JoTL Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education

2026: Vol 7, Nr 3
doi: 10.24834/jotl.7.3.2093

POLICE DOCUMENTATION, ACCOUNTABILITY AND LEGAL SAFEGUARDS: EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF RECURRING CRITICISM FROM THE SWEDISH PARLIAMENTARY OMBUDSMAN

Kristina Borodina

Faculty of Law, Uppsala University

kristina.borodina@jur.uu.se

Abstract English

Documentation is a central but often underestimated component of police work. It is a legal obligation and a condition for reviewing the exercise of police powers. This article examines the educational implications of recurring criticism of police documentation by the Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (Justitieombudsmannen, JO). The material consists of five JO decisions issued between 2018 and 2024; a 2026 own-initiative decision is used as a complementary source. The applicable documentation requirements and JO's legal assessments are examined through doctrinal legal analysis. The decisions are then compared through a theory-informed qualitative document analysis based on close reading, thematic categorisation and an analytical matrix. JO's reasoning most clearly presents documentation as a means of accountability and as a legal safeguard: it enables interventions to be reconstructed and facilitates review of legality, proportionality and respect for individual rights. The relevance of documentation to professional learning is developed by relating these findings to research on police education; it is not treated as evidence of shortcomings in police education. Drawing on Granér's distinction between legalistic and autonomous police culture, the article argues that documentation can connect legal requirements with context-sensitive professional judgement. It concludes that police education should integrate documentation into teaching and assessment of legal reasoning, proportionality and professional decision-making.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Kristina Borodina

Keywords: police education, documentation, accountability, legal safeguards, professional learning, Parliamentary Ombudsman, police professionalism

Sammanfattning Svenska

Dokumentation är en central men ofta underskattad del av polisarbetet. Den utgör en rättslig skyldighet och är en förutsättning för att polisens maktbefogenheter ska kunna granskas. Artikeln undersöker vilken betydelse Justitieombudsmannens (JO) återkommande kritik mot polisens dokumentation kan ha för polisutbildningen. Materialet består av fem JO-beslut med beslutsdatum 2018-2024; ett initiativbeslut från 2026 används som kompletterande källa. Tillämpliga dokumentationskrav och JO:s rättsliga bedömningar undersöks genom rättsdogmatisk analys. Besluten jämförs därefter genom en teoriinformerad kvalitativ dokumentanalys, baserad på närläsning, tematisk kategorisering och en analytisk matris. I JO:s resonemang framträder dokumentation tydligast som ett medel för ansvarsutkrävande och som en rättssäkerhetsgaranti: dokumentationen gör det möjligt att rekonstruera ingripanden och att granska legalitet, proportionalitet och respekten för enskildas rättigheter. Kopplingen till professionellt lärande utvecklas genom att dessa resultat relateras till forskning om polisutbildning; JO-besluten används inte som belägg för brister i polisutbildningen. Med stöd i Granérs distinktion mellan legalistisk och autonom poliskultur argumenterar artikeln för att dokumentation kan förbinda rättsliga krav med kontextkänsligt professionellt omdöme. Slutsatsen är att polisutbildningen bör integrera dokumentation i undervisning och examination av rättsligt resonemang, proportionalitetsbedömningar och professionellt beslutsfattande.

Nyckelord: polisutbildning, dokumentation, ansvarsutkrävande, rättssäkerhet, professionellt lärande, Justitieombudsmannen, polisprofessionalism

1.Introduction

Documentation is a fundamental component of police work. Police officers must not only make decisions in complex and rapidly changing situations but also record the factual and legal grounds for those decisions in a form that allows the intervention to be understood and reviewed. Documentation therefore connects operational decision-making with educational goals concerning independent judgement, critical assessment of information and accurate, legally sound professional communication (Swedish Police Authority, 2021).

Research on professional language in police education further shows that professional knowledge is developed and expressed through practices in which students formulate, justify and communicate assessments and decisions (Jonsson et al., 2025). From this perspective, documentation is not merely an administrative record produced after an event. It is a form of professional written communication through which observations, legal grounds and discretionary assessments are made available for subsequent review and reflection.

The significance of documentation is also reflected in Swedish legal regulation and public oversight. Documentation duties are prescribed in the Police Act and in rules governing criminal investigations and coercive measures. In Government Bill 2023/24:102, the Government stressed the importance of traceability, reviewability and legal certainty when proposing that certain police employees could use an identifier other than their name in documents. JO has likewise repeatedly emphasised that adequate documentation is necessary for subsequent review of police decisions and coercive measures.[1]

At the same time, recurring criticism from JO shows that documentation continues to present difficulties in operational policing. The selected decisions concern preventive body searches, photography and filming during police interventions, measures affecting children and other coercive measures. A recurring problem is that missing or incomplete information makes it difficult to determine how a decision was reached, whether the legal requirements were met and whether the measure was necessary and proportionate.

Previous research has examined police culture (Granér, 2004), changing orientations toward *legalistic* and *autonomous*[2] policing during the transition from police education to operational practice (Petersson, 2015), reflective professional learning among police educators (Bergman, 2016), the relationship between police education and operational practice (Hove & Vallès, 2020) and organisational factors influencing police decision-making (Nilsson, 2021). Research has also highlighted tensions between legalistic and more autonomous orientations within police work and demonstrated that professional norms may change as recruits move from formal police education into operational policing (Granér, 2004; Petersson, 2015).

Taken together, this literature addresses police culture, professional learning, the relationship between education and practice, and the role of language in professional decision-making. Police documentation has also been examined in relation to legal obligations and organisational problems (Nilsson, 2021). The present article addresses a different question: how JO's criticism of documentation can inform the educational development of legally informed professional judgement.

The article first examines the functions attributed to documentation in the selected JO decisions, with particular attention to accountability and legal safeguards. It then considers how these findings may inform police education. The JO decisions are not treated as evidence about the content or quality of current police education.

The study is guided by the following research question:

---

[1]Examples include JO decisions 7687-2016, 6506-2017, 961-2020 and 9534-2022, as well as JO's 2023 inspection of preventive body searches and vehicle searches in four local police areas (Dnr 2199-2023). These decisions are discussed in greater detail below.

[2] The concepts *legalistic* and *autonomous* policing originate from Granér's analysis of Swedish police occupational culture. The legalistic orientation emphasises adherence to legal rules, organisational directives and the formally sanctioned social mandate of the police, whereas the autonomous orientation places greater emphasis on practical police work, professional discretion and the police's independent role in maintaining social order. Rather than representing mutually exclusive categories, Granér conceptualises them as ideal-type perspectives situated on a continuum of police practice and professional identity. Petersson's study of Swedish police recruits later demonstrated that police students generally express strong support for legalistic values during academy training, while autonomous orientations tend to become more pronounced during occupational socialisation.

What functions are attributed to documentation in the selected JO decisions, and what implications does this analysis have for police education?

The article first presents a theoretical and educational framework concerning accountability, legal safeguards, professional learning and occupational culture. It then explains the material and analytical procedure before presenting the findings. The discussion examines the character and limits of the JO material, Granér's distinction between legalistic and autonomous police culture and the implications for police education.

2. Theoretical and Educational Framework

2.1 Documentation and Accountability

Accountability is a central principle of democratic policing. Police officers exercise powers that may affect individual rights, liberty and bodily integrity. The legitimacy of those powers depends not only on whether decisions are lawful, but also on whether their factual and legal grounds can subsequently be examined. Documentation makes police action visible and reviewable and thereby supports institutional accountability.

Within policing, documentation obligations are regulated through several legal instruments. Sections 27 and 28 of the Swedish Police Act are of particular importance for a range of police interventions. Other documentation duties follow from the Code of Judicial Procedure and the rules governing criminal investigations. The applicable provisions determine both when documentation is required and what information must be recorded, including the nature and legal basis of the measure, the decision-maker and circumstances relevant to the intervention.[3]

The Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO) has repeatedly emphasised that adequate documentation is a prerequisite for meaningful review of police actions. Without sufficient documentation, it may be difficult, and sometimes impossible, to reconstruct decision-making processes or evaluate how police discretion has been exercised. Documentation therefore enables supervisors, courts and oversight bodies to examine the factual and legal basis of police interventions and creates a record through which discretionary decisions may subsequently be evaluated.

2.2 Documentation as a Legal Safeguard

Documentation also functions as a legal safeguard for individuals subjected to police powers. Public authorities must act within the law, but legal review also requires a record of what occurred, why a measure was taken and which circumstances informed the decision.

[3] Sections 27 and 28 of the Swedish Police Act contain detailed provisions regarding documentation of police interventions and the use of coercive measures. The provisions have been described as among the most important legal safeguards within the Police Act. See Munck and Sverne Arvill, Polislagen – En kommentar, commentary to Sections 27–28.

Swedish legislative materials associate documentation with legal certainty, traceability and the possibility of subsequent review (Government Bill 2023/24:102, pp. 11-12, 29). A sufficiently detailed record can counter arbitrary exercises of public power, encourage careful decision-making and enable affected persons to understand and, where appropriate, challenge an intervention. It also provides a basis for assessing legality, necessity, proportionality and procedural fairness.

Documentation may also protect police officers by showing that an intervention was authorised and carried out in accordance with the applicable requirements. Its safeguarding function therefore depends not only on the existence of legal rules, but also on whether the information necessary to apply and review those rules has been recorded.

2.3 Documentation as Professional Knowledge and Learning

Contemporary police work requires officers to make decisions under conditions of uncertainty, competing interests and incomplete information. Professional competence therefore involves more than the correct application of legal rules. It also requires officers to interpret situations, exercise judgement, justify decisions and reflect critically on actions taken (Rantatalo et al., 2015).

Comparative research shows substantial variation in the organisation of European police education, ranging from vocational and workplace-based models to programmes more closely connected to higher education. Hove and Vallès (2020) describe the Nordic model as closely linked to formal higher education and oriented towards broad and deep professional competence.

Within the Swedish Police Programme, students are expected to make independent and critical assessments, process and analyse information in a legally sound manner, justify their positions, and express themselves accurately and with due regard to legal certainty (Swedish Police Authority, 2021). Research on professional language in police education further demonstrates how these general aims are realised through teaching practices centred on formulating, justifying and communicating professional assessments (Jonsson et al., 2025).

Documentation can be understood within this framework as a professional knowledge practice. To document an intervention, an officer must select relevant circumstances, distinguish observation from interpretation, state the legal basis for the measure and explain how professional judgement was exercised. The written record makes these elements available for communication and later examination.

Documentation can also provide material for supervision, feedback and organisational learning. Research on police education has emphasised the importance of reflection for professional development (Bergman, 2016; Rantatalo et al., 2015). By preserving the grounds for a decision, documentation enables colleagues, supervisors and educators to discuss the assessment made, compare possible courses of action and identify matters requiring further development. These possibilities provide the basis for the article's discussion of professional learning, although they are not stated expressly in every JO decision.

2.4 From Education to Practice: Professional Development and Occupational Culture

Professional competence is not developed exclusively through formal education. Police officers continue to learn after graduation through practical experience, workplace interactions and participation

in occupational cultures. The transition from police education to operational policing therefore involves a process through which professional norms, values and understandings of police work are continuously negotiated and reinforced.

Research on Swedish police culture has identified tensions between what Granér (2004) describes as *legalistic* and *autonomous* orientations toward police work. The legalistic orientation emphasises adherence to legal rules, procedural correctness and the formal social mandate of the police, whereas the autonomous orientation places greater emphasis on practical problem-solving, professional discretion and operational effectiveness. These orientations should not be understood as mutually exclusive categories but rather as competing tendencies that may coexist within police practice.

Petersson's (2015) study of Swedish police recruits demonstrated that police students generally express strong support for legalistic values during police education. However, the transition into professional practice may expose recruits to workplace norms and occupational expectations that place greater emphasis on practical discretion and operational considerations. The relationship between educational ideals and operational realities is therefore not always straightforward.

Documentation requirements are closely associated with the legalistic orientation because they emphasise legal grounds, procedural correctness and reviewability. They are nevertheless carried out in operational settings characterised by time pressure, competing priorities and the need for situational judgement. Granér's distinction does not imply a simple opposition between legality and professional discretion. It directs attention to the status and meaning that documentation may acquire in different understandings of police work. This distinction is used in the discussion as an interpretive framework; the JO material itself does not provide evidence about occupational culture or the causes of documentation deficiencies.

3. Material and Method

3.1 Material

The material consists of decisions issued by the Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (Justitieombudsmannen, JO) concerning police interventions and documentation. JO is an independent supervisory authority that reviews whether public authorities comply with legal and procedural requirements. Its decisions contain legal and institutional assessments based on the material available in each matter. They are therefore analysed as supervisory assessments rather than as neutral or complete accounts of operational police work.

The central material is a purposive sample of five JO decisions issued between 2018 and 2024: JO (2018), Dnr 7687-2016; JO (2019), Dnr 6506-2017; JO (2022), Dnr 961-2020; JO (2023), Dnr 2199-2023; and JO (2024), Dnr 9534-2022. Four concern individual cases. Dnr 2199-2023 concludes an inspection of preventive body searches and vehicle searches in four local police areas. JO's 2026 own-initiative decision on the documentation of house-search decisions, Dnr 6533-2025, is used as a complementary source in the legal analysis and discussion.[4]

[4] The five central decisions are JO (2018), Dnr 7687-2016; JO (2019), Dnr 6506-2017; JO (2022), Dnr 961-2020; JO (2023), Dnr 2199-2023; and JO (2024), Dnr 9534-2022. JO (2026), Dnr 6533-2025, is used as a complementary source.

The decisions were selected because documentation was central to JO's assessment and because they cover different types of intervention and different consequences of missing information. The selection was intended to support a close comparison of JO's reasoning, not to establish the frequency of documentation deficiencies or to represent all complaints concerning the Police Authority.

3.2 Method

The study combines doctrinal legal analysis with a theory-informed qualitative document analysis. The doctrinal analysis is used to identify the applicable documentation requirements and to examine how JO interprets those requirements in relation to legality, proportionality and procedural safeguards (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012). The document analysis follows Bowen's (2009) account of the systematic review and interpretation of documents. The thematic component involved theory-informed categorisation and comparison of relevant passages in an analytical matrix.

Each decision was first read closely in its entirety. Passages relevant to the research question were then identified, sorted and compared in an analytical matrix. For each decision, the matrix recorded the type of intervention, the relevant legal provisions and grounds, the information that was missing or criticised, the consequences for reconstruction and review, the implications for legal certainty and individual rights, and any statements concerning education, supervision or organisational improvement. The matrix made it possible to compare how similar documentation problems were interpreted across different decisions.

The analysis was primarily theory-informed. The concepts of accountability, legal safeguards and professional learning, developed in the preceding sections of this article, guided the comparison, while the content and boundaries of the categories were revised during repeated readings of the decisions. Accountability and legal safeguards recur expressly in JO's reasoning. The discussion of professional learning was developed by relating JO's observations about reviewability, recorded reasoning and organisational improvement to research on police education. The categories are therefore used to organise and interpret the material; they do not constitute measures of prevalence.

3.3 Scope and Limitations

JO decisions concern matters in which questions have already been raised about police conduct or documentation. The material therefore illuminates contested practices and identified deficiencies rather than routine documentation that has not generated supervisory scrutiny. The sample cannot support conclusions about how common the problems are within Swedish policing.

JO decisions do not provide unmediated accounts of the events reviewed. JO interprets each matter within its supervisory mandate and on the basis of applicable law, the authority's records, written responses from the Police Authority and, where relevant, complaints, statements from individual officers or other material. Missing documentation is therefore both a subject of criticism and a limitation on what JO can establish. An inability to reconstruct a decision does not by itself show exactly what occurred or that the intervention was unlawful; in some decisions, the point is precisely that the available material does not permit a reliable assessment.

The material is also heterogeneous. Four decisions concern individual cases, whereas Dnr 2199-2023 is based on inspections in four local police areas, documentation from more than 650 interventions and conversations with police officers. The inspection decision provides a broader basis for identifying recurrent practices, but it is not treated as an empirical unit equivalent to an individual complaint case.

Finally, the study does not examine teaching, student learning or the organisational causes of documentation practices. The educational proposals follow from the legal and document analysis and should not be read as empirical findings about current police education. Since the study uses publicly available documents and involves no participants or personal data collection, no ethical approval was required.

4. Findings

4.1 Documentation as Accountability

A recurring pattern in the selected decisions is that documentation functions as a prerequisite for accountability. JO repeatedly emphasises that a record must make it possible to understand and reconstruct a police intervention and to examine the grounds on which police powers were exercised (JO, 2018, Dnr 7687-2016; JO, 2019, Dnr 6506-2017; JO, 2023, Dnr 2199-2023; JO, 2024, Dnr 9534-2022).

The criticism frequently concerns missing or incomplete information about the grounds for an intervention, the circumstances known to officers when a decision was taken and the reasoning on which the decision rested. Where such information is absent, JO's ability to assess the exercise of police discretion is correspondingly reduced.

In Dnr 7687-2016, concerning a police intervention against passengers travelling by bus to a demonstration, the documentation did not permit a full reconstruction of the searches and body searches or the responsibilities of the officers involved. Dnr 6506-2017 illustrates a related problem. A circumstance later invoked as central to an identification measure had not been recorded in the contemporaneous protocol and was inconsistent with a film of the intervention. JO therefore relied on the protocol and the film when assessing the legal grounds for the measure.

The broader inspection decision, Dnr 2199-2023, was based on documentation from more than 650 preventive body searches and vehicle searches in four local police areas, together with conversations with police officers. JO identified recurring failures to record legally relevant circumstances and concluded that the statutory conditions were not being assessed in the manner required by law. The deficiencies concerned both the content of the records and interventions for which documentation was incomplete or missing.

Taken together, the decisions show that documentation supports accountability by preserving the factual and legal grounds needed to examine police discretion. Where those grounds are not recorded, subsequent explanations may be difficult to verify and external review becomes less reliable.

4.2 Documentation as a Legal Safeguard

The material also shows that documentation functions as a legal safeguard. It provides a record of what occurred, why a measure was taken and how the legal requirements were understood in a particular case. That record is especially important when the intervention is coercive or affects a person in a vulnerable position.

In Dnr 9534-2022, concerning police measures against a fifteen-year-old, the documentation was described as sparse and the accounts of the officers differed on important points. The records did not clearly show when the different suspicions arose, what information supported the house-search decision or how the child's best interests had been considered. The deficiencies restricted the possibility of assessing whether the procedural safeguards applicable to the child had been respected. In Dnr 961-2020, the forced photography of a person's motorcycle-club vest and driving licence lacked legal support and was not documented in an acceptable manner. JO linked the measure to the protection of private life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

The complementary 2026 decision, Dnr 6533-2025, further clarifies the connection between documentation and legal safeguards. JO stated that the circumstances on which a house-search decision is based must be apparent from the decision or other case documents. More detailed reasoning may be required when the search concerns a person who is not suspected, when a child perspective is relevant or when proportionality considerations are particularly prominent.

Across the material, documentation enables affected individuals and supervisory bodies to examine legality, necessity, proportionality and the observance of procedural rights. The absence of such information does not always establish that an intervention was unlawful, but it may prevent a reliable assessment and thereby weaken the practical protection provided by the legal rules.

4.3 Documentation and the Conditions for Professional Learning

JO does not generally discuss documentation in terms of professional learning. The educational relevance developed in this article begins with a recurring consequence of inadequate documentation: the grounds for professional decisions are not available for later examination. This limits not only legal review but also the material that could be used for supervision, feedback and discussion of alternative courses of action.

Some decisions nevertheless contain observations with direct relevance to learning and organisational development. In Dnr 7687-2016, JO called for continued information and education concerning the legal limits on photography and suggested that the Police Authority review the chain of command in operations involving several groups. In Dnr 2199-2023, the comparison of a large number of records, together with conversations with officers, enabled JO to identify recurring difficulties in the application of the relevant provisions.

5. Discussion

5.1 Interpreting the JO Material

The analysis shows that accountability and legal safeguards are the functions most clearly articulated in JO's reasoning. JO repeatedly connects an adequate record with the possibility of reconstructing an

intervention, examining its legal grounds and assessing respect for individual rights. The discussion of professional learning is developed by relating these findings to research on police education; it is not an empirical conclusion about the effects or quality of existing police education.

The JO material offers detailed insight into supervisory reasoning when police conduct and documentation are contested, but it must be read in light of its institutional character. JO asks whether public administration complies with legal requirements and protects individual rights. Its assessments depend on the case record and the explanations obtained during the investigation. Where documentation is missing, JO may be able to criticise the failure to record the intervention while remaining unable to determine every aspect of what occurred. The conclusions of this study therefore concern the functions attributed to documentation in JO's reasoning, not the prevalence or causes of documentation deficiencies.

The decisions must therefore be read critically rather than as complete accounts that resolve every factual and legal question. In this study, JO's legal assessments are considered in relation to the material described in each decision, including contemporaneous records and explanations supplied during the investigation. Particular caution is required where missing documentation leaves factual or legal questions unresolved.

5.2 Documentation and Police Culture

Granér's distinction between legalistic and autonomous police culture provides a framework for interpreting why documentation may occupy an uncertain position in professional practice. A legalistic orientation gives prominence to formal powers, procedural requirements and reviewability. An autonomous orientation foregrounds situational problem-solving, occupational experience and operational effectiveness. In a practice marked by time pressure and competing demands, documentation may consequently be treated as a task that follows the intervention rather than as part of the intervention itself. The JO material cannot establish that this cultural tension caused the deficiencies examined here. It offers a possible interpretation that requires further empirical study.

The distinction need not be understood as a choice between legal rules and professional judgement. Documentation can connect the two by requiring officers to explain how the circumstances observed supported the legal grounds for action and how necessity and proportionality were assessed. It allows context-sensitive judgement to remain visible while making it legally intelligible and reviewable. Police education should therefore neither reduce documentation to correct completion of a form nor present legalism as a substitute for situational judgement.

5.3 Implications for Police Education

One educational implication of the analysis is that JO decisions may be used as case material in scenario-based teaching. Students could be asked to identify factual and legal information missing from the record, distinguish observation from interpretation, assess whether the legal conditions for an intervention were met, and draft or compare documentation of the same scenario. The cases can also support discussion of necessity, proportionality, children’s rights and how time pressure, chains of command and occupational expectations may affect documentation.

Such use of the decisions should not amount to mere reproduction of JO's conclusions. Students should also examine the material on which JO based its assessment and consider how deficiencies in the record affected what could be established. Assessment could focus on how students select legally relevant facts, connect those facts to the applicable legal basis, address countervailing considerations, and articulate necessity and proportionality. Used in this way, documentation becomes part of teaching legally informed, reflective and context-sensitive professional judgement rather than an isolated administrative skill.

6. Conclusion

The selected JO decisions attribute two principal functions to documentation: it supports accountability and operates as a legal safeguard. In both respects, documentation preserves the factual and legal grounds required to reconstruct and review police interventions. Missing information may impede assessments of legality, proportionality and individual rights. The educational relevance of the decisions lies in the professional reasoning that the records reveal, or fail to reveal.

Granér's distinction between legalistic and autonomous police culture helps to situate documentation between formal legal requirements and context-dependent police judgement. The analysis suggests that police education can connect these dimensions by integrating documentation into scenario work, legal analysis, reflection and assessment. The aim is not mechanical compliance, but the capacity to make professional decisions legally intelligible, reviewable and open to critical examination.

References

Bergman, B. (2016). *Poliser som utbildar poliser: Reflexivitet, meningsskapande och professionell utveckling* (Doctoral dissertation). Umeå University.

Bowen, G.A. (2009). *Document analysis as a qualitative research method*. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27-40.

Government Bill 2023/24:102. (2024). *Stärkt skydd för vissa polisanställda* [Strengthened protection for certain police employees]. Stockholm: Government Offices of Sweden.

Granér, R. (2004). *Patrullerande polisers yrkeskultur*. Lund: Socialhögskolan, Lunds universitet.

Hove, K., & Vallès, L. (2020). *Police education in seven European countries in the framework of their police systems*. In T. Bjørgo & M.-L. Damen (Eds.), *The making of a police officer: Comparative perspectives on police education and recruitment (pp. 18-54)*. Routledge.

Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). *Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research*. Deakin Law Review, 17(1), 83–119.

Jonsson, C., Bergqvist, M., Alinder, V., & Kilsgård, N. (2025). *Professionsspråk i undervisning – polisutbildningen som exempel.* Högre utbildning, 15*(2), 79–87.*

Munck, J., & Sverne Arvill, E. (2025). *Polislagen: En kommentar*. Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik.

Nilsson, C. (2021). *Dokumentation av tvångsmedel: Varför får polisen kritik om bristande dokumentation?* (Bachelor's thesis). Linnaeus University.

Petersson, O. (2015). *Att bli polis: Från utbildningens förväntningar till gatans norm*. Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik.

Rantatalo, O., Karp, S., Ghazinour, S., & Lauritz, L.-E. (2015). *Hur utvecklas nya polisers reflexiva förmågor under yrkessocialisation? En agenda för framtida forskning*. In R. Granér & O. Kronkvist (Eds.), *The past, the present and the future of police research: Proceedings from the Fifth Nordic Police Research Seminar* (pp. 171–184). Växjö: Linnaeus University.

Swedish Police Authority. (2021). *Programme syllabus for the Police Programme* (Ref. No. A724.496/2021). Swedish Police Authority.

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2018). *Criticism of the Police Authority for photographing and filming individuals without legal support in connection with house searches and body searches, and for deficiencies in documentation* (Dnr 7687-2016).

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2019). *Criticism of the Police Authority for detaining and searching an individual without legal grounds and for its handling of filming during the intervention* (Dnr 6506-2017).

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2020). *Body searches and vehicle searches under the Police Act for preventive purposes in the search for weapons and other dangerous objects* (Dnr 8911-2019).

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2022). *The Police Authority photographed a person's motorcycle-club vest and driving licence without legal support, thereby infringing the right to private life under Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights* (Dnr 961-2020).

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2023). *Review of police use of body searches and vehicle searches for crime-preventive purposes* (Dnr 2199-2023).

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2024). *Criticism of the Police Authority concerning measures taken in connection with an intervention involving a fifteen-year-old* (Dnr 9534-2022).

Swedish Parliamentary Ombudsman (JO). (2026). *Statements concerning documentation requirements for decisions on house searches under the Code of Judicial Procedure* (Dnr 6533-2025).