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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This paper reports on the evaluation of the ASP (Armament Systems and Procedures) and PPCT (Pressure Point Control Tactics) batons trialed by approximately 150 officers at Farnborough and Southsea sub divisions between September 1993 and July 1994.

The batons were evaluated against the following key criteria:

i) number of assaults and seriousness of assaults on police officers;

ii) use for other lawful purposes such as house and vehicle entry;

iii) psychological effect on police officers;

iv) behavioural effect on offenders;

v) physical effect of the baton on offenders;

vi) usability and portability;

vii) reliability;

viii) complaints incurred;

ix) as far as was practicable, public acceptance;

x) officers personal preference, between the baton and truncheon and between the ASP and PPCT.

It was no part of the present study to review costs or provide any assessment of the technical specifications of the respective batons.

During the trial period there has been a clear downward trend in the number and seriousness of assaults on police officers. The batons were found to be effective for all purposes, whether for personal protection or entry to houses or vehicles. Officers are more inclined to carry the baton on patrol than the truncheon. Officers felt safer and more protected with the baton than the truncheon. Officers reported that they are more likely to draw and use the baton than the truncheon. It is reported that the action of fully racking up the baton was usually enough to control potentially violent offenders. Baton strikes on offenders have not caused untoward injury. Officers reported that the baton is more accessible and comfortable to carry than the truncheon. Many officers would prefer the baton to be equipped with a strap. The ASP baton suffered no damage throughout the trial, the PPCT did on several occasions, through normal usage. Although officers experienced opening difficulties with both types of baton, the problem was predominantly related to the PPCT. The pouches holding both baton types were problematic in that they failed to securely hold the baton in the pouch. The PPCT pouches recorded more complaints than the ASP. No complaints or disciplines were recorded due to use of the batons. No adverse media publicity has emanated from the baton trials.

One hundred per cent of officers preferred the baton to the truncheon. Sixty nine per cent of officers preferred the ASP, 10% the PPCT and 21% had no preference.

The ASP appears to be technically better than the PPCT.

Conclusion: the research evidence supports a switch from the truncheon to the baton, and the ASP is the preferred baton type.
SECTION 1 - AIMS AND BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

There has been a documented rise in both the number and seriousness of assaults against police officers. Given the publicity speculating that officers are inadequately protected, some commentators feel that the truncheon is an ineffective tool for self defence. Recent publicity in respect of standard equipment in other countries, especially the American style side-handled baton, led to the West Yorkshire motion at the Police Federation Conference in May 1990 for the issue of such batons to the British police. An ensuing debate led to Home Office agreement to trial various types of baton. A Working Group set up in Hampshire studied the various truncheons and batons and reported their findings in the report 'Alternatives to the Existing Police Truncheon'. As a result of that report the current evaluation was undertaken.

AIMS OF THE STUDY

Although the primary goal of this study is to assess whether assaults on police officers in both number and severity are reduced or not by use of the new style batons, there are other criteria to be considered. The key aims of this study are therefore:

i) to measure the reduction (or otherwise) in the number of assaults and seriousness of assaults on police officers;

ii) to evaluate whether batons are used effectively for other lawful purposes such as house and vehicle entry;

iii) to evaluate the psychological effect of the baton on police officers;

iv) to evaluate the behavioural effect of the baton on offenders;

v) to evaluate the physical effect of the baton on offenders;

vi) to assess the usability and portability of the baton;

vii) to assess the reliability of the baton;

viii) to measure complaints incurred due to use of the batons;
ix) to access as practicable public acceptance of the batons;

x) to access officers personal preference between the baton and truncheon and between the ASP and PPCT.

BACKGROUND

Historical

'Early man soon discovered it was easier to defend [himself] when carrying a piece of wood heavier at one end than the other rather than an ordinary stick...it is natural that the truncheon carried by police has evolved from man’s earliest tool of defence' (Finn, 1979a) [Sic]. However the truncheon is not unique to the police, ‘post office officials, colliery and dockyard police, railway, river, canal and parks police all had their own version’ (Williams, 1986). Both long and short truncheons were first ordered in 1814 for police purposes by the Home Office for both special constables and the police (After Clark, 1935). It is interesting to note that truncheons have always ‘varied greatly in size and shape’ (Dicken, 1952). Indeed the original police truncheon was 20 inches long, but in 1856 truncheons were cut down to 17 inches to conform with the new pattern. In 1887 all existing truncheons became obsolete and two new patterns were introduced. The first, intended for uniformed constables and sergeants was 15 1/2 inches long, the second, for senior officers and the CID measured 12 1/2 inches in length (After Finn, 1979a). since 1887 the pattern of the police truncheon has changed very little.

Recent Developments

There has been a documented rise in assaults against police officers in respect of both their number and seriousness (Police Review, 5.7.91; Police Review, 19.6.92; Police Review, 25.6.93). There has also been much commentary that officers have inadequate protection against attackers and some commentators feel that the truncheon is an ineffective tool for self defence (Finn, 1979b; Kingshott, 1992; Waddington, 1992). Recent publicity in respect of standard equipment in other countries, especially the side-handled baton (see appendix 1) used in America led to the West Yorkshire motion at the Police Federation Conference in May 1990 for the issue of such batons to the British police (Police, June 1990).

The ACPO Standing Sub-Committee on Self Defence, Arrest and Restraint, which included members of the Superintendents’ Association and the Police Federation was unanimous in recommending to the ACPO Personnel and Training Committee that there was a need for the side-handled baton to be introduced into the police service. However the ACPO Personnel and Training Committee felt unable to recommend the use of the side-handled baton and referred the
matter to the ACPO Public Order Sub-Committee (After Coyles, 1992). Although the Home Office offered ACPO the opportunity to trial the side-handled baton, ACPO declined (Police Review, 3.1.92). After adverse 'rank and file' reaction ACPO reconsidered its decision (Police Review, 7.2.92). Although ACPO then agreed for trials to go ahead (Police Review, 13.3.92) the trials were later shelved (Police Review, 22.5.92), in part, because of the furore caused by the Rodney King incident in Los Angeles (see appendix 2). Indeed the then Home Secretary, Kenneth Clarke, supported this view by refusing to authorise trials of the side-handled baton on the grounds that it would fundamentally alter the style of British policing, for the worse (Police Review, 27.11.92).

Because the trials of the side-handled baton had floundered, alternative batons such as the Arnold, ASP, CASCO, Celayaton, Monadnock, PPCT and 'traditional' truncheon were trialed. Details of these batons can be found in appendix 3 and details of the trials in appendix 4. The current Home Secretary, Michael Howard, announced in June 1993, that an extendible side-handled baton could now be trialed, but, reaffirmed that the rigid side-handled baton was an inappropriate piece of equipment for the British police (Police Review, 18.6.93). Indeed trials have now been completed and the Home Secretary has authorised the use of extendible side-handled batons (Police Review, 24.6.94).

**The Extendible Baton**

Extendible batons are a British invention, first manufactured in 1935 by J Hudson and Company, England (After Pence, 1992). In more recent years extendible batons have, alongside side-handled batons, become a common piece of equipment for American police officers. Indeed the generic ASP (Armament Systems and Procedures), CASCO (Counter Assault Systems) and PPCT (Pressure Point Control Tactics) are all North American companies producing police orientated equipment.

The ASP, CASCO, PPCT are all friction locking batons of similar design. In essence they consist of three steel sections of decreasing diameters. The largest of these forms the handle and the baton is carried in a collapsed state on a holder on the belt. It is therefore easily concealed. When the baton is drawn from the belt it can be carried unobtrusively in the hand until the officer is ready to extend it. A flick of the wrist then extends the baton. Collapsing, the baton is more difficult it needs to be struck firmly on a hard surface. These batons are made in a variety of lengths and ASP make a lighter 'airweight' version. Additionally the ASP baton has the facility for a torch attachment (After Tan and Camilleri, 1993).

The advantages of extendible batons over the traditional truncheon are held to be that: they are small and can hang from a pouch on the belt; are unobtrusive and therefore retain the traditional image; are comfortable to carry; are accessible; they can be held discretely in the hand in
potentially violent situations; when racked open it is reported that they have a positive psychological effect on potential attackers; they can be drawn and extended quickly even in relatively confined spaces; they are light weight and well balanced which allows for rapid strikes; offers greater length and can therefore keep offenders at a distance; they are more effective than the traditional truncheon; their use is based on traditional straight baton techniques; training is therefore simple and short; they also have the versatility to be used as a kubotan; they can be used by both men and women who are left or right handed serving on uniform, traffic or CID and performing duty on foot, pedal cycle, motorcycle or in cars. Reported disadvantages are few, namely no strap, the cost, loss of the traditional image and potential to inflict serious injury.

Scientific Evaluation

Scientific evaluation is an essential part of the evaluation of a new baton type. Various scientific evaluations of the extendible batons have been carried out. Avon and Somerset Constabulary commissioned studies by the University of Bristol and the University of Cardiff. The Police Scientific and Development Branch (PSDB) conducted a study on behalf of the Home Office. All of these studies are essentially concerned with length, weight, diameter, velocity and injury potential of the batons.

The Roberts and Nokes (1994) study at the University of Cardiff concludes:

'the results indicate that impact from the conventional police truncheon generates approximately half the pressure generated by that from the ASP baton. The question of what type and degree of injury may result from the baton impact is impossible to answer with precision...data regarding skull fracture imply that the peak force generated by either conventional truncheon or ASP baton falls within the range capable of producing such injury. Neurological injury and fracture of long bone cannot be excluded as a possible consequence.'  'there appears to have been no systematic collection or objective analysis of injuries sustained from impacts from the conventional truncheon. There also appears to be no data which allow an objective answer to the question of what injuries may have been prevented by deployment of the conventional truncheon. This question should be considered where it is proposed that the conventional truncheon be replaced by a baton so different in design.'

The Tan and Camilleri (1993) PSDB report for the Home Office concludes:

i)  'All truncheons which are strong enough to be used defensively have the ability to inflict serious or life threatening injuries. Increasing the weight and length of a truncheon will increase its effective mass and velocity at impact therefore increasing its injury potential. Reduction of the diameter of the truncheon will further increase the injury potential as the force of the impact will be concentrated over a smaller area.'
ii) The ASP, CASCO and PPCT 'which are all nominally the same length and have similar weights and dimensions, would therefore have similar injury potentials.'

iii) University of Cardiff 'estimated that the injury potential of the ASP would be approximately twice that of a standard 16 inch wooden police truncheon....whilst PSDB believes the work gives an indication of the relative injury potential there is insufficient detail for the work to be conclusive.'

iv) 'The increased injury potential needs to be weighed against the threat to the police and the desirability of increasing the ability of police officers to defend themselves.'

v) 'The use of longer truncheons increases the range of tactics that are available and therefore an appropriate training programme is essential. Correct training will help to reduce the risk of injury by identifying appropriate tactics and strike areas.'

Scientific evaluation of potential injury caused by any baton is confounded by the necessity to be furnished with the following information:

'a precise measurement for the force of the blow, an exact description of the area struck; an exact measurement of the angle at which the blow was struck; a complete description of the general health, past medical history and body structure of the person struck; professional medical examination of any injury or, in the event of death, post mortem examination and report; to measure pain and emotional trauma one would have to know the state of mind and the general pain tolerance of the person struck. It is clear that all of these complete factors cannot be examined to yield information required' (Williams, 1986).

This underlines the importance of using any baton in accordance with the principles of Section 3 of the Criminal Justice Act, 1967.
SECTION 2 - METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The two sub divisions selected for the extendible batons trial were Farnborough and Southsea. Farnborough sub division includes both Farnborough and Yateley sections. Southsea is a single station sub division. Officers from the traffic sections at Fleet, which serves Farnborough and Fratton which serves Southsea were also part of the trial. Farnborough and Yateley represent an urban rural mix, whereas Southsea is part of the City of Portsmouth and attracts increased population due to its resort status, night clubs and football ground.

Officers on both sub divisions were trained from the middle of September 1993 on a rolling programme, whereby officers were issued with batons as they were successfully trained. Training was completed in December 1993. For the first part of the trial, from September 1993 to the end of March 1994, the ASP was deployed to officers serving in the Farnborough sub division and the PPCT to Southsea officers. Batons were then exchanged and issued to officers at the other sub division for the second part of the trial which concluded at the end of July 1994. An Interim Report was completed at the end of the first part of the trial (appendix 5).

Sample

By December 1993 136 officers were trained, 72 at Farnborough (Farnborough 42, Yateley 26, Fleet traffic 4) and 64 at Southsea (Southsea 60, Fratton traffic 4). Each sub division had a complement of uniform (including foot and mobile patrol, area beat officers, rural beat officers and station duty officers), traffic and CID officers. The sample included males and females; constables, sergeants and inspectors; of all ages and service lengths.

The Pre Trial questionnaire was sent to all officers in the Farnborough and Southsea sub divisions before training and issue of batons. The Interim and final Trial questionnaires were sent only to officers trained and issued with batons.

Measures

The following details were collected via the Pre Trial questionnaire (appendix 6):

i) organisational factors: sub division, department, rank;

ii) demographic characteristics: age, gender, length of service;
The Interim Trial questionnaire (appendix 7) collected the same information as the Pre Trial questionnaire and in addition the following details were obtained:

i) technical factors relating to: problems opening and closing the baton, other problems with the baton or pouch, problems with holding the baton, the need for the baton to have a strap;

ii) personal perceptions in respect of: the likelihood of drawing or using the baton more than the truncheon, acceptability of the baton to the public, whether the baton gives officers a false sense of security;

iii) comparative factors: advantages of the baton over the truncheon, disadvantages of the baton over the truncheon, officers preference between the baton and truncheon.

The Final Trial questionnaire (appendix 8) collected the same information as the Pre Trial and Interim questionnaires and additionally the following information:

i) comparative factors: officers preference for the ASP or PPCT or whether they did not have a preference.

Additionally, everytime the baton was used in accordance with the Protocol of Use (appendix 9) details were collected via the Baton Evaluation form (appendix 10):

i) organisational factors;

ii) demographic characteristics;

iii) usage details: incident details including time, date, location, number of suspects, type of weapon faced if appropriate, arrests made if appropriate, whether the officer would have drawn or used the truncheon if faced with similar circumstances;

iv) injury details: officer reporting, other police officers, third party (including the offender);

v) use of the baton: after the baton was drawn whether it was kept closed but not further used, kept closed and used, fully extended but not further used, fully extended and used;

vi) effect of the baton: after the baton was drawn whether the suspect complied or not;

vii) training assessment: measure of how helpful or unhelpful the training had been.

Procedure

All details were obtained from:

i) the Pre Trial questionnaire administered in early September 1993 prior to the commencement of the trial, the Interim Trial questionnaire sent out at the end of March 1994 prior to the exchange of batons and the Final Trial questionnaire distributed at the end of June 1994. Officers received copies of these questionnaires through the internal...
post and returned them via the same means.

ii) the Baton Evaluation form completed by officers every time a baton was drawn or used.

iii) data about the number and seriousness of assaults and sickness was obtained from an internal injury on duty form (AD85) and from the Hampshire Constabulary Personnel Computer.

iv) information in respect of the physical effect of the baton on offenders was obtained from custody records.

v) details of complaints against police were obtained from the Complaints and Discipline department.

vi) assessment of public acceptance of the batons was achieved through environmental scanning.

**Analysis**

Once all the data had been collected from the various questionnaires and pro formas outlined above, analysis was undertaken by using SPSS (X).
RESULTS

Introduction

The Pre Trial questionnaire was distributed to all 187 officers serving in the Farnborough and Southsea sub divisions, 135 were returned which represents a 72% return rate. In the two sub divisions 136 officers were trained, to whom Interim Trial questionnaires were distributed, 109 were returned representing a return rate of 80%. Due to officers being posted from Farnborough and Southsea throughout the trial, the number of officers taking part in the trial declined. Therefore, 128 Final Trial questionnaires were distributed, 100 were returned, a return rate of 78%. In total 114 Baton Evaluation forms were returned.

Organisational Details of the Sample

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of Pre Trial, Interim, Final and Evaluation forms returned by organisational details of sub division, department and rank.

Table 1. Organisational Details of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Details</th>
<th>Pre Trial n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Interim n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Final n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Evaluation n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnborough</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southsea</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CID</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insp</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>114</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

Table 2 shows the number and percentage of Pre Trial, Interim, Final and Evaluation forms returned by demographic characteristics of gender, age and length of service. It is notable that female officers used the batons less than would be expected from their population.

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristics</th>
<th>Pre Trial</th>
<th>Interim</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baton Usage

Throughout the trial batons were used on 114 occasions. Batons were drawn in the closed state and not further used on 38 occasions; drawn, extended but not further used on 46 occasions; drawn, extended and used on 14 occasions and used to gain entry to houses or vehicles on a further 16 occasions.

Reduction in the Number and Seriousness of Assaults

Assaults are classified as assault 1 (minor assault - spat at, kicked, punched), assault 2 (minor injuries - grazes, bites, cuts, stitches) and assault 3 (serious assaults - broken bones). Table 3 shows the assault classification by the number of officers assaulted. The column ‘previous year’ relates to the number of assaults sustained during the corresponding months in the year preceding the trial. The next column displays the number of assaults on officers not trained or issued with a
baton during the trial and the following column discloses officers assaulted during the trial who have been trained and issued with a baton. The final column indicates the total number of officers assaulted throughout the trial. It can be seen that during the trial period there was a clear downward trend in both the number and seriousness of assaults.

Table 3. Assault Classification by the Number of Officers Assaulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assault Classification</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Trial Period Officer Untrained</th>
<th>Trial Period Officer Trained</th>
<th>Trial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the number of days sick and absences sick taken by officers who were assaulted. The column ‘previous year’ relates to the days and absences sick recorded during the corresponding months in the year before the trial started. The next column displays the days and absences sick taken by assaulted officers not trained or issued with a baton during the trial and the following column discloses the same for those who have been trained and issued with a baton. The final column indicates the total number of days and absences due to sickness throughout the trial. It can be seen that during the trial period the number of days sick recorded by officers trained and issued with the baton slightly decreased, although overall a sharp rise is recorded. However the number of absences sick due to assaults declined.

Table 4. Sickness Days and Absences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sickness</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>Trial Period Officer Untrained</th>
<th>Trial Period Officer Trained</th>
<th>Trial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effectiveness of Batons Used for Other Lawful Purposes

Other lawful purposes are those other than personal protection and mainly include entry to houses and vehicles. The batons are reported as being effective for these purposes.
Psychological Effect of the Baton on Police Officers

Table 5 shows the results to the question 'how often did you carry your truncheon/baton with you?' Only 47% of officers frequently carried the truncheon whereas 93-95% frequently carried the baton.

Table 5. Frequency of Truncheon or Baton Carriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Pre Trial (Truncheon)</th>
<th>Interim (Baton)</th>
<th>Final (Baton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 displays the results to the question 'in situations where you found yourself physically at risk, how safe did carrying the baton make you feel?' It can be seen that only 18% of officers felt 'very safe' or 'safe' carrying the truncheon whereas 88-89% did so carrying the baton.

Table 6. Safety Level by Truncheon or Baton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Level</th>
<th>Pre Trial (Truncheon)</th>
<th>Interim (Baton)</th>
<th>Final (Baton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither safe nor unsafe</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsafe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 shows the results to the question 'in situations where you found yourself physically at risk, which degree of protection did carrying the baton offer you?' It is notable that no officers considered the truncheon to offer 'considerable protection.' although 43-48% of officers reported the baton offered 'considerable protection.'

Table 7. Protection Level by Truncheon or Baton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Level</th>
<th>Pre Trial (Truncheon)</th>
<th>Interim (Baton)</th>
<th>Final (Baton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerable protection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some protection</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little protection</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No protection</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to me</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the results to the question 'in violent situations, would you be more or less likely to draw the baton compared with the truncheon?' This table indicates that 67-71% of officers considered that they are more likely to draw the baton compared with the truncheon.

Table 8. Likelihood of Drawing the Baton Compared With the Truncheon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of Drawing</th>
<th>Interim (Baton)</th>
<th>Final (Baton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As likely</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 displays the results to the question 'in violent situations, would you be more or less likely to use the baton compared with the truncheon?'. It can be seen that 35-40% of officers considered that they were more likely to use the baton compared with the truncheon.

### Table 9. Likelihood of Using the Baton Compared With the Truncheon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of Use</th>
<th>Interim (Baton)</th>
<th>Final (Baton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As likely</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less likely</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Baton Evaluation form was completed when officers used the baton. Officers were asked 'would you have drawn your truncheon in similar circumstances?', 47% replied 'yes', 46% 'no' and 7% 'didn't know'. To the question 'would you have used your truncheon in similar circumstances?', the replies were 'yes' 40%, 'no' 40% and 'didn't know' 20%.

On the Final Trial questionnaire officers were asked 'do you think that the baton gives a false sense of security to those carrying it?', 4% replied 'yes', 93% 'no' and 3% did not respond.

### Behavioural Effect of the Baton on Offenders

When officers were faced by violent offenders they reported that in 75% of cases the action of drawing and extending the baton was sufficient to control the situation. Furthermore written feedback concerning the effect of this action confirmed this finding.

### Physical Effects of the Baton on Offenders

The batons have been used to strike offenders who were subsequently arrested on six separate occasions. On four occasions no injuries were recorded due to the batons strike. In one case the prisoner was taken to the hospital and examined by the doctor but then refused further medical attention. Finally an injured prisoner was examined by a doctor who recorded 'tenderness to lower calf - painful - no swelling obvious or bruise apparent'. Furthermore at three particularly problematic football matches, Portsmouth versus Millwall (2.4.94), West Bromwich Albion (8.5.94) and Southampton (10.5.94) large scale public disorder ensued and batons were used to
strike offenders but no arrests were made or injuries reported. As far as is known baton strikes have not therefore caused any untoward injuries during the trial period.

**Usability and Portability of the Baton**

On the Final Trial questionnaire in response to the question *'did you experience any difficulty keeping hold of the baton?*,* 6% of officers experienced problems, 93% did not and 1% failed to respond. However in response to the question *'do you think it would be helpful for the baton to have a strap?*, 53% replied 'yes', 41% replied 'no' and 6% failed to respond.

Table 10 shows the results to the question *'how accessible have you found the truncheon/baton?*'

It can be seen that the truncheon was found to be 'very accessible' by 2% of officers whereas the baton was 'very accessible' to 56-61% of officers.

**Table 10. Accessibility of the Baton Compared With the Truncheon**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Pre Trial (Truncheon)</th>
<th>Interim (Baton)</th>
<th>Final (Baton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very accessible</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccessible</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very inaccessible</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to me</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 reveals the results to the question *'how comfortable have you found the truncheon/baton to carry?*’ It is notable that 22% of officers reported the truncheon to be 'very comfortable' or 'comfortable,' whereas 88% found the baton to be 'very comfortable' or 'comfortable.'
Table 11. Comfort of the Baton Compared With the Truncheon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Pre Trial (Truncheon) n</th>
<th>Pre Trial (Truncheon) %</th>
<th>Interim (Baton) n</th>
<th>Interim (Baton) %</th>
<th>Final (Baton) n</th>
<th>Final (Baton) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncomfortable</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very uncomfortable</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable to me</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability of the Baton

The ASP batons have not suffered any damage throughout the trial, although four of the PPCT batons did. Two became bent through normal usage and another two lost their screw on ends whilst being opened.

Results to the question on the Interim Trial questionnaire ‘did you experience any difficulties opening or closing the baton?’ indicated that 3% of officers experienced problems, 95% did not and 2% failed to respond. However results to the same question on the Final Trial questionnaire indicated that 26% (26 cases) of officers had problems and 74% (74 cases) did not. Further analysis of the data indicated that the ASP was problematic in 5 (19%) cases and the PPCT in 21 (81%) cases.

The pouches holding the batons have been found to be inadequate. In the Final Trial questionnaire ten officers complained that the ASP and twenty officers that the PPCT pouches were not deep enough and too loose, thus allowing the baton to fall out of the pouch. In particular the PPCT pouches were criticised for not having a restraining strap to keep the baton in the pouch. Other complaints about the pouches were that they moved on the belt and that they lost their shape. It has been advocated by several officers that ‘quik kuf’ style pouches, that can be angled on the belt to suit the individual, ought to be considered.

Complaints Incurred due to the Use of the Baton

Complaints and Discipline Department have not recorded any complaints or disciplines due to the use of the batons.
Public Acceptance of the Baton

In the national newspapers reports of baton trials have been published, albeit not specifically about Hampshire. Articles and letters have also appeared in Police and Police Review. A photograph of a Hampshire officer holding a fully extended baton has been published in the Portsmouth News (18.6.93). Articles have also appeared in two editions of the Force newspaper 'Frontline'. Furthermore the trials were mentioned in the Chief Constable's Annual Report, 1993. There appears to have been no adverse comment in the press or elsewhere about officers being issued with and using batons.

In response to the question on the Final Trial questionnaire 'do you think that the image of a police officer with a fully extended baton is acceptable or unacceptable to the public?', 95% considered it acceptable, 3% unacceptable and 2% failed to respond. Accompanying comments suggested that the public are supportive of officers being issued with batons.

Training Assessment

Officers who used the batons were asked to assess how helpful they found the training programme. Although 18% of officers failed to respond the other replies were 'very helpful' 47%, 'helpful' 33%, 'unhelpful' 2% and 'very unhelpful' 0%.

Preference for the Truncheon or Baton

On the Final Trial questionnaire all officers stated a preference for the baton over the truncheon. Furthermore 69% preferred the ASP, 10% the PPCT and 21% had no preference.
DISCUSSION

Reduction in the Number and Seriousness of Assaults

Although there is a clear downward trend in both the number and seriousness of assaults, other elements such as the short duration of the trial, that the total number of assaults are few, 'quik kufs' have been introduced between the previous years assault figures and the trial and the effect of the training per se as opposed to the effect of the baton are all potentially contributory factors.

Although the number of days sick recorded by assaulted officers only decreased slightly, the overall number of days sick has increased by 60%. However the number of absences sick recorded by officers assaulted has decreased sharply. The increase in days sick can be attributed to two officers being off duty for 21 days (officer trained and issued with a baton) and 23 days (officer untrained and not issued with a baton) both after serious assaults. A longer time period is really needed to assess the sustainability of these findings.

Effectiveness of Batons Used for Other Lawful Purposes

Although batons are reported as being effective for other lawful purposes such as house and vehicle entry there is however a need for training to be given to officers, for these purposes, to ensure that batons are not damaged.

Psychological Effect of the Baton on Police Officers

More officers more frequently carried the baton with them than the truncheon. Officers that reported that they either 'sometimes' or 'never' carried the baton were inspectors, sergeants, station duty or CID officers. All front line officers reported carrying the baton 'often' or 'always'.

Although there is a clear trend for the baton to be drawn more often, written comments accompanying the question indicated that this was in the closed state to increase confidence, something to which the truncheon is less likely to lend itself. However there is also evidence that the baton is used more often. Although this could be interpreted as correct level of use, in the circumstances, for an appropriate and effective piece of equipment, it could also arguably indicate the possibility of increased use in the future. The consequences of increased use can only be subject of speculation.

Sir Paul Condon, the commissioner of Metropolitan police stated in their Force newspaper, The Job, 'we must feel confident in our work but at the same time be on our guard against over reliance on the protective capability of any particular piece of equipment'. Although only 4% of officers in the Final Trial questionnaire considered that the baton gives a false sense of security,
written feedback expresses concern that some officers appear over confident with the baton. Clearly this is of some concern.

**Usability and Portability of the Baton**

Over half of the officers trialing the batons would prefer the baton to have a strap, several officers commenting that a strap would be particularly useful when hands become sweaty. If a baton is taken off of an officer because it is difficult to hold due to not having a strap then any reported advantages are obviously negated. This is therefore an area that requires further consideration.

Despite most officers reporting that the batons were either 'very accessible' or 'accessible' written feedback strongly indicates that the baton is considered inaccessible when worn on the belt under a jacket. Three possible solutions are:

i) officers are issued with an equipment belt designed to be worn over external clothing and catering for the baton, 'quik kufs', radio and torch.

ii) future training and 'protocol of use' should encourage and allow officers to store the baton wherever it is most accessible and comfortable.

iii) future training and 'protocol of use' should also allow officers to draw and use the baton in the closed state.

**Reliability of the Baton**

Two PPCT batons have lost their screw on ends whilst being opened. There are real dangers associated with such problems.

There are a few problems reported in the final stage of the trial with a quarter of the batons failing to stay open when racked up. Although it has been identified that this is predominantly the PPCT batons it is nevertheless important to note that there were five reports of the ASP experiencing these problems. This could indicate that the batons are susceptible to wear and tear or indicative of the need to adjust the batons correctly for use and for regular maintenance. Both these issues could be addressed through training.

A report by the Metro Dade Police Department (1993) reported that ASP commissioned an independent study by Technimet Corporation, to conduct corrosion resistance tests on the ASP and PPCT batons. Batons were fully extended and placed in a salt fog cabinet. Results showed that after 27 hours the ASP showed no signs of rust corrosion whereas corrosion was prevalent on
the PPCT. This might be of particular relevance in a coastal county such as Hampshire and the Isle of Wight.

Training Assessment

Only two officers were critical of the training programme. One occasion was in respect of entry to a house or vehicle and the comment made was that use of the baton for such a purpose was not addressed during training. The other occasion was where a shield team entered a small flat and batons were drawn and racked up prior to entry. The adverse comment related to the difficulty of drawing and racking a baton up in a confined space. This is not a reflection on the training but comment on the limitation of a longer baton in a small enclosed area.
CONCLUSIONS

1. The number and seriousness of assaults on officers has decreased.

2. The number of days and absences sick recorded by officers trained and issued with the baton have decreased.

3. The batons are effective for the purposes of house and vehicle entry.

4. The majority of officers (95%) frequently carry batons on patrol whereas fewer than 50% of officers frequently carried the truncheon.

5. Officers feel substantially safer carrying the baton in situations of physical risk than the truncheon.

6. Officers report that the baton offers considerable protection in situations of physical risk.

7. Approximately 70% of officers considered that in violent situations they are more likely to draw the baton than the truncheon.

8. About 40% of officers believed that in violent situations they are more likely to use the baton than the truncheon.

9. Officers were equally divided about the likelihood of their drawing or using the truncheon or not in similar circumstances when they used the baton.

10. On 75% of occasions when officers were faced by violent offenders the action of racking up the baton was sufficient to control the situation.

11. Baton strikes have not caused untoward injuries to offenders during the trial period.

12. Although 95% of officers reported no difficulty in holding the baton, over 50% would prefer the baton to have a strap.

13. Officers report that the baton is significantly more accessible than the truncheon.
14. Officers report that the baton is substantially more comfortable to carry than the truncheon.

15. Although the ASP batons suffered no damage throughout the trial, four PPCT batons were damaged through normal usage.

16. Problems were experienced opening both baton types. However results of the Final Trial questionnaire indicated that of the 25 problematic batons, 5 were ASP's and 20 PPCT's.

17. The pouches holding both baton types were inadequate mainly because they were too loose thus allowing the batons to readily fall out. The ASP pouch on balance was better than the PPCT pouch.

18. No complaints or disciplines were recorded due to use of the batons.

19. The baton trials both nationally and in Hampshire have been subject to much publicity. No adverse comment has been made about officers being issued with or using batons. Furthermore 95% of officers believe that the fully extended baton is an acceptable image to the public, in appropriate circumstances.

20. Officers overwhelmingly consider baton training to be helpful.

21. One hundred per cent of officers preferred the baton to the truncheon.

22. Sixty nine percent of officers prefer the ASP, 10% prefer the PPCT and 21% had no preference.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Preference

1. Issue the ASP baton to all Hampshire officers subject to:

Policy Considerations

2. the implication of increased injury potential of the batons;

3. the implication of the increased use of the baton;

4. the drafting of a ‘Protocol of Use’ for the baton to potentially contain the elements in the existing protocol and additionally including permission for officers to use the batons in the closed state and to carry the baton anywhere and anyhow that is accessible and comfortable;

Practical Considerations

5. the implication of the torch attachment to the ASP;

6. the implication of the batons not having a strap and half the officers preferring the batons to have a strap;

7. the need to issue an equipment belt designed to be worn over external clothing and catering for the baton, ‘quik kufs’, radio and torch;

Training Considerations

8. use of the baton to enter houses and vehicles;

9. the potential dangers of over reliance on the baton;

10. correct adjustment of the spring in the batons to ensure the baton racks up readily and stays racked up;

11. regular maintenance of batons.
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APPENDIX 1. SIDE-HANDELED BATON

The Monadnock PR24 (Prosecutor and Restraint) was developed in 1971 by Lon Anderson, an American conservation officer. Whilst on patrol he was attacked by a gang and found that his straight stick was ineffective. He remembered from his service days how the police in Okinawa (mountainous Japanese island in the Ryukyu group, captured by USA in World War 2), used a tonfa in a spinning action to quell a riot. Anderson developed the idea of the tonfa into the PR24 which was patented in 1974. The Los Angeles County Sheriffs department conducted a six month trial and became the first department to adopt it. The Los Angeles Police introduced it in March 1980. Many United States police departments have now adopted it (After Williams, 1986; Le Bihan, 1992). The Toronto police, in Canada have used the PR24 since 1982 (Kingshott, 1992). A full descriptive report of the side-handled baton can be found in Fraser (1992).
On 3rd March 1991, Rodney King was pursued by the California Highway Patrol and eventually stopped. The incident culminated with three Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) officers beating King with their side-handled batons. Twenty-one other LAPD officers were at the scene. None intervened to stop the beating. King sustained 56 blows and repeated kicks. The incident was videoed by an amateur with a video camera. ‘Never before in the history of American law enforcement has one event so graphically depicted police officers at their worst to the entire country. In the aftermath of the incident, the video tape was shown on major television networks for eight consecutive days, and almost a month later there were still daily articles in the leading newspapers’ (After Gallagher, 1991). Subsequently ‘a six week trial ended with the acquittal of the officers charged with assaulting Rodney King. Despite the overwhelming evidence, the jury did not believe what they saw and acquitted the officers involved. That verdict resulted in a death toll of 44, making the Los Angeles riots the worst in United States history with 1,900 injured, 5,200 arrested, in excess of 3,700 buildings destroyed by fire and the costs estimated in excess of $1 billion’ (Kingshott, 1992).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baton Type</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Mass (Kg)</th>
<th>Length (mm)</th>
<th>Strike Surface Diameter (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truncheon</td>
<td>Hardwood</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>399 (16&quot;)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Solid Nylon</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>524 (21&quot;)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celayaton</td>
<td>Rattan Coated in Rubber</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>668 (26&quot;)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>514 (21&quot;)</td>
<td>196 (8&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASCO</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>536 (21&quot;)</td>
<td>207.5 (8&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCT</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>519.5 (21&quot;)</td>
<td>196 (8&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monadnock</td>
<td>Aluminum and Polycarbonate</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>609 (24&quot;)</td>
<td>358 (14&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 4. ALTERNATIVE BATON TRIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Area</th>
<th>Baton Type</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon and Somerset</td>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASP (Airweight)</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PPCT</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>ASP (21” and 26”)</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CASCO</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monadnock</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celayaton</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monadnock</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Truncheon</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monadnock</td>
<td>Trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5. INTERIM TRIAL EVALUATION REPORT

INTERIM REPORT OF THE TRIAL OF THE EXTENDIBLE BATONS AT FARNBOROUGH AND SOUTHSEA

INTRODUCTION

Background

There has been a documented rise in both the number and seriousness of assaults against police officers. Given the publicity speculating that officers are inadequately protected, some commentators feel that the truncheon is an ineffective tool for self defence. In May 1990 West Yorkshire tabled a motion at the Police Federation Conference for the issue of American style side-handled batons. An ensuing debate finally led to Home Office agreement to trial various types of baton.

Straight Baton Trials in other Forces

The Arnold a 21” rigid plastic baton has been fully introduced into both Dorset and Northumbria. The Celayaton a 26” lightweight rattan stick coated in rubber is being trialed by the Metropolitan police. The Monadnock 24” telescopic baton, a two piece metal baton with a 14” handle and a 10” extension is being trialed by the Merseyside, Metropolitan and Surrey Forces. The generic ASP, CASCO and PPCT batons are all three piece extendible telescopic batons, 8” when closed extending to 21” when opened. Avon and Somerset have fully introduced the ASP; Merseyside are trialing the ASP and CASCO and Surrey the ASP.

Hampshire Baton Trial

Two types of extendible batons were chosen for Hampshire. The trial started in September 1993 at Farnborough and Southsea with a rolling programme of training. By December 1993 136 officers were trained, 72 at Farnborough (Farnborough 42, Yately 26 and Fleet traffic 4) and 64 at Southsea (Southsea 60, Fratton traffic 4). The ASP was trialed at Farnborough and the PPCT at Southsea from September 1993 until March 1994. The batons were then swapped around and issued to officers at the other station. At present it is planned that the batons will be withdrawn at the end of July when the trial will be completed. A final report will then be prepared.

METHODOLOGY

Prior to training and issue of the batons a pre trial questionnaire was sent to all officers stationed at both Farnborough and Southsea. Throughout the trial an evaluation form is completed every
time a baton is used, as defined by the 'Protocol of Use'. During March 1994 an Interim questionnaire was distributed to all officers trialing the batons to assess the particular baton they were using. It is intended that at the end of the trial there will be a final questionnaire thus completing data collection.

RESULTS

The study investigated ten key issues. Preliminary results are as follows:

**Reduction in number and seriousness of assaults on police.**

Assaults are classified as assault 1 (minor assault - spat at, kicked, punched), assault 2 (minor injuries - grazes, bites, cuts, stitches) and assault 3 (serious assaults - broken bones). Table 1 shows the assault classification by the number of officers assaulted. The column 'previous year' relates to the number of assaults sustained during the corresponding months in the year before the trial started. The next column displays the number of assaults on officers not trained or issued with a baton during the trial and the fourth column shows officers assaulted during the trial who have been trained and issued with a baton. The final column indicates the number of officers assaulted throughout the trial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assault Class</th>
<th>Previous Year</th>
<th>During the Trial Officer Untrained</th>
<th>During the Trial Officer Trained</th>
<th>Trial Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the duration of the trial is short, the number of assaults are few and 'quik kufs' have been introduced between the previous years assault figures and this trial, there is a clear downward trend in both the number and seriousness of assaults.

**Effectiveness of batons used for other lawful purposes.**

Other lawful purposes are those other than personal protection and mainly include entry to houses and vehicles. The batons are reported effective for these purposes. There is a need for instructions and training to be given to officers to ensure that batons are not damaged.
Psychological effect of the baton on police officers.

Table 2 shows the results to the question 'In situations where you found yourself physically at risk, how safe did carrying the truncheon/baton make you feel?'

**Table 2 Safety by Truncheon or Baton.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Level</th>
<th>Truncheon</th>
<th>Baton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Safe</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Safe or Unsafe</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the results to the question 'In situations where you found yourself physically at risk, what degree of protection did carrying the truncheon/baton offer you?'

**Table 3 Protection by Truncheon or Baton.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Level</th>
<th>Truncheon</th>
<th>Baton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considerable Protection</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Protection</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Protection</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In respect of drawing and using the baton 72% of officers felt that they were more likely to draw the baton compared with the truncheon. However written comments accompanying this question indicated that the drawing of the baton was in the closed state to increase confidence, something to which the truncheon is less likely to lend itself. In respect of using the baton 38% of officers felt that they would be more likely to use the baton than the truncheon. There is a trend for the baton to be both drawn and used more than the existing truncheon.

**Behavioural effect of the baton on offenders.**

When officers were faced by offenders they have reported that in 77% of cases (33 occasions) when the baton was drawn and fully extended that was sufficient to control the situation. Furthermore, written feedback concerning the positive effects of drawing and extending the baton have been good.
Physical effects of the baton on offenders.

To date the batons have been used to strike offenders on five separate occasions. On three occasions no injuries were recorded due to the batons strike. In one case the prisoner was taken to hospital and examined by a doctor but then refused further medical attention. Finally an injured prisoner was examined by a doctor who stated ‘tenderness to lower calf - painful - no swelling obvious or bruise apparent.’ Baton strikes have not therefore caused any untoward injuries.

Usability and portability of the baton.

In the Pre Trial Survey 2% of officers reported the truncheon as being 'Very Accessible' and 49% 'Accessible.' In the Interim Survey 61% found it 'Very Accessible' and 36% 'Accessible.' However written feedback indicates that the baton is inaccessible when worn on the belt under the anorak. In respect of comfort the Pre Trial Survey recorded 3% of officers found the truncheon 'Very Comfortable', 19% 'Comfortable' and 47% 'Uncomfortable'. This compares with the Interim Trial Survey results where 50% of officers found carriage of the baton 'Very Comfortable', 38% 'Comfortable' and only 8% 'Uncomfortable'. The baton is therefore both more accessible and more comfortable to carry than the truncheon.

Reliability of the baton.

The ASP batons have not suffered damage throughout the trial. However four of the PPCT batons did sustain damage. Two have become bent through normal usage and another two lost their screw on ends whilst being opened. There are real dangers associated with such problems.

Although 3% of officers stated that they experienced problems holding the baton it is noteworthy that 47% of officers considered that the baton ought to be equipped with a strap.

A report by the Metro Dade police department reported that, in January 1993, ASP commissioned an independent study by Technimet Corporation, to conduct corrosion resistance tests on the different types of extendible batons. Batons were fully extended and placed in a salt fog cabinet. Results showed that after 27 hours the PPCT showed signs of rust corrosion. However there were no signs on the ASP. This information might obviate officers personal preference between the ASP and PPCT.

Complaints incurred due to the use of the baton.

Complaints and Discipline department have not recorded any complaints or disciplines due to the use of the batons.
Public acceptance of the baton.

In the national newspapers reports of baton trials have been published, albeit not specifically about Hampshire. Articles and letters have also appeared in Police Review. A photograph of a Hampshire officer holding a fully extended baton has been published in the Portsmouth News. Articles have also featured in two editions of Front Line. Furthermore the trials were mentioned in the Chief Constable's Annual Report. Despite this publicity there appears to have been no adverse comment in the press or elsewhere about officers being issued with and using these batons.

Officers were asked whether they considered the batons to be acceptable to the public or not. 93% considered they were acceptable, 4% not acceptable and 3% did not know.

CONCLUSION

During the period of the trial to date there is a clear downward trend in the number and seriousness of assaults on officers. The batons have been found to be effective for all purposes, whether entry to premises/vehicles or for personal protection. Officers feel safer and more protected with the baton than the truncheon. Likewise officers find the batons more accessible and more comfortable to carry than the truncheon. Officers trialing the batons overwhelmingly prefer the batons to the truncheon. Officers are, however, more likely to use the new baton than the truncheon although at this time there appears not to have been any untoward consequences. Of the two baton types it would appear that the ASP is manufactured to a higher specification than the PPCT.

Inspector Martin Laux
Research and Development
May 1994
This questionnaire is designed to gather information about a number of issues concerning truncheons. It is not designed to identify you as an individual, but to gain an overall appreciation of the present situation. Your experience and opinion from an operational point of view are of prime importance. All information will be treated in confidence.

Please complete this questionnaire, and return it in the envelope provided, to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, Police Headquarters, Winchester, by Friday, 1st October, 1993.

Please tick the relevant boxes.

**Background Details**

Sub Division:  
- Farnborough [ ]  
- Southsea [ ]

Department:  
- Uniform [ ]  
- Traffic [ ]  
- CID [ ]

Rank:  
- Constable [ ]  
- Sergeant [ ]  
- Insp [ ]

Gender:  
- Male [ ]  
- Female [ ]

Age:  
- [ ] years

Length of Service:  
- [ ] (to nearest year)
Usage

How often do you carry your truncheon with you?

- Always
- Often
- Sometimes
- Never

If you do not regularly carry your truncheon with you, please explain why not:

____________________________________________________________________________________

How many times in the last five years have you used a truncheon to defend yourself? (Please give your best estimate).

____________________________________________________________________________________

How many times in the last five years have you used a truncheon for other lawful purposes? (e.g. entry to houses).

____________________________________________________________________________________

What lawful purposes have you used a truncheon for? Please list:

____________________________________________________________________________________

Safety and Protection

In situations where you may feel yourself to be physically at risk, how safe does carrying a truncheon make you feel?

- Very safe
- Safe
- Neither safe or unsafe
- Unsafe
- Very Unsafe
In situations where you may feel yourself to be physically at risk, what degree of protection does carrying a truncheon offer you?

Considerable Protection  
Some Protection  
Little Protection  
No Protection

**Accessibility and Comfort**

How accessible do you find the truncheon?

Very accessible  
Accessible  
Inaccessible  
Very inaccessible

How comfortable do you find the truncheon to carry?

Very Comfortable  
Comfortable  
Uncomfortable  
Very Uncomfortable

**Other**

If you wish to make any further comments, please write them below.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please return it to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, in the envelope provided.
Interim Trial Survey

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the use of the baton during the first part of the trial. This questionnaire is not designed to identify you as an individual, but to gain an overall appreciation of the trial. Your experience and opinion from an operational point of view are of prime importance. All information will be treated in confidence.

Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, Police Headquarters, Winchester, by Monday, 21st March, 1994.

Please tick relevant boxes.

**Background Details**

Sub Division: Farnborough [ ] Southsea [ ]

Department: Uniform [ ] Traffic [ ] CID [ ]

Rank: Constable [ ] Sergeant [ ] Insp [ ]

Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Age: [ ] years

Length of Service: [ ] (to nearest year)

**Usage**

What baton type did you trial? ASP [ ] PPCT [ ]

How often did you carry your baton with you?

Always [ ]

Often [ ]

Sometimes [ ]

Never [ ]

If you did not regularly carry your baton with you, please explain why not:

How many times during the trial have you used the baton to defend yourself?
How many times during the trial have you used the baton for other lawful purposes? (e.g. entry to houses)  

What lawful purposes have you used your baton for? Please list:

**Safety and Protection**

In situations where you found yourself physically at risk, how safe did carrying the baton make you feel?

- Very safe
- Safe
- Neither safe or unsafe
- Unsafe
- Very unsafe
- Not applicable to me

In situations where you found yourself physically at risk, what degree of protection did carrying the baton offer you?

- Considerable protection
- Some protection
- Little protection
- No protection
- Not applicable to me

**Accessibility and Comfort**

How accessible have you found the baton? How comfortable have you found the baton to carry?

- Very accessible
- Accessible
- Inaccessible
- Very inaccessible
- Very comfortable
- Comfortable
- Uncomfortable
- Very uncomfortable
**Technical**

Did you experience any difficulties opening or closing the baton?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, please explain:

Have you experienced any other difficulties with the baton?

Did you experience any difficulty keeping hold of the baton?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, what problems did you experience?

Do you think it would be helpful for the baton to have a strap?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

**Personal**

In violent situations, would you be more or less likely to **draw** the baton compared with the truncheon:

More likely to draw the baton? [ ]  As likely to draw the baton? [ ]  Less likely to draw the baton? [ ]

In violent situations, would you be more or less likely to **use** the baton compared with the truncheon:

More likely to use the baton? [ ]  As likely to use the baton? [ ]  Less likely to use the baton? [ ]

Do you think that the image of a police officer with a fully extended baton is:

Acceptable to the public? [ ]  Unacceptable to the public? [ ]
Do you think that the baton gives a false sense of security to those carrying it?
Yes    No

Please give reasons for your answer:


_________________________

Comparison

What advantages do you believe the baton has compared with the truncheon?


_________________________

What disadvantages do you believe the baton has compared with the truncheon?


_________________________

Would you prefer to be issued with a:    Baton?    Truncheon?


Other

If you wish to make any further comments, please write them below or continue on a separate sheet.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please return it to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX 8. FINAL TRIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

THE TRIAL OF THE EXTENDIBLE BATON
AT FARNBOROUGH AND SOUTHSEA 1993-1994

Final Trial Survey

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the use of the baton during the final part of the trial. This questionnaire is not designed to identify you as an individual, but to gain an overall appreciation of the trial. Your experience and opinion from an operational point of view are of prime importance. All information will be treated in confidence. Please complete this questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, Police Headquarters, Winchester, by Wednesday, 6th July.

Please tick relevant boxes.

Background Details

Sub Division: Farnborough [ ] Southsea [ ]

Department: Uniform [ ] Traffic [ ] CID [ ]

Rank: Constable [ ] Sergeant [ ] Insp [ ]

Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

Age: [ ] years

Length of Service: [ ] (to nearest year)

Usage

What baton type did you trial? ASP [ ] PPCT [ ]

How often did you carry your baton with you?

Always [ ]

Often [ ]

Sometimes [ ]

Never [ ]

If you did not regularly carry your baton with you, please explain why not:

How many times during the trial have you used the baton to defend yourself?

[ ]
How many times during the trial have you used the baton for other lawful purposes? (e.g. entry to houses)

What lawful purposes have you used your baton for? Please list:

**Safety and Protection**

In situations where you found yourself physically at risk, how safe did carrying the baton make you feel?

- Very safe
- Safe
- Neither safe or unsafe
- Unsafe
- Very unsafe
- Not applicable to me

In situations where you found yourself physically at risk, what degree of protection did carrying the baton offer you?

- Considerable protection
- Some protection
- Little protection
- No protection
- Not applicable to me

**Accessibility and Comfort**

How accessible have you found the baton?  How comfortable have you found the baton to carry?

- Very accessible
- Accessible
- Inaccessible
- Very Inaccessible
- Very comfortable
- Comfortable
- Uncomfortable
- Very uncomfortable
Technical
Did you experience any difficulties opening or closing the baton?
Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please explain:

Have you experienced any other difficulties with the baton or pouch?

Did you experience any difficulty keeping hold of the baton?
Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, what problems did you experience?

Do you think it would be helpful for the baton to have a strap?
Yes ☐ No ☐

Personal
In violent situations, would you be more or less likely to draw the baton compared with the truncheon:

More likely to draw the baton? ☐
As likely to draw the baton? ☐
Less likely to draw the baton? ☐

In violent situations, would you be more or less likely to use the baton compared with the truncheon:

More likely to use the baton? ☐
As likely to use the baton? ☐
Less likely to use the baton? ☐

Do you think that the image of a police officer with a fully extended baton is:

Acceptable to the public? ☐
Unacceptable to the public? ☐
Do you think that the baton gives a false sense of security to those carrying it?

Yes  [ ] No  [ ]

**Comparison**

What advantages do you believe the baton has compared with the truncheon?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

What disadvantages do you believe the baton has compared with the truncheon?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Would you prefer to be issued with a:  

Baton?  [ ]  Truncheon?  [ ]

Would you prefer to be issued with:  

ASP?  [ ]  PPCT?  [ ]  No preference?  [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

**Other**

If you wish to make any further comments, please write them below.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please return it to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, in the envelope provided.
APPENDIX 9. PROTOCOL OF USE FOR THE ALTERNATIVE BATONS

1. Officers will not carry or use the ASP or PPCT baton unless they have successfully completed a training programme to the satisfaction of a baton instructor and are authorised by them.

2. Officers will only carry ONE truncheon or ASP or PPCT baton at any one time. In other words officers will not carry a truncheon and a baton.

3. Officers are reminded that they are answerable in law to Section 3, Criminal Law Act, 1967. That section states ‘A person may use such force as is reasonable in the circumstances in the prevention of crime, or in effecting or assisting in the lawful arrest of offenders or suspected offenders or of persons unlawfully at large’.

4. The ASP or PPCT baton carried by officers is only to be used to protect themselves, their colleagues, members of the public when faced by violent attack or to assist in the detention of a person using extreme violence.

5. The ASP or PPCT baton is to be carried discretely. When it has to be used, every attempt should be made to aim the baton blow towards a person’s arms or legs and not the head or face. Officers are reminded that although the baton is a defensive piece of equipment, it also has the potential to cause injury and must be used in accordance with Section 3, Criminal Law Act, 1967.

6. WHERE NECESSARY, in POTENTIALLY violent situations, the ASP or PPCT baton may be drawn and held discretely in the closed position, but ready for use. If the situation defuses then the baton will be replaced. For the purposes of the trial such action will require the completion of an Evaluation form by the officer. (For the duration of this trial it has been agreed that the Evaluation form will be used instead of a G31 report as prescribed by Force Standing Orders P 10 3 2).

7. If the ASP or PPCT baton is extended, an Evaluation form will be required from the officer.

8. If the ASP or PPCT baton is used to strike, an Evaluation form will be required from the officer.

9. In all cases where the Evaluation form is required the original must be submitted to that officers Sub Divisional Commander of Head of Department and a copy to Research and Development.
APPENDIX 10. BATON EVALUATION FORM

THE TRIAL OF THE EXTENDIBLE BATON
AT FARNBOROUGH AND SOUTHSEA
1993-1994

Baton Evaluation Form

This form must be used whenever the ASP or PPCT baton is drawn, even in the closed state. During the trial, it replaces the need for a G31 report (as prescribed in Force Standing Orders P 10.3.2).

If the incident results in the prosecution of any person, the existence of this form must be revealed to the CPS as unused material, by the use of form MG6C. A copy of it must be retained on the police prosecution file.

On completion, please submit this form to your Sub-Divisional commander or Head of Department and send a copy to Inspector Martin Laux, Research and Development, Police Headquarters, Winchester.

Please tick the relevant boxes.

**Background Details**

Sub Division: Farnborough ☐ Southsea ☐

Department: Uniform ☐ Traffic ☐ CID ☐

Name and number (please print): ________________________________

Rank: Constable ☐ Sergeant ☐ Insp ☐

Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

Age: ______ years

Length of Service: ______ (to nearest year)
Usage

Baton type?

ASP  [ ]  PPCT  [ ]

Incident Details:

Time  _______________________

Date  _______________________

Location  _______________________

Circumstances  _______________________

If you had faced similar circumstances with a truncheon, would you have drawn it?

Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]  Don't know  [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

If you had faced similar circumstances with a truncheon, would you have used it?

Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]  Don't know  [ ]

Please give reasons for your answer:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Did you use the baton to:

Defend yourself?  [ ]  Other lawful purpose?  [ ]

(e.g. entry to houses)

If you have used the baton for ‘other lawful purpose’ there is no need to fill in the rest of the questionnaire unless you wish to make any further comments at the end.
How many suspects were confronting you?  

Did the suspect(s) have a weapon?  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, what weapon type?  

Was/were the suspect(s) arrested?  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, custody record number:  

Injuries

Were you injured?  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, brief details of injury:  

Were any other officers injured?  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, brief details of officer and injury:  

Was anyone else injured?  
(including the suspect)  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If yes, who, and what were their injuries?  


**Use and Effect of the Baton**

After drawing the baton, was it:

- Kept closed, but not further used? [ ]
- Kept closed and used? [ ]
- Fully extended, but not further used? [ ]
- Fully extended and used? [ ]

Did the suspect comply as a result?  Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Please comment on your answer.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

How helpful was the pre trial training in dealing with this incident?

- Very helpful [ ]
- Helpful [ ]
- Unhelpful [ ]
- Very unhelpful [ ]

Please give a reason for your answer:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

**Other**

Please use the space below for any further comments you wish to make: