related research does exist^[1], it is often weighted towards the United States, historical in nature, and focused on National Security. Other jurisdictions have gone much further in supporting research, the USA for example has its own National Intelligence University. While these studies are useful, contemporary UK law enforcement intelligence practice has not attracted sustained or systematic academic scrutiny. Intelligence development is still primarily informed by both anecdotal experience and defensive drafting in response to public, media, and judicial criticism^[2]. UK policy and practice remain unchallenged, drafted and reviewed without an evidence or research base. As a consequence, opportunities for identifying proven new ways of efficient and effective working are being missed. The result is that new enabling technologies are not exploited, inefficient practices remain, and capacity and capability is suboptimal.

This guidance is not intended to provide a comprehensive introduction of all research techniques or an introduction to theoretical perspectives. These are already documented in an array of helpful publications^[3]. This guidance should be read alongside these and similar publications in order to inform planning prior to undertaking police intelligence related research. This document aims to highlight key challenges that researchers face when undertaking research and provides some guidance on how these may be overcome. Therefore, the following guidance is set to follow the researcher's journey from the planning and preparation phase through to the research output phase.

[1] See academic journals *Intelligence and National Security* <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/fint20/current>, *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* (Routledge) <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujic20/current> and the *International Journal of Intelligence, Security, and Public Affairs* <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/usip20>.

[2] Stanier, I. P., & Nunan, J. (2018). Reframing Intelligence Interviews: The Applicability of Psychological Research to HUMINT Elicitation. In A. Griffiths, & R. Milne (Eds.), *The Psychology of Criminal Investigation: From Theory to Practice* (pp. 226-248). London: Routledge.

[3] Useful research publications, amongst others include: David E Gray (2018) *Doing Research in the Real World* (4th Edition) Sage London. Alan Bryman (2015) *Social Research Methods* (5th Edition) Oxford University Press. Oxford. Emma Wincup (2017), *Criminological Research: Introducing qualitative methods series* (2nd Edition) Sage London. Colin Robson (2015) *Real World Research* (4th Edition) John Wiley & Sons. Chichester. Heather McCosker, Alan Barnard & Rod Gerber (2001) *Undertaking Sensitive Research: Issues and Strategies for Meeting the Safety Needs of All Participants* (2001) Volume 2, No. 1, Art. 22 *Qualitative Social Research* <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/983/2142>.

REAL WORLD CHALLENGES

Undertaking academic research in LEA brings many challenges, especially when the research topic is intelligence related. Firstly, it needs to adopt an interdisciplinary approach, drawing on ideas from other disciplines including politics, economics, sociology, criminology, and psychology. Secondly, access to the data. Intelligence systems are populated by information collected overtly (through open source data, protected/restricted data-systems and police-public interactions collection) and covertly (via informers, undercover officers, and surveillance tools). To protect people and operational methodology these data sources often attract operational security measures. Linked to the sensitivity of collection methodology and access to the accrued data are legal constraints (i.e. statutory rules around interception data) and the ongoing duty of care to human sources of information (i.e. in particular, a heightened commitment to covert human intelligence sources). An added complication could be that more than one agency may have legal responsibilities associated with the required research data. Thirdly, UK policing is a large complex structure making identification of the relevant key stakeholders, decision makers, sponsors, and gatekeepers difficult without informed insiders to assist. Fourthly, there are an array of agendas that have to be navigated, including austerity related constraints, Government strategy, political influences, and inbuilt aversion to threats to reputation. Finally, workforce positions are fluid with high turnovers of staff and when coupled with the inevitable hierarchical bureaucracy, even within the smallest of organisations, this makes planning difficult, as prior agreements may have to be revisited and research briefs re-presented to new portfolio leads or department heads.

Research Planning and Preparation

Faced with these real-world challenges, where does one start when attempting to undertake research encompassing an aspect of law enforcement's use of intelligence? As with all research, the planning and preparation phase is central to the successful completion of an academic research project. This phase demands that the researchers:

- establish research aims and objectives that can be easily communicated to law enforcement and provide clear focus for research activity;
- adopt a measured, sensible and informative research approach to potentially complex and sensitive area of policing
- ensure the scope of the research is realistic and does not overstretch the researchers' reach
- avoid making unnecessary demands on the data holders in terms of time and use of the product;
- secure early contact with law enforcement organisational academic research contacts to assess the feasibility of the research proposals and address any concerns raised as soon as practicable;
- plan for unexpected delays in the working timescale for the project in terms of consultation, access to data, personnel changes and logistical expenses;
- draft a working 'Memorandum of Understanding' between researcher, funders (if applicable), and the respective law enforcement agencies; and
- develop a research proposal agreed by both an ethics committee and law enforcement sponsors.

Understanding Police Governance Arrangements

When navigating the policing landscape an understanding of policing governance is useful. UK law enforcement is made up of a number of different Home Office Forces, Government departments and quasi-private and private organisations. Many operate both independent of others as well as in multi-agency collaborations. This in turn means that strategic steering groups such as the National Police Chiefs Council have significant but not control or oversight of groups delivering what would be deemed 'policing'. By understanding the governance, the academic researcher may be able to identify a docking

NPCC IPRC (version 1.3)

point for research proposals. Critical in terms of permissions and access are the various National Police Chiefs' Council Coordination Committees. These groups are responsible for the development, coordination and implementation of policing strategies and policing standards.

There are eleven broad committees including the crime operations committee, the information management committee and the counter-terrorism committee. Details of the current lead and brief summary of the areas under their responsibility are accessible via the NPCC website (<http://www.npcc.police.uk/Home.aspx>). Under these committees there are an array of other portfolios (including the Intelligence Portfolio) which in turn oversee subgroups. For example, the NPCC Intelligence Portfolio oversees, among others, the *Intelligence Practice Research Consortium* (See <https://twitter.com/npcciprc>), the *CCTV Working Group* and the *Prison Intelligence Working Group*. NPCC Coordination Committees work closely with the College of Policing, Forces and other criminal justice partners to monitor and develop effective policy and practice and to ensure compliance with standards. The NPCC is committed to and supportive of evidence-based research to develop policing policy and practice.

Consideration of the Police Code of Ethics

Research is unlikely to be supported by police if its methodology and application is inconsistent with the College of Policing's statutory Code of Ethics (http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Ethics/Documents/Code_of_Ethics.pdf). These detail nine values including areas relevant to researchers. These include those associated with accountability, integrity and objectivity and, in the context of intelligence, honesty and integrity (covert policing), equality and diversity (actively seeking or using opportunities to promote equality and diversity), duties and responsibilities (demonstrating an effective use of policing resources), confidentiality (maintaining the confidentiality of commercial and other sensitive information).

Where the researcher is associated with a university, the research will usually require ethical approval from the appropriate department or faculty ethics committee. The research will also require permission from the law enforcement agency where the data will be drawn from and, normally, sign off of the output. Furthermore, if a research project is externally funded, the researcher may also require ethical approval from the funding organisation before the research commences, which typically forms part of the research grant application. This effectively creates a demanding three stage ethical approval process (i.e., the LEA, the university, and the funder). This may add additional research planning time and should be factored into the chronology of the research.

To enhance the approval process, it is best practice for the researcher to establish the turnaround time of the ethics committees (i.e., some ethics committees only sit monthly or in particular periods of an academic year). Where there is a University collaboration with another institution, the research must ascertain whether ethical approval from one institution can be accepted by another. It is not unknown for different institutional ethics committees to disagree with each other, and as a consequence, introduce further delays when attempting to secure ethical approval. As a general guidance, it is recommended to allow for at least one to two months within the research timescale for ethical approval, though this can vary depending upon the research project in question.

Securing Contacts and Building Research Resilience

Undertaking academic research in sensitive areas of policing including intelligence and covert policing can be challenging. Securing access to data may be time consuming as a consequence of a number of factors (i.e., requirements around appropriate vetting, matters becoming subject to *sub judice*, requirements imposed around data handling in order to protect information, restraints on access to data

NPCC IPRC (version 1.3)

based on specific legislative restrictions (Intercept product) and protection of intelligence related tradecraft, personnel and operational methodology).

Another challenge is resilience in terms of contacts and ongoing access. Policing is a hierarchical organisation and accordingly vertical and horizontal staff turnover is high. To compensate for the impact of a research sponsor moving post (e.g., promotion, different operational roles or moving force area), it is advised that the researcher builds in resilience to the research contacts. This would include securing the support of a deputy or of a wider governance group support. The NPCC working groups, especially the *NPCC Intelligence Portfolio*, can provide both sponsorship of a research proposal, and support throughout the research project making the research less dependent on a single staff member. By providing a research proposal to the chair of a NPCC working group, at the earliest possible stage, any outstanding concerns or research practicalities can be addressed.

This is where the *NPCC Intelligence Practice Research Consortium* (IPRC) can act as an initial contact for researchers. The NPCC IPRC can provide initial feedback on the researcher's proposal, discuss data access challenges and ethical considerations, and ensure the researcher's project reaches the appropriate NPCC working group. Where assistance is required in identifying the appropriate NPCC contact, please enquire with:

- Dr Ian Stanier (Chair of the NPCC IPRC) Senior Lecturer. Liverpool John Moores University) I.P.Stanier@ljmu.ac.uk;
- DI David Hollies (Secretary of the NPCC IPRC) West Midlands Police ROCU – david.hollies@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk.

Academic Points of Contact Within Force Areas

Most Forces have established a point of contact within their organisations to receive research requests, support academic related research (through the access to data and facilitating introductions) and maintain liaison with research partners including Universities and Industry. Some Forces have dedicated academic docking points, while others have an identified unit responsible for dealing with requests (often within Strategic Analysis Units or Training Departments). With the advent of Evidence-Based Policing, many forces have a lead within Force to act as the single point of contact for research inquiries. Large forces often have their own dedicated unit; for example, West Midlands Police has the *Academic Research Team* (<https://www.west-midlands.police.uk/get-involved/academic-research>). Other Forces are part of a wider collaborative academic partnership such as the *East Midlands Police Academic Collaboration* (EMPAC - <http://www.empac.org.uk/contact/>).

Drafting a Researcher – Law Enforcement Memorandum of Understanding

On occasions, there may be a requirement to agree a *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) between the Researchers and the lead agency. While not always required, this bespoke MoU has the benefit of providing:

1. clarity to both parties over the nature and scope of the research;
2. reassurance over the use and management of the data to which the researcher has permission to access;
3. early understanding and agreement over the mechanisms in which different levels of publication will be approved and used;
4. support for the implementation of the ethical approval requirements; and
5. identification for key stakeholders and future customer for the research product.

Access to / use of Sensitive Information

There is a surprising amount of information available to researchers in the context of intelligence, including sensitive information:

- the disclosures of whistle-blowers (i.e., Edward Snowden, Chelsea Manning and Wikileaks);
- legislative development on sensitive investigatory powers including explanatory notes, public consultation documents and Hansard (i.e., *Investigatory Powers Act 2016*, the *Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act*, and accompanying Statutory Instruments);
- judicial Inquiries (i.e., the *UK Undercover Policing Inquiry*, the *US inquiry into Enhanced Interrogation Techniques and allegations of torture*);
- parliamentary and associated ad hoc inquiries (i.e., *Intelligence and Security Committee of Parliament* reports, the *Deputy Prime Ministers Independent review of Surveillance*, and reports by the Independent reviewer of terrorist legislation);
- oversight bodies (including the *Investigatory Powers Office Commissioners*, the *HMICFRS*, *CCTV and Biometric commissioners*);
- non-government organisation reports (including *Amnesty International*, *Big Brother Watch*, *Liberty*);
- investigative and mainstream journalism (i.e. *The Guardian* and *The Independent* have covered intelligence and covert policing in some depth); and
- intelligence and covert policing social media (i.e., see Twitter accounts for @npcciprc; @HevershamIntel; @CovertLJMU; @mrkoot; though it is important to note the lack of peer review for some social media sources). In some cases, the insight is more significant and comprehensive than restricted policy.

Nonetheless, some ‘raw data’ may not be accessible (legal restrictions) or if accessible, unusable in its original state (sub judice, likely to compromise methodology). Where the data is known but the original source needs to be protected, the researcher should consider ways of corroborating findings from elsewhere. These approaches adopt a methodological triangulation by using multiple methods, such as, interviews, surveys and investigative case studies. Not only does this approach allow for a parallel sourcing of data, but it also helps strengthen other methodological findings.

Researchers must be aware of the following challenges and solutions when undertaking research concerning police intelligence:

- **Security:** This incorporates approved access to sensitive data (security vetting level), and access to secure police buildings such as strap environments. Possible outlets include the researcher acquiring the appropriate vetting level or requesting the raw data to be sanitised so that vetting is no longer required. On occasions, vetting can be provided by the sponsoring Force or other LEA subject to the material being accessed by the researcher.
- **Removing data offsite:** It can be time consuming and expensive for a researcher to travel and be situated within a secure police building to undertake the research. In some cases, this will be the only solution. However, if the researcher is able to sanitise the data themselves (appropriate vetting required) or have the data sanitised by the organisation who owns the data, then it may be possible to remove the data offsite.
 - Case example: A research study exploring covert audio recorded interactions coded the sensitive data for rapport and communication techniques within a secure police building. The coded data, which did not include identifiable information such as names and locations was able to leave the secure site and be securely stored on a University drive. Anything sensitive or could lead to identification remained at the secure site.
- **Data retention and data protection:** The use of a secure encrypted USB hard drive (i.e., iron key USB) will provide sufficient physical data protection for sensitive data removed from a secure site, dependant on the security classification of the information – see the note below on

security sensitive material. Researchers must further consider how they will store the data, the length of storage, and whether the data is best left in a police premises and what would be their potential liability for loss of data. Universities will provide additional guidance on data storage, retention and protection and will be aligned to the *General Data Protection Regulations 2018* (GDPR <https://bit.ly/2A10ayF>). It is important to also consider other legislation that could impact on the use of data (EU Privacy Shield, *Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000*, *Official Secrets Act* etc.). As an example, see the *University of Portsmouth's* guidance on dealing with research data (<https://library.port.ac.uk/researchdata.html>), though it is vital that the researcher follows the guidance provided by the police force they belong to, as well as any academic institute or research funder associated to their research.

- **Conflict of interest:** Police officers (as the researcher) accessing police data need to be aware of the *Management of Police Information* (MoPI <https://bit.ly/2rjatKY>), which highlights the issues that need to be considered in order to comply with the law and manage risk associated with police information. The data accessed requires an academically agreed objective, with organisational consent to avoid accessing data that is not required by the researcher.
- **Security sensitive research:** It is good practice to secure sign off from the sponsoring LEA to ensure they are satisfied that any publication would not pose a risk to any sensitive source or methodology. Moreover, researchers must be aware that the possession and/or distribution of security sensitive material can result in arrest and prosecution under counter-terrorism legislation (*Terrorism Act 2006*). The possession and/or dissemination of security sensitive research material could be considered unlawful under the terms of certain acts ^[4]. Researchers are advised to study *The Terrorism Act 2006 Chapter 11 (Part 1: Offences)* before engaging in research which relies on the need to access or store this type of material. In outline, security sensitive research material includes, but is not limited to:
 - Military or paramilitary training manuals or procedures.
 - Documentation or media supporting extremist ideologies.
 - Instructions, guidance or advice on the planning or execution of terrorist acts.
 - Instructions, guidance or advice relating to the acquisition or use of a radioactive device or radioactive material.
 - Material supporting, inciting or condoning acts of terrorism.
 - Material intended to radicalise or proselytise individuals into adopting an extremist viewpoint.
 - Material intended to recruit or otherwise enlist members or followers to banned organisations.
 - Instructions, guidance or advice (including the acquisition of components) on the subjects of:
 - bomb making;
 - the manufacture of improvised explosive devices (IEDs);
 - the creation of chemical weapons or toxic agents.

Security sensitive material must not be stored on a personal computer, USB device or external hard drive, but rather kept on a secure location supported by the researcher's policing or academic institution. Before the research commences and as part of the ethical approval process, the researcher is required to outline the material to be accessed and complete an ethical review questionnaire, outlining the oversight process throughout. Researchers are advised to contact the policing and academic institutions they are associated with, as the requirements for each institution may differ.

[4] <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/apr/25/boston-college-ordered-by-us-court-to-hand-over-ira-tapes> 'Boston College ordered by US court to hand over IRA tapes. Police in Northern Ireland have long sought to obtain taped interviews of former IRA prisoner Anthony McIntyre made for academic archive. Anthony McIntyre, a former IRA prisoner, worked with the Boston Project to create a recorded oral archive of paramilitary testimonies about the Troubles'.

Avoiding Delays and Managing Timescales

Policing is inherently complex, and organisations are continually evolving to tackle new demands and operational challenges. Delays to projects may be linked to the demands on law enforcements' finite resources. Significant real term police budget cuts have reduced the police workforce by over 30,000 officers and staff since 2010. Even approved research projects may need to factor in delays based on operational pressures. This may require the researcher to be very flexible in responding to often short notice 'windows' for research (i.e., interviews).

Securing authorities for intelligence related research often requires extensive consultation with Force leads, relevant NPCC Portfolios and appropriate associated subgroups. Effective sequencing of the relevant authorities requires insight into the schedules of key governance meetings. A failure to submit research proposal requests may incur delays in securing approvals. This is of particular importance where the researcher is under time constraints; for example, when the research is undertaken as part of a dissertation or a time limited research funding grant. The researcher should plan for delays by building these into the research planning process. For University students, this may require initiating and submitting research proposals early in the first term of the academic calendar. It is recommended that in partnership with academic supervisors, researchers find out when relevant 'approval' law enforcement working groups are scheduled to meet. This can be achieved by liaising directly with the Force / Regional representative on the groups or, if not known, through the National Police Chiefs Council.

Where access to intelligence and associated data is linked to an ongoing investigation, matters of *sub judice* may be live and take primacy over any research request or usage. In the first instance, early consultation with the *Senior Investigating Officer* (SIO) may be a necessary requirement. Where commitments to providing access to data have been given it may be caveated; for example, only provided at the conclusion of the criminal proceedings and possibly with data restrictions (i.e., redaction, sanitisation or in an agreed 'form of words').

Other delays to research data access requests may occur where the data required to be collected may be an outcome of joint activity with other partners. In some cases, this may require permissions to be secured from both agencies. For example, research involving intelligence and organised crime within a prison context may require permission from *Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service* (HMPPS) or financial intelligence research may require permission from *Her Majesty's Revenues and Customs* (HMRC). Agencies may have different processes for applying for research data. To undertake research within a prison environment, a formal application process is to be followed (<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/national-offender-management-service/about/research>). Further guidance is laid out in NOMS Prison Service Instruction 22/14 'Research Applications' (<https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/offenders/psipso/psi-2014/psi-22-2014-research-applications.pdf>).

If the research has a short-term timescale (i.e., to be completed within the duration of an academic year), then a cross-sectional study may be suitable. Here the research will examine a particular time frame (i.e., intelligence collected by Police Community Support Officers on drug offending over a 12-month period). It may also include capturing a snapshot of attitudes at any given time (i.e., the attitude of RIPA Authorising Officers to the recruitment of potential covert human intelligence sources with sex offending history). If time permits, then researchers may consider a longitudinal research project. The advice here is to secure the permission and authority of a senior officer or NPCC Portfolio lead. This authority will help smooth over issues that may arise from 'middle manager turnover'. This high authority will increase the probability of ongoing organisational commitment to a research project.

Evidence Based Policing

Evidence-Based Policing (EBP) is an approach to policy making and tactical decision-making for police forces. Advocates of EBP emphasise the value of statistical analysis, empirical research and, ideally, randomised controlled trials. The research approach has been described as:

In an evidence-based policing approach, police officers and staff create, review and use the best available evidence to inform and challenge policies, practices and decisions. As a way of working, it can be supported by collaboration with academics and other partners. The best available evidence will use appropriate research methods and sources for the question being asked. Research should be carefully conducted, peer reviewed and transparent about its methods, limitations, and how its conclusions were reached. The theoretical basis and context of the research should also be made clear. Where there is little or no formal research, other evidence such as professional consensus and peer review, may be regarded as the 'best available', if gathered and documented in a careful and transparent way.' (Canadian Society of Evidence Based Policing <http://www.can-sebp.net/what-is-ebp>).

The EBP Matrix, developed by George Town University’s *Centre for Evidence Based Crime Policy* (<https://cebc.org/evidence-based-policing/the-matrix/>) is a research-to-practice translation tool that organises moderate to very rigorous evaluations of police interventions visually, allowing agencies and researchers to view the field of research in different policing areas. It is worth noting that EBP does not dismiss more traditional drivers of police decision-making but seeks to raise awareness and increase the application of scientific testing, targeting and tracking of police resources, especially during times of continuing law enforcement budget cuts and demand for effective and efficient policing practice.

The purpose of the chart below is to reinforce an understanding that ‘evidence’ can sit within different levels of quality, which is dependent upon the research methodology utilised. It is important to note that Ratcliffe’s chart does not dismiss qualitative research methods. In fact, his blog further outlines the importance of conducting qualitative research, regarding the interpretation of results, seeking insights into a program’s success or failure, and considering a way forward (<http://www.jratcliffe.net/blog/not-all-evidence-is-created-equally-an-update/>).



Since the inauguration of Home Office funded *What Works in Crime Reduction* (see <http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Pages/default.aspx>), to establish *what works* or *what does not work* as best practice within policing, an EBP research approach should be applied. To strengthen networking

ties within policing research, it is highly recommended that the researcher joins the *Society of Evidence Based Policing* (SEBP) to receive email updates regarding events (i.e., SEBP conference) and research projects. Additionally, the SEBP website provides contact details for each SEBP local regional coordinator, who may be able to provide additional guidance to researchers in their region (<https://www.sebp.police.uk/contact>). Where a researcher is considering a comparative analysis on intelligence use and management, they may want to consider international police EBP groups, including the *Canadian Society of Evidence Based Policing* (CAN-SEBP <http://www.can-sebp.net>) and *Australia & New Zealand Society of Evidence Based Policing* (ANZSEBP <http://www.anzsebp.com/home>).

UNDERTAKING RESEARCH

This guidance is not intended to provide a comprehensive introduction of all research techniques or an introduction to theoretical perspectives. However, it is recommended that researchers visit the College of Policing's guidance on undertaking research, which includes 'how to' guides, the bursary scheme and academic support (<https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Support/Pages/Research-guidance.aspx>). In addition, researchers should read a number of research methods textbooks across the disciplines (i.e., criminology, psychology, sociology, law, economics, and politics) to gain a foundation of knowledge in the differing research methods and their appropriateness to the project's research question.

Academic Literature

Access to the relevant academic literature is vital for any research project, as the researcher needs to be aware of what research exists to inform their current research strategy. Any research should aim to target a gap within the literature or to corroborate / challenge earlier research.

If a researcher is associated to an academic institute, then full time or guest access should be granted to the academic institute's physical and online library. By gaining an academic login, the police researcher will be able to access a wide range of academic journals that the institution is subscribed too, by simply logging in via their institutional account. Where the researcher is a law enforcement member of staff and undertaking the project without an affiliation to an academic institution, accessing a wide range of academic material can be somewhat difficult and without subscription, expensive. The following range of sources will provide a foundation for non-affiliated staff to access academic material.

Google Scholar: The institution's online library together with Google Scholar are a good starting point for researchers to find and access articles (e.g., search by keywords, article title, authors, and date). If the PDF link is available, then the article is usually open access to any researcher.

If this is not the case, simply click on the article link, and by using an academic login the article will become available to download as a PDF. Sources such as *Policing Insight* provide a weekly academic research summary that is helpful to keep up to date with recent policing research from a range of academic journals (<https://policinginsight.com/news/weekly-academic-research-summary/>).

ResearchGate: It may be helpful to create a ResearchGate account (<https://www.researchgate.net>), as this provides a networking opportunity with the academic community, as well to follow academics, projects, and request copies of academic articles. ResearchGate also provides notifications of recent research, new and updated projects and interactions with the researcher's own account.

National Police Library: Association with an academic institution is not always the case for police researchers undertaking research. However, serving police officers or members of police staff are able to access a range of academic journals through the *National Police Library*, based at the College of Policing's Ryton on Dunsmore site. To do so, the researcher is required to become a free member of the College of Policing by signing up at their website (<http://www.college.police.uk/membership>). After

registering to the College, access to the National Police Library can be sought via the College of Policing membership number, which then can provide the police officer or police staff researcher with an OpenAthens account. This OpenAthens account can be used as an 'institutional login' to access research articles. Any queries can be directed to library@college.pnn.police.uk.

Knowledge Hub: The Knowledge Hub community is another source of research, policy and practice. Access is free and can be accessed via the PNN network or academic email. This community includes a number of sites, most are open access, others open on application (see <https://knowledgehub.group>).

Legislation: Any research concerning intelligence and covert policing needs to consider the associated underpinning legislation. The researcher needs to be aware of legal provisions that may have a bearing on their research. Key legislative provisions include:

- Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (including the accompanying Codes of Practice and Statutory Instruments);
- Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (including the accompanying Codes of Practice and Statutory Instruments);
- Serious Organised Crime and Police Act 2005;
- Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984;
- Offender Management Act 2007;
- Prison Act 1952 and Prison Rules;
- Data Protection Act 2018 (GDPR);
- Official Secrets Act 1989;
- Security Service Act 1989;
- Intelligence Services Act 1994; and
- Associated Terrorism legislation.

UK legislation can be accessed for free via <http://www.legislation.gov.uk> and case law via British and Irish Legal Information Institute, known as BAILII (via <http://www.bailii.org>). European case law can be accessed for free via the European Court of Human Rights website (<https://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=home>).

RESEARCH OUTPUTS

The purpose of academic research in intelligence is to build knowledge and understanding. It is an aid to enhancing the business of intelligence. It highlights effective and efficient practice, and challenges those that fall short in delivering crime reduction and community safety. Research helps individuals and organisations nurture and develop their potential and benefits civil society. It may modify or deliver a new intelligence related product, policy, technology or service. Research provides the foundation for policing innovation and practical application.

To optimise the benefits of research, the findings need to be shared as widely and safely as possible, and in particular to those parts of the organisation whose current practice will be directly impacted upon. To maximise impact, it is important that the target audience for the research has been identified. For the current document, the target audience will incorporate those directly on the front-line, police officers in senior roles, policing think tanks and scholars who have a vested interest in police intelligence, to name but a few.

Once the researcher's target audience has been identified, an integral part of the research process is to understand the array of available research outputs. For research to have an impact, it not only requires a sound methodology addressing its original aims and objectives, but the research needs to be readily accessible for its target audience (i.e., the findings on effective CHIS recruitment methodology needs to be accessible to those involved in the use and management of informants).

NPCC IPRC (version 1.3)

The type and location of the research output may depend upon the aims and objectives of the research, the sensitivity of the data, and the prior approval from the organisations involved. With regards to the sensitivity of the data, the researcher must consider the extent of publishing the findings. This does not mean that research conducted on sensitive data cannot be published externally (i.e., academic journals and conferences), but with some research, the findings may be presented in different ways, depending on the audience.

The researcher may wish to consider publishing two versions of the research output. One version may be published internally to a specific audience (i.e., for members of the Dedicated Source Unit). Wherever possible, intelligence-based research should be internally accessible for the target audience. By doing so it will encourage future support, increase its impact and inform and improve the quality of policy and practice. Prior to publication it is vital that final approval is granted from the participating organisations before any research output is produced. It is the responsibility of the 'participating organisation' to make a decision on the nature of publication as soon as practicable to ensure the currency of the research findings.

Internal outputs may include:

- uploading on the NPCC Knowledge Hub sites;
- publication on an internal law enforcement intranet;
- presentation at the annual NPCC Intelligence Portfolio's conference;
- signposting the research on the College of Policing's research map (<http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Research-Map/Pages/Research-Map.aspx>);
- depositing a copy of the research within the National Police library (<http://www.college.police.uk/What-we-do/Research/Library/Pages/default.aspx>); and
- Continuous Professional Development (CPD) events.

If the data is deemed sensitive in nature (i.e., it concerns covert techniques, tradecraft, and ongoing investigations) then in order to publish version two externally in the public domain, the data will require an appropriate level of sanitisation that prevents the disclosure of sensitive policing practices, whilst still effectively contributing to the academic literature. External outputs may include:

- signposting the research on the College of Policing's research map (<http://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Research-Map/Pages/Research-Map.aspx>);
- society of Evidence Based Policing (SEBP) <https://www.sebp.police.uk>;
- academic conferences;
- academic journals (not an exhaustive list):
 - *Intelligence and National Security* <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/fint20/current>;
 - *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/ujic20/current>;
 - *International Journal of Intelligence, Security, and Public Affairs* <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/usip20>;
 - *Policing: A Journal of Police and Practice* <https://academic.oup.com/policing>;
 - *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy* <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/gpas20/current>;
 - *Police Practice and Research* <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/gppr20/current>;
 - *The Police Journal* <https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/journal/police-journal>.

It is important that this guidance remains current and relevant. If this guidance can be improved or updated, please forward the suggested changes to NPCC Intelligence Practice Research Consortium.