United Agents

Community of Practice within Border Policing in the Baltic Sea Area

Yakhlef, Sophia

2018

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

United Agents

Community of Practice within Border Policing in the Baltic Sea Area

SOPHIA YAKHLEF
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY | LUND UNIVERSITY 2018

United Agents

United Agents

Community of Practice within Border Policing in the Baltic Sea Area

Sophia Yakhlef

LUND
UNIVERSITY

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
by due permission of the Faculty of Social Sciences,
Lund University, Sweden.
To be defended at Kulturens hörsal, 26th of October 2018 at 13.15.

Faculty opponent
Helene O. I. Gundhus, University of Oslo

Organization LUND UNIVERSITY	Document name Doctoral Dissertation
	Date of issue 26th of October 2018
Author(s) Sophia Yakhlef	Sponsoring organization

Title and subtitle United Agents: Community of Practice within Border Policing in the Baltic Sea Area

Abstract

The risks and insecurities emphasised in contemporary societies have given rise to diverse forms of policing, such as transnational and intelligence-based police collaborations. This dissertation focuses on a border police collaboration project, called *Turnstone*, that took place between 2014 and 2015, aiming to address issues related to irregular migration and cross border crimes in the Baltic Sea areas. The purpose of this study is to provide a community of practice perspective on cross- border police collaboration drawing on ethnographic fieldwork and interviews with a number of intelligence police, coast-guard, and border guard officers from Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden.

The study illustrates the everyday interactions as well as the formal processes and practices that have generated a trust-based collaborative environment, which is necessary for sharing secret intelligence information. Increasing demands of collaboration places the officers in an ambivalent position: their neighbouring countries are both their work partners and the ”source” of the cross-border criminals. Two processes account for the emergence of a community of practice: 1) the development of a common linguistic repertoire (a set of norms and values that served as guidelines for streamlining and guiding the pursuit of their joint daily activities), and 2) the actors' engaging in what they consider “real police work”. The study shows how the participants are at pains to reconcile between these two demands: “real police work” involving “action” and aiming at catching criminals, versus formal work practices, such as attending formal meetings and writing reports, thereby catering to bureaucratic needs.

By focusing on their joint activities organized during the project (referred to as Power Weeks), the study shows how a trust-based relationship, which is necessary for the exchange of culturally, politically and professionally sensitive information, has gradually developed by the participants in and through their joint engagement in these everyday practices. The study highlights the importance of both informal face-to-face encounters and more formal processes in the development of the group as an entity. The findings of this study suggest that working together, attending formal meetings, producing reports, sharing sensitive information, and profiling suspects are equally important as the informal after-work activities. The Power Weeks included various episodes of telling stories and sharing jokes and this has proved to a be a fertile context for generating trust, knowledge, and innovative work practices. The study emphasises the relevance of community of practice for understanding how participants from different organizational and cultural contexts brought together in a project can develop a collaborative environment around sensitive issues.

Key words: Border police collaboration, community of practice, intelligence sharing, transnational policing, face-to-face encounters, meetings, trust building, Baltic Sea area, Europe.

Classification system and/or index terms (if any)

Supplementary bibliographical information		Language English
ISSN and key title ISSN 1102-4712 United Agents		ISBN 978-91-7753-806-6 (print) ISBN 978-91-7753-807-3 (pdf)
Recipient's notes	Number of pages 211	Price
	Security classification	

Signature  Date 2018- 09-17

United Agents

Community of Practice within Border Policing in the Baltic Sea Area

Sophia Yakhlef

LUND
UNIVERSITY

Cover photo by Sophia Yakhlef
Back cover photo by Oliver Victor Pawela

Faculty of Social Sciences
Department of Sociology

ISBN 978-91-7753-806-6 (print)
ISBN 978-91-7753-807-3 (pdf)
ISSN 1102-4712 nr 119

Printed in Sweden by Media-Tryck, Lund University
Lund 2018

MADE IN SWEDEN

Media-Tryck is an environmentally certified and ISO 14001 certified provider of printed material. Read more about our environmental work at www.mediatryck.lu.se

To my family

Contents

Acknowledgements

During the past five years my life has been defined by images of borders and boundaries: thinking about them, crossing them, and finally overcoming them. As a researcher I have been able to cross several borders and follow the workings taking place "behind the scenes" of bordering practices in the EU. This would not have been possible without being granted access to the empirical world of law enforcement organizations. I am most grateful to the police, border and coast guard officers who generously shared their knowledge and time with me.

Writing this dissertation has been possible thanks to the help of many others, to whom I am grateful. I would firstly like to express my deepest gratitude to the staff at the Department of Sociology at Lund University and the faculty of Social Sciences for giving me the opportunity to complete this study. Amongst others, thank you Åsa Lundqvist, Britt-Marie Johansson and Christofer Edling at the department of Sociology.

This dissertation would not have been possible without my supervisors Malin Åkerström and David Wästerfors. Their constant encouragement, knowledge, advice, and sense of humour have been invaluable inputs during the fieldwork and the writing process. I would also like to thank my co-field researcher Goran Basic for his never diminishing enthusiasm for fieldwork and social research. Thank you all for excellent collaboration, coffee breaks, pep-talks, stimulating conversations and much needed mentoring!

Agneta Mallén, Veronika Burcar and Christopher Swader provided valuable advice, read drafts and helped steer the thesis into its current shape. I am also very grateful for the constructive comments of Renita Thedvall from Stockholm University (the discussant of my final script); with your help all the pieces finally fell into place. Sara Uhnoo, Stina Bergman Blix and Åsa Wettergren also provided useful input on my conference presentations regarding this study.

My interest in doing fieldwork developed during my years as a social anthropology student at Stockholm University. Some of my former teachers in social anthropology, therefore, need an extra warm thank you for providing me with ethnographic inspiration and stories from your fields, amongst others: Mark Graham, Shahram Khosravi, Asta Vonderau, Helena Wulff, Johan Lindquist, Sverker Finnström (Uppsala University), Jennifer Mack (KTH and Uppsala University) and Tova Höjdestrand (Lund University).

I would like to extend a big thank you to my former office roommate Susanne Boethius for always patiently answering my questions and queries about life as a PhD student. Also, thank you Håkan Silverup, my present office-mate, for always providing a positive outlook and bringing cheerfulness to our office.

I would also like to thank all my other fellow PhD colleagues (former and present) in sociology, social anthropology and pedagogics, to mention a few, Lisa Flower, Tullia Jack, Ramus Ahlstrand, Uzma Kazi, Anders Hylmö, Mona Hemmaty, Henriette Frees Esholdt, Liv Sunnercrantz, Mattias Nilsson Sjöberg, Katrine Tinning, Isabelle Johansson, Anna Berglund, Imad Rasan, Hanna Sahlin, Colm Flaherty, Wei Wang, Lars Crusefalk, Lotta Granbom, Daniel Görtz, and Bettina Rother and others, for encouragement and advise.

Thank you Alexandra Franzén for always making me laugh and for our (much needed) breaks with good food and stimulating conversations (about everything from cats to politics).

Being a PhD student also involves lessons in becoming a teacher, and I have been fortunate to work with a number of inspiring people during these past few years, thank you Mimmi Barmark, Erik Hannerz, Veronika Burcar, Agneta Mallén, Anna Rypi, Mikael Klintman, Elin Ennerberg, and Bo Isenberg for being excellent teaching colleagues. Also, thank you all the students for patiently and attentively listening to me while talking about this project.

Furthermore, a number of people have indirectly assisted me in completing this project by cheering me on, especially Nicole Hanzon, Linda Karlsson, Johanna Kesti (and baby Julie Kesti), Nina Helén Rekkedal, Therese Sommarström, Błażej Sawinski with family, Krystyna and Igor Pawela.

A huge tank you to my family, my mother Susanne, my father Ali, my brother Jonas, and to my extended family in Skåne who housed me during these past years: Annette, Oscar and Johan Bengtsson and Sara Hillsäter. Last but not least, thank you Oliver for encouraging me to apply to the PhD program and for everything else!

Sophia Yakhlef

Department of Sociology,

Lund, September 2018

1. Introduction

The recent decades have seen an increase in the cross-boundary mobility of people, production, investments, information, knowledge and ideas, but also growing restrictions, laws, and regulation to surveil this mobility. The result of such processes is increased pressure on regional law enforcement organizations to communicate, exchange information, and coordinate enforcement actions with colleagues in other parts of the world on a daily basis (Aas and Gundhus 2015; Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2017).

For this study, my interest lies in the processes necessary for transnational border police collaboration. During my work with this project, I have been curious about how a community of practice can be created by members from various law enforcement organizations through everyday practices, that is, by doing things together (Wenger 1998, 47). I have been especially interested in the possibilities to capture processes of collaboration ethnographically, and to analyse it with the help of a community of practice approach.

The ethnographic data and interviews underlying this study were gathered in the context of a European collaborative project called Turnstone. I was accepted as a PhD candidate in January 2014 with the purpose of studying the collaboration between the border officials participating in the project. My task (together with two other researchers, Basic and Åkerström) was to do fieldwork and conduct interviews with members from police and border organizations in Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in order to collect their experiences of cross border collaboration with a view to understanding how officers from these countries can develop a context conducive to a fruitful collaboration. These data were later compiled in two EU reports about Project Turnstone (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2015a; 2015b).[1]

Project Turnstone was an initiative by the Stockholm County Police, Border Division, and was introduced in January 2014[2]. The project was co-funded by the EU, the Stockholm Police, and the Police and Border Guard board, Northern prefecture in

[1] For this thesis, the entire scope of the Turnstone project, including the design of project related meetings, activities as well as informal conversations with participating members were part of this study.

[2] The project was designed and initiated before the so-called European migration crisis in 2014 and 2015 and was accordingly not a result of these events.

Estonia. The initiators named the project Turnstone; inspired by a type of bird living in the Baltic Sea area surviving by turning over stones and feeding on the small water-creatures living underneath. I was told by one of the initiators that the name was chosen because of the similarities between the bird and the border officials in the area who are committed to "going the extra mile turning over stones" to find criminals.

The organizations described in this study are border police, coast guard, and police organizations with the tasks of fighting, preventing, and solving border related criminal activity in the Baltic Sea area. Most of the people who participated in the project were intelligence officers working with sharing, sending, and analysing secret or sensitive information about crime groups, suspects, and border related criminal activities. The officers stemmed from different countries and organizations and had different law enforcement training and work backgrounds. Despite their differences, most of them identified as intelligence officers and had similar work roles at their home organizations. Prior to the initiation of Project Turnstone, some of these officers had exchanged information over the phone or via email and had thus worked together remotely. Other officers had never participated in this kind of collaboration and had mainly exchanged information or questions via formal information and network channels.

According to the initiators, Project Turnstone was a response to the changing work environment of border police officers in the EU. Confronted with new rules, laws, and legislation the officers faced the challenge of developing their work methods, with primary demand for increasing international collaboration. As it turned out, distrust among the European organizations had often obstructed such attempts of international collaboration. The participating organizations and their intelligence officers can be described as inherently suspicious in their conduct and practice. This suspicious disposition can be explained at least in terms of two reasons: 1) it is the ethos of the organizations to be suspicious, 2) and each border (police) organization is set to guard its borders, often against those (neighbouring) nations that they are collaborating with. The officers described that sharing information with "unknown" international partners was a risk if hands-on collaboration was not yet established. Learning to trust one another was thus a vital condition for the "success" of such a collaboration.

Distrust was not the only obstacle highlighted by the officers: 1) different rules, laws, and legislation, 2) different work methods, organizational, and cultural practices as well as 3) stereotypical understandings of each other through national stereotypes all hindered bilateral collaboration. The officers who initiated the project, being well aware of such obstacles, had sought to find solutions to these problems. The only solution that they could see was to work together, in the same room, for a period of time in order to get to know one another and establish trust-based relationships. They especially emphasised that they needed to do every day work together in order to establish joint goals, and learn from one another in order to create a sense of a common

identity within a single working community, rather than officers from different countries exchanging information.

This study thus describes the complex collaboration processes that emerge when members from different organizations with a common goal engage in everyday work together. More specifically, it focuses on how the participating officers in the joint investigation teams performed their joint tasks despite organizational, legal or cultural backgrounds, and how a community of practice is formed through everyday practices, that is, by doing things together (Wenger 1998, 47).

Project Turnstone was a temporary project in the sense that the time allocated to meet and work together in the different border officers were limited to about once a month during two years. During these two years, the officers' repeated interaction enabled them, over time, to negotiate and establish work practices agreed on by all participants. After the termination of the project, the expectation was that the officers would keep in touch and continue to exchange information.

Despite various challenges, participating officers regarded the project, and especially the informal work sessions eventually called Power Weeks, as successful. The officers claimed that the everyday work performed during the Power Weeks had allowed them sufficient time and space to determine whether the participants were trustworthy, and ultimately, whether they were the "right guys" to be entrusted with sensitive information. Face-to-face communication and personal relationships were highly important, as the establishment of shared linguistic repertoire, generally accepted words, expressions or ways of talking helped establish the officers as a "group"; as a community with a joint purpose rather than simply a gathering of various individuals participating in a project.

The remaining part of this chapter sets the scene for the present study and further introduces the research project that provides the empirical basis underlying this study. It also offers a brief background to European border guarding exigencies and describes the political and legal context that inspired the collaboration project.

Background of the Study

The Research Project

Nowadays, border management and border security, emergency preparedness and environmental protection, climate change, and migration management, are issues that cannot be managed within the confines of national borders. Consequently, nations are pressed to conduct joint initiatives and develop new collaboration skills in order to

"fight", for instance, cross border crime (Denney 2005; Hills 2006; Stenning and Shearing 2012). Most often, cross-border intelligence police collaborations are hampered by various organizational, legal, political, and cultural factors. As stated in the application of Project Turnstone, the enlargement of the Schengen area in 2007/2008 prompted nations to devise new ways of collaboration and to "invent" new methods of border guarding. Project Turnstone was thus an extension of previous collaborative projects between EU countries in the Baltic Sea area.

The law enforcement organizations participating in Project Turnstone were 1) the Police and Border Guard Board in Estonia, 2) the Helsinki Police, 3) the Gulf of Finland Coast Guard District in Finland, 4) the State Border Guard of the Republic of Latvia, 5) the State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania, 6) the Stockholm County Police, Border Police Division, and 7) the Swedish Coast Guard, Region Northeast. The project expanded in 2015 to include a few border officials from Norway, Poland, and Europol[3] who participated occasionally in some project related activities.

The goals of Project Turnstone (as stated in the application) were[4]: 1) to increase mutual trust between the border agencies and their officials on all levels, 2) to increase and streamline day-to-day cross-border collaboration among the border agencies, 3) to increase interactions among law enforcement agencies and the academic community[5], 4) to create effective and adaptable work methods while safeguarding the right to freedom of movement, and 5) to improve the social and cultural knowledge among and within border agencies. In the project application, a detailed list of project related activities was described and outlined by the initiators. For each activity the number of participants, the cost of the activity, and the purpose of the activity were also stated. The activities listed were mainly project related meetings and joint operative activities.

As one of the main goals of the project was to increase and enable collaboration among members of the different organizations, a specific "investigation group" was organized. The group consisted mainly of criminal analysts and intelligence officers[6] from Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Sweden who were interested in joining. The idea was that this selected group of people would work close together and engage in different work-related activities, share information and knowledge, create close personal

[3] Europol is the European Union's law enforcement agency that supports the EU Member State (as well as non-EU partner states and international organizations) in fighting organized forms of crime, terrorism, and cybercrime. https://www.europol.europa.eu/about-europol

[4] Annex 5- Individual Conclusion HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/4000004316, document provided by the project group.

[5] This issue focuses on the interaction between the researchers and the law enforcement agencies.

[6] Some of the participating intelligence officers were originally coast guard, border guard, police or border police officers who had undergone special training to qualify as intelligence officers. Others had mainly worked (and had been trained as) intelligence officers in the organizations. A few civilian employees educated in analysing intelligence information were also interviewed for this study.

relationships, and hopefully become a "special international criminal analysis team" to be reckoned with. The tasks of the team were mainly to process and investigate information regarding on-going or border-related criminal activities. The name of these activities was originally Operative Action Meeting (or Operative Action Week as one of the initiators said) but they were later renamed Power Weeks by the participating officers.

The group worked together over a number of intermittent weeks during 2014 and 2015. The Power Weeks usually lasted between five and seven days and took place at the different border agencies, with four Power Weeks in 2014 and four Power Weeks in 2015. Each week engaged between 8 and 20 (or in some cases more) participating police, border or coast guard officers working together. The same officers (with some exceptions) participated in all the activities. A small number of intelligence officers from Europol participated in the Power Weeks and assisted the other officers by helping them find and process intelligence information[7]. The majority of the participating officers were male and the number of females participating in the Power Weeks varied between one and six[8]. In this sense, the research is best described as a study of a specific group of (mostly) male border intelligence officers participating in a European collaborative project.

Border Policing in the EU

Dating back to the end of the Second World War, the idea of EU emerged as a vision of a peaceful, united, and prosperous Europe. The European Security and Defence policy[9] aims to avoid political confrontation, environmental threats, and destabilising regional conflicts. As described by the policy, this should be achieved through intense collaboration in areas of justice and home affairs to security and defence. Europol was created to improve cooperation effectiveness of police organizations within the European Union (Bowling 2009). According to the official EU website, the end of the Soviet Union in Europe created a sense of a more "united Europe". The *Single Market* with "the four freedoms" was created in 1993, giving rise to the free movements of goods, services, people, and money within the EU. The 1990s also saw an increased awareness of how "Europeans could act together concerning issues of security and defence"[10].

[7] In order to protect the anonymity of these Europol officers, their specific roles during the project (or any accounts made by them) have not been specified.

[8] The number of participants in each Power Week is difficult to estimate as several other officers outside the Power Week "office" assisted the Power Week team and conducted surveillance during the Power Weeks. Most of my ethnographic observations focus on the team members who worked in the office (about 20 officers participated each time, however, membership in the group was not static).

[9] http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cmsUpload/78367.pdf

[10] http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm

Although freedom of movement (and the abolition of EU's internal borders) facilitated travel, trade, and exchange within the Schengen region (Benyon 1996), the agreement is also seen as a facilitator for new patterns of cross border crimes, higher crime rates, and the development of new cross-border crime markets in Europe (van Duyne 1993). This development has led to amplified efforts to control and monitor borderlands and border crossings, and European police and border police organizations are urged to collaborate with international law enforcement organizations. The European Union can be regarded as a paradigm of the network state where border control takes place within societies and not just at regional borders (Guiraudon and Lahav 2000; Rumford 2006, 157).

Although freedom of movement and the abolition of EU internal borders facilitated travel, trade, and exchange within the Schengen region, the agreement was argued to be the cause of an increase in cross border crimes that needed to be managed and prevented. This development has led to a stepping up of efforts to control and monitor borderlands and border crossings, mainly through international collaboration (Benyon 1996, 355) and intelligence sharing (Reiner 2010). The scholarly response interest has mainly been in security networks (Whelan 2016) and various border policing institutions, such as for example police, ports and airports, prisons and courts, military and private security firms, as well as secret intelligence agencies (Bowling and Westenra 2018).

Intelligence sharing in the EU

The aim of intelligence-led analysis is to identify and target prolific offenders and crime hotspots, and to collect information and construct observable patterns that provide knowledge of the criminal environment (Ratcliffe 2009; Reiner 2010). This information can become the foundation for police action (such as surveillance) and dictates priorities for crime prevention agencies (Ratcliffe 2009). Intelligence information is often defined as a product (as a specific and exclusive piece of information) or as an activity (when open or secret data is turned into information that can generate action). However, there are discussions focusing on the exact meaning of criminal intelligence and the difference between intelligence sharing and information sharing. Intelligence is sometimes identified as a *process*, and in other cases as a *product* (Block 2008a). In such cases, secrecy and analysis distinguishes intelligence from mere information. In general terms, intelligence is information that officers need to help them understand a particular offence, crime or person that they are investigating (2008a, 184). The process of intelligence generally includes tasking, collecting, analysing, and distributing information between collaborating partners (Lowenthal 2016, 11).

Officers use the national and international databases that they have access to in order to receive, send, and map information about criminal activity. Officers working in the EU have a range of formal information channels at their disposal for exchanging

information, such as for example Europol, Interpol, and the Schengen information system. Such international channels assist national police organizations to develop a wider picture of transnational criminal activity beyond their national borders (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 354-355). Additionally, informal collaboration networks of intelligence officers can arguably facilitate information exchange. In order to ease international information sharing between organizations, the use of liaison officers stationed overseas has also increased in recent years (Block 2008a, 184, 197)[11].

Exchanging intelligence information is however, not without complication as there are several internal barriers to communication between police organizations. Limited interactions, physical distance, different ranks, as well as different legal, cultural or technical considerations might also obstruct information sharing in and among networks of collaborating police or border officers (Block 2008a, 191; Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017, 584).

Bordering practices

Border guarding, or border management in the EU, can be described as the administration of borders and is generally understood as a concern with protecting the territorial integrity of states from intrusion by illegal immigrants or traffickers. Although its precise meaning varies according to national contexts, the practices of border guarding generally concern the procedures, rules, and techniques that regulate traffic and activities across defined border areas or border regions. The practices involved in border guarding consist of border checks on people, their vehicles, and belongings at official border crossing points. Surveillance can be carried out between different crossing points or within border zones (Hills 2006).

Border guarding in the EU is similar to performing police work, especially the intelligence-based investigation work with the purpose of tracing information about suspected criminals. The terms border police or border guard is often used interchangeably, but border guard is more commonly used in a European context (Hills 2006, 86). In the present study, I use both concepts as some of the interviewed officers work in organizations that are referred to as border authorities and some as part of the national police. During the cold war era, many European border guards enjoyed a paramilitary or military role when protecting state frontiers, whereas border guarding in the recent era is often viewed as a policing matter. Contemporary border officers are usually trained in criminal law, national security policies, risk assessment, criminal

[11] Liaison officers are law enforcement officers posted abroad (on behalf of their home agency) to work with the law enforcement agencies in the country where they are posed. The role of liaison officers is to facilitate horizontal (sometimes informal) exchange of information between the host organization and the home organization and to coordinate collaborative efforts regarding criminal investigations in both countries. However, the exact role of intelligence officers in EU members states might differ as it is subject to national preferences (Block 2010, 195-196).

investigation, communications, traffic control, logistics, and alien policing (that is, the laws and proceedings regarding immigration) (Hills 2006, 75).

Transnational (Border Police) Collaboration

The risks and insecurities highlighted in contemporary societies have given rise to diverse forms of policing, such as transnational policing and intelligence-oriented police work (Hills 2006). The concept of risk has been wildly used as fears of global insecurity have increased because of terrorism, pollution, and epidemics (Denney 2005, 1-7). Several scholars (amongst others Bauman (2002)) see the terrorist attack of 9/11 as a symbolic end of an era followed by increased dominance of territorial power and border security. In Europe, the consequence of the Schengen enlargement and Freedom of moment has been increased efforts to control and monitor borderlands and an urgent need for cross border collaboration. New technological practices have been implemented to facilitate the monitoring and control of border zones, border crossings, and "unauthorised" populations (Hills 2006).

As the territorial border has been moved outwards, not only including the border crossings or border zones (but also the police, prisons, courts, ports, airports, private security firms and secret intelligence agencies) it is argued that cross-border surveillance networks and the mobilization of international police collaboration have become vital elements of contemporary policing (Bowling and Westenra 2018, 2; Weber and Bowling 2004). European border police organizations are especially affected as cross-border crimes are not confined to the borders of any single nation state (Stenning and Shearing 2012).

As underlined by Loftus (2015, 115), the cultures and practices of those responsible for policing borders and cross border crime have gained surprisingly little attention by social researchers studying the police. Much previous research on bordering practices, collaboration, and security governance (in Europe and elsewhere) describes the political and structural dimensions of border politics, such as new forms of state control, evolving surveillant practices, as well as the emerging hybrid networks of private and public security nodes (Bowling and Westenra 2018; Loftus 2015; Whelan 2016). In a European context, policing scholars have focused their attentions on arrangements or policy making between various organizations, as well as the institutions designed to facilitate international, cross-border police collaboration in Europe, such as for example Europol and Frontex (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007; Hufnagel, Harfield & Bronitt 2012; Nadelman 1993; Stenning and Shearing 2012).

The practice of controlling the ingoing and outgoing movements of populations is described by Bigo (2008, 101) as "policing at a distance", suggesting a new form of policing that takes place beyond national jurisdictions. This mode of control is less visible as the de-localized police functions are also transferred from the border (police)

to various other actors (Bigo, 2008). Researchers have highlighted how such bordering practices result in *crimmigration*, that is, the intersection of immigration and crime control (Aas 2011, 332; Bowling and Westenra 2018; van der Woude, van der Leun and Nijland 2014), as well as the (social) exclusion of immigrants (Aas 2011; Agamben 1998; Balibar 2010; Dauvergne 2004; Khosravi 2007; Wonders 2006, 72). Various ethnographic studies have provided personal accounts of people who have crossed borders and thereby giving valuable insights into the unequal treatment of these people (Gerard and Pickering 2014; Loftus 2015; Weber and Bowling 2004).

Although the narratives and experiences of people crossing borders are important aspects of border policing and security governance, I claim that the perspectives, stories, and practices of the people who guard and control borders deserve equal attention. Despite the growing interest in border policing networks and international police collaboration, there is a lack of ethnographic studies focusing on the everyday-life practices of border officers (Côté-Boucher, Infantino and Salter 2014), especially those focused on cross border police collaboration. In the words of police researcher Loftus (2015, 122), "there is a strong need for a series of ethnographies, incorporating observation and interviews, to scrutinise the culture and practices of state and non-state border police on the ground. This would inform us of what is taking place at the sharp end of border policing in diverse settings". More precisely, border security needs to be "addressed from the angle of the everyday practices of those who are appointed to carry it out" (Côté-Boucher, Infantino and Salter 2014, 195).

Some previous studies have, however, paved the way for a more extensive theoretical focus on the "closed worlds" (Loftus 2015, 120) of international police collaboration, the everyday practices of border officers, and the collaboration between intelligence officers and other social control professionals. The tendency to highlight personal connections or networks and the distrust of digital and formal network systems is especially observed by researchers of intelligence led policing. One such example is Cotter's (2015) study of intelligence police officers in Canada. The study shows that officers distrusted the formal digital network emphasising the importance of personal social networks and interpersonal relationship in knowledge sharing. Cotter argues that cooperation or multi-jurisdictional information sharing is paramount for the effectiveness of sharing intelligence information. In order to improve intelligence sharing and digital information analysis, networks that connect intelligence units and information sharing systems have been developed. Information can thus be formally shared via digital information networks or informally through personal social networks. Drawing on these findings, Cotter suggests that police intelligence is best understood by adopting a social network perspective characterised by informal, horizontal information flows between collaborating officers (2015).

Along the same lines, Alain's (2001, 114-116, 118) comparative analysis of difficulties in cross-border intelligence work between European and North American organizations

shows that cooperation was initiated in three different spheres: on a political, technical, and an operational level. His observations suggest that the North American/Canadian officers and the European officers saw similar difficulties that hindered cooperation; sending and receiving information was described as inefficient as data was often delayed, which jeopardized cases and investigations. The officers dealing with day-to-day work practices saw official cooperation structures as complicated, time consuming, and ineffective in comparison to using personal contacts and informal interactions.

Whelan (2016, 15) uses the concept of "group" (defined as a social unit with a shared history) in his study of intelligence networks in Australia in order to understand a network "culture". Whelan criticises previous police research that primarily sees police organizations as independent units of analysis, concluding that intelligence-led policing requires that diverse security actors work together through and in networks. Security networks can be defined as organizational forms involving public, private or hybrid actors working together following security objectives. Whelan describes the process in which organizational subcultures take shape, concluding that security groups experience cultural changes when working together in and through networks (2016).

Gundhus' (2005, 128-129, 142-43) study of the growing use of information and communication technology highlights how cultural and practical aspects of policing are affected by such changes. Drawing on empirical research conducted in two Norwegian police organizations, Gundhus explores how risk-based technologies and grand theories of risk management are negotiated and translated by actors at the local level. Her findings show that crime prevention discourses and the use of technology in the two organizations are not only shaped by top-down management but by bottom up contingencies. Traditional practices were adapted to new demands rather than substituted for; and there were variations of resistance to the new work tools. In sum, risk classification tools are regarded as important sites of worker and management mediation.

To the extent that policing practices have today become both national and international, local and global in nature, Dupont, Manning and Whelan (2017, 584) call for new ways of organizing and managing cross border initiatives designed for collaboration. As noted above, formal networks do not seem to be a context that yields the expected results. Rather, efficient collaboration is claimed to be based on informal, work-related relationships, as these are believed to generate a trust-based context that is conducive to the sharing of tacit, sensitive information and knowledge among the parties involved.

Defining collaboration

As organizations and corporations become increasingly complex operating across national borders, collaboration processes between institutions and actors have captured scholars' attention. Collaboration is often considered as crucial for living and operating

in our increasingly interconnected world (Cogburn and Levinson 2003; Schott 1994). However, collaboration can be perceived in a variety of ways and is often contrasted or used interchangeably with cooperation.

In a general sense, collaboration involves instances where there is more than one person working on a single task but together with others (Roschelle and Teasley 1995). Roschelle and Teasley (1995, 70) define collaboration as the "coordinated, synchronous activity that is the result of a continued attempt to construct and maintain a shared conception of a problem". They distinguish between collaborative and cooperative problem solving: collaboration is perceived as a "mutual engagement of participants in a coordinated effort to solve the problem together" whereas cooperation is "accomplished by the division of labour among participants, as an activity where each person is responsible for a portion of the problem solving" (1995, 70). Officers interviewed for this study used both expressions when talking about the project and about their daily work. As this study focuses on officers working alongside one another (driven by mutual engagement) in synchronised activities in order to solve joint problems, the concept of collaboration will be used throughout this study.

The Aim of the Study

The aim of this study is to suggest a framework for understanding how practitioners from various organizations, cultural contexts, and nations build a sense of a community that is necessary for them to jointly and collaboratively "get the job done". Theoretically, it shows that building a community of practice was crucial for the officers to develop interpersonal trust and for a fruitful collaboration to develop. Thus, theoretically, this study adopts Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger's (1998) theory of community of practice in order to analyse the process in which a (transnational) border police community was created. Empirically, the study will draw on an ethnography of a border police collaboration project that has brought together a number of intelligence police, border and coast officers from seven organizations in five countries (Finland, Sweden, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia). Two main questions will serve as guidelines of the study:

- What accounts do the participating officers use for engaging in a collaborative venture?
- What processes and practices created a sense of a community among the participants?

The first question addresses the officers' accounts for engaging in the collaboration project and to participate in inter-organizational collaboration. I focus on the processes whereby the participating officers, united by a joint purpose, develop a common language and a set of common norms and values, build a sense of identity and trust-based relationships through, among other things, storytelling and sharing jokes while engaged in their everyday practices. Analyses of the work performed by the officers during the project focuses on how a community of practice is created by performing everyday practices together. My interest also lies in what happens when different law enforcement organizations collaborate; what social practices and procedures need to develop in order for the officers to identify themselves as a "border guarding community"?

I look at the complex collaboration processes that are at play when members from different organizations with a common goal engage in everyday work together. Hence, despite their organizational, legal, and cultural backgrounds, the officers have created an informal but efficient basis for sharing sensitive information, knowledge and experience.

Having explored the processes whereby this community of practice has emerged, I turn to the question of how this community of practice, as an informal social context integrating working, learning and relating, was perceived as instrumental in promoting the prospects of "successful collaboration" among the officers. Although the participants were fairly autonomous in shaping what counts as right or wrong, suitable or unsuitable, moral or immoral, they are accountable for the success or failure of their efforts to the external institutions they depend upon (for funding and legitimacy). This relationship with such external stakeholders is mediated by a number of artifacts ranging from performance indicators, reports, documents, etc, that the community has to reluctantly generate – unwillingly as these are regarded by the practitioners as distractors from their "real work". According to interviewed officers, a successful collaboration cannot only be measured in numbers (such as number of arrests), but also by the development of informal, trust-based relationships among the participants that outlast the duration of the collaboration.

Contributions of the Study

Even though the past decades have seen productive theoretical and empirical interest in borders from various academic fields (Aas 2011, 332), empirical studies of cross-border police collaboration focusing on the perspectives, stories, and practices of the people responsible for preserving border priorities have been surprisingly neglected (Loftus 2015, 116). The reasons for this are mainly that contemporary transnational policing (facilitated by technological developments) is rather a new occurrence and one which is often difficult to study (Stenning and Shearing 2012). Furthermore, although

there has been an extensive literature on police organizations and police culture, there has been a lack of attention regarding the social processes and cultural expressions that transnational police collaboration might entail (Whelan 2016).

The Turnstone project presented a unique opportunity to observe ongoingly (in the here and now) how a community of practice forms, enabling its participants to cope with the challenges of the day. Therefore, I use theoretical concept as a tool for analysing the empirical data with the focus on how the border police officers' community building is constructed through both participatory, face-to-face encounters, negotiation, and the creation of symbolic and material artifacts in their everyday work activities. This study is thus an attempt to redress this imbalance by providing a detailed ethnography of how cross-border collaboration between various officers and organizations emerges and evolves. The present setting is different from those treated in previous research studies where much focus has been put intra-organization collaboration, that is, collaboration between actors within the same (border police) organizations or collaboration between organizations in similar socio-cultural or economic settings. The incentive to collaborate stemmed from the officers' shared vocation; a desire to fight cross-boundary criminal activities and an aspiration to improve their skills of performing these activities.

The present study suggests a framework for understanding how transnational border-police collaboration may develop and build a sense of a social community based on everyday practices. In the progression of regular joint activity, a community of practice establishes ways of acting, doing things, saying things, and negotiating power relations and values (Eckert 2006, 1). Crucial to this practice-based framework is the centrality of two processes: 1) the development of an informal, trust-based context involving a shared language and a set of norms and values in a face-to-face fashion as they perform their everyday practices, and 2) the use of material, and symbolic artifacts to inscribe the content of their interactions in more durable forms. These processes, referred to by Wenger (1998) as participation and reification, respectively, are instrumental in creating social practices that transcend the various borders (national, organizational, social, cultural, and political) among the participants. Participation brings together the participants, allows them to build trust, negotiate identities, a sense of belonging, shared norms, values, and cognitive grids. Reification is a matter of documenting in a more durable form what has been interactionally negotiated, agreed on and established in the here and now, in order to make transferable over borders, in documents, reports, and various codified forms of information (Wenger 1998).

Although taking part in an "organized" collaboration project, the participating officers lacked a common language and pre-existing standards and processes for collaboration. Interviewed officers acknowledged that the most important step for "successful" international collaboration was to create a common understanding of work practices, goals, and issues of conduct. This could only be achieved, according to the officers by

"doing things together" and "learning from one another". This is a process that requires time and repeated interaction.

Thesis Outline

Following this introductory chapter, the remaining part of this dissertation consists of nine chapters. The next chapter provides a review of some relevant literature and previous research on global policing, transitional police collaboration, and changes in policing. Here I also make an account of some previous studies of police work that adopt the community of practice perspective. Previous studies of intelligence and operative police work, as well as theories of collaboration obstacles relevant to the present study are also outlined.

In chapter 3, I suggest the theoretical framework used for analysing the empirical data. My theoretical starting point is the concept of community of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). I conclude my theoretical contributions and highlight the benefits of studying transnational border police collaboration using community of practice as a theoretical lens.

In chapter 4, I focus on the methodological considerations and the process of gathering the empirical data for this study. I further describe the empirical material, namely ethnographic observations at the participating organizations and interviews with border, police, and coast guard officers from the participating organizations. Methodological challenges, ethical considerations, and issues regarding my role as a researcher are also discussed.

Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 8 present the empirical data, followed by analysis and interpretation. More specifically, in chapter 5, I focus on the officers' accounts of collaboration obstacles that were perceived to hinder "successful" collaboration. Issues related to trust (such as rumours of corruption) as well as structural and organizational differences, as perceived by the participants, are discussed in light of previous research.

Chapter 6 provides a glimpse into the background of the project and the environment of border policing in Europe, as narrated by the project participants. The first introductory meeting organized by the project initiators and their goals and visions of the project are stated. Furthermore, different understandings of success, as discussed by the officers, are analysed. This discussion focuses on two demands that confronted the officers: 1) to achieve "successful collaboration" (such as getting acquainted with one-another and achieving trust-based relationships, and 2) to provide formal stakeholders (such as funders) with statistical "proof" of their performance and "success" in preventing and solving crime.

In chapter 7, I introduce the operative work weeks referred to as the Power Weeks. I illustrate an average work day during the Power Weeks and the officers' first steps in finding common, meaningful ground. I describe how the officers negotiated mutual objectives, and identified knowledge gaps and structural obstacles that had previously hindered "collaboration. I also describe how material artifacts created (mainly documents, names of the project, and activities) and administrative activities (such as formal meetings) helped formalising the project as an "entity". As the officers valued practice-based work but saw a great need for more formal structure in the project, the analysis discusses the necessity for both approaches in the process of community building.

In chapter 8, I provide examples of the forms of informal socializing taking place during the Power Weeks. The backdrop of these descriptions is the view that learning to collaborate and to build trust is a social process that is tied to ongoing activities and practices within communities of people (Fox 2000, 854). In this process, I focus on the sharing of a set of various linguistic practices, such as stories, jokes, anecdotes, and memories. The implications of these practices for the officers' community building are then discussed.

In the final chapter, I conclude the study by summarising the main findings in relation to the set-up aim. I explore the implications of these findings, suggesting new avenues for further studies.

2. Previous Research

The aim of this chapter is to position the study within extant research on international and transnational collaboration and information sharing. At premium is previous research that reflects the changing nature of police practices, collaboration, and intelligence-based policing, as this strand of research is deemed relevant to transnational border police collaboration. Additionally, some relevant theories regarding trust, risk, networks and community building related to the present study are accounted for. The chapter concludes with highlighting some limitations of previous research on border police collaboration.

Global Policing and Transnational Collaboration

Changes in Policing

The recent years have seen major changes in the objectives, working ideologies, and priorities in major criminal justice organizations (Garland 2001). Garland (2001, 18) claims that the police now hold an image less focused on crime fighting but more oriented towards public service, aiming to reducing fear and disorder in society. Additionally, the pluralisation of policing has been associated with the expansion of private security personnel, community policing, and private police auxiliaries (Peterson and Åkerström 2014; Reiner 2010).

Furthermore, the police are not the only agent in society that can use formal social control, as exemplified in this study which is concerned with seven different law enforcement organizations (coast guard and border guard organizations) with policing mandates. More specifically, this study focuses on the collaboration between intelligence officers working at various police, border police, and coast guard organizations. Although the participating officers all have slightly different work tasks, procedures and practices, they all enjoyed policing mandates to peruse and apprehend cross-border criminal activity. In other words, they are all engaged in various forms of *policing*. As pointed out by Reiner (2010, 3-4), there is a difference between the concept of the *police* as a social institution and processes of *policing*. Police organizations can have a variety of different forms in societies, but every society arguably needs some form

of policing which might be carried out by different institutional arrangements and processes (Reiner 2010, 4). Policing implicates a more general aspect of social control; a concept which is complex and unspecific. Cohen (1985, 1-2) refers to social control as organized ways in which society responds to behaviour that is considered deviant, threatening, worrying, problematic or undesirable.

The phenomenon of globalization has warranted scholars' interest from different disciplines. One example is the shift away from issues of sovereignty and social control towards a focus on global policing (Stenning and Shearing 2012). Scholars have taken great interest in new institutions created to facilitate policing on a global scale (Johnston and Shearing 2003; Wood and Dupont 2006), often ignoring how local police work has been affected by this global turn (Sausdal, 2018)[12]. As argued by Stenning and Shearing (2012, 272), policing has been, and still is, transformed in various ways. They especially highlight the tendency to move various functions and activities of policing from state police to private security actors working for transnational corporations (such as airlines, banks, hotel chains, credit card companies, and shipping companies). Additionally, as noted by several scholars, the recent years have seen the rise of new methods of social control focusing on the detection, capture, detention and banishment of criminalized migrants (Aas 2011; Bowling and Westenra 2018, 2; Parmar 2018; van der Woude, van der Leun and Nijland 2014). One way to shed light on the changing environment of policing is to focus on the ground-level realities of border policing (Loftus 2015, 119) and the work practices of officers engaged in transnational border police collaboration.

Police Collaboration

In the field of law enforcement, the collaboration between various security organizations is often regarded as the solution to organized crime in an interconnected, globalised world characterised by political, economic, social, and technical transformations (Bowling 2009). The concepts of transnational policing and international policing are often used interchangeably, both referring to police activities that cross and transcend national boundaries and borders. The term international policing suggests, however, that policing is exclusively a state sponsored activity taking place between or among states. Transnational policing refers to a type of policing that does not only focus on the security concerns of a particular state, but also includes a

[12] One example is Sausdal's study of Danish police task force officers engaged in policing cross-border crimes and their concerns of being the "last real" Danish police officers. Another example is Sheptycki's (1998a) study of police agencies in the English Channel Tunnel regions, focusing on how police institutions become involved in issues beyond their sovereign nation state. Another example is Gundhus' (2005, 128-129) study of risk-based policing in Norway and the interaction between new discourses of (global) risk based policing discourses and established cultural and structural police practices.

variety of internationally-sponsored policing organizations or non-state, private organizations. In the present study, the concept of transnational policing is thus being preferred, as it better reflects the plural character of modern policing (including actors from different nations, organizations, and transnational information networks) (Stenning and Shearing 2012, 272-275).

Although transnational police collaboration is claimed for being the solution to preventing organized crime and terrorism, Bowling (2009, 149) sees flaws with this argument. Crimes such as smuggling, human trafficking (or "slave trade"), political violence, and terrorism have never been constrained by national borders and have in various ways previously required international police collaboration. Alain (2001) perceives the signature of the 1923 Vienna treaty and the creation of Interpol as the onset of transnational police collaboration and the Second World War and the Cold War era as other historical periods of increased (forced) international collaboration. Interpol, or the International Criminal Police Organization was founded in the 1920s as a communication network with the purpose of facilitating cross-border policing by enabling communication and assistance between police organizations (Bowling 2009, 152; Stenning and Shearing 2012, 272). Europol, another formal international police cooperative organizations, was similarly a result of political commitments encouraging multilateral collaboration in fighting transnational crime (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 349).

Even though organized crime has always existed across international borders, technological advances (such as developments of the internet, social media, and digital communication) have opened up a spectrum of "virtual" transnationalisation creating a wide range of "new" transnational crimes and disorders (Stenning and Shearing 2012). It has also enabled more organized policing working against trans-boundary criminality (Martin 2010; Spearin 2010). Furthermore, market based, political, and technological changes have transformed, reshaped, and restructured the organization and boundaries of police organizations and cross-border policing (in Europe and elsewhere) (Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017).

As transboundary crimes are not only confined to any one nation and state boundaries, the call for transnational collaboration and policing organizations has increased. The role of transnational policing can roughly be divided into two categories: 1) assisting and peacekeeping in states where the national police cannot provide these services (organized for example by the European Union or the United Nations), and 2) international collaboration regarding cross-boundary crimes (such as for example organized crime, terrorism trafficking of drugs, weapons or people, forgery or corruption) (Stenning and Shearing 2012, 275). Cross-border surveillance networks are also vital parts of such emerging systems of crime fighting and transnational governance (Aas 2011).

Researchers have taken an interest in the growing number of cross-border police networks and the organization of transnational collaboration. Many have focused on intergovernmental relations and the complexity of the structures of cross-border police collaboration (Bowling and Foster 2002; Loader and Walker 2007). For example, Benyon et al. (1993, 11-13) have investigated the field of international collaboration by mapping and defining policing enterprises and collaboration in Europe at the macro, meso, and micro levels. The macro level implicates international legal agreements and the synchronisation of regulations and national laws. Collaboration on a meso level implies law enforcement and police operational structures, and the micro level includes the detection and prevention of particular crime problems. Relations between states, institutional maps, and summaries of taxonomies of transnational policing are valuable for researchers in order to understand some of the mechanisms of the various institutions involved. The precarious aspects of such studies, however, is that constant administrative reform and restructuring might soon make such mapping out of date (Sheptycki 1995).

Furthermore, as argued by Sheptycki (1995), there is more to the transnational sphere than inter-governmental connections, especially the role that the law enforces play in transnational policing. Police organizations working with transnational collaboration are constituted by a social web of actors affected by changing work practices, training, and services of security provision (Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017, 585). Researchers have argued for a complete change in perspective from policing to security governance, claiming that transnational policing in various forms will increase in coming decades (Bowling 2009, 158). This entails a new model of problem solving: a preventative and reductionist type of crime control referred to as intelligence-based policing (Johnston and Shearing 2003; Reiner 2010).

Intelligence Based Policing

In the 1990s, Castells (1996) envisioned the rise of the network society driven by the dynamics of information technology transcending traditional (physical) spaces and places for institutions and organizations. Others have similarly defined the globalized age as a package of transnational flows of people, production, investment, ideas, and information (Tsing 2000, 327). It is frequently claimed that contemporary policing (in such a connected world) requires international collaboration where intelligence information and evidence can be shared, where partners can coordinate operations, and track down criminals who operate across international borders (Block 2008a; Bowling 2009).

Although intelligence gathering and sharing is not a new practice in law enforcement organizations (or in other institutions), policing has become more technology-driven and virtually based during recent years, enabled by increased transport and

communication technology (Stenning and Shearing 2012). Intelligence-led policing requires analysis and management of risks rather than reactive responses to specific crimes (Cotter 2015; Maguire and John 2006).

Although secrecy is a central theme of intelligence analysis, the end of the cold war era and tendencies to increase transparency in public administration have increased the visibility of intelligence work and systems. Furthermore, after the attacks during 9/11, and during the events that followed, intelligence agencies became the centre of attention in media reporting as well as in political discourse. Still, intelligence work is an area that has often escaped both academic and public scrutiny (Fägersten 2010, 31).

Research of intelligence exchange and collaboration

Researchers of intelligence work have put much emphasis on mapping and understanding various processes of information exchange (Block 2008a; 2008b; Gerspacher and Dupont 2007; Whelan 2016). Additionally, the efficiency of intelligence officers, the productivity of intelligence analysts, and difficulties in intelligence exchange are common topics for researchers studying intelligence-oriented police work. Evans and Kebbell (2012, 240), for instance, identify the essential skills and abilities required from intelligence analysts to be perceived as efficient. They propose a shift in attitudes where intelligence analysts are not only seen as technical specialists but as part of a support structure for decision-makers. Based on in-depth interviews they determine three characteristics considered necessary for being regarded as an effective analyst: sufficient work skills, an attitude of commitment and pride, and a striving to be productive and having a "can do" attitude.

One important aspect of intelligence and operational police work is collaboration between authorities and organizations. Intelligence officers and security personnel are often looked at from the perspective of "networks". The research tool of network analysis has been used to investigate structural patterns of interactions between actors in order to highlight hierarchies and systems of collaboration (Blatter 2004, 533). Their relations and patterns are analysed in order to assess their effects on the organizations and individuals in the networks designed for collaborative purposes (Scott 2012).

As the network concept emphasises competition and the various interests of the actors involved, Gerspacher and Dupont (2007, 353) see the network perspective as useful when studying cross-border police collaboration. Security networks come in various sizes and shapes, from local partnerships seeking to prevent criminal behaviour to a web of national law enforcement organizations endeavouring to fighting transboundary criminality. Interpol and Europol are two of the most recognized international police collaboration organizations and formal international security networks (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 352-361).

Within the field of organization and criminology there has been great scholarly interest in security networks. Researchers have especially emphasised the variety of agencies

involved in security governance, seeing the network concept as a metaphor for the shifting relationships between security nodes (Johnston and Shearing 2003; Whelan 2016; Wood and Dupont 2006). More importantly, there is an increasing tendency among researchers to focus on informal networks as an organizational form of collaboration; the mechanism of the networks, the role of the actors involved, and how working in and through networks may lead to bilateral collaboration (as sensibilities are shared among the members) (Alain 2001; Cotter 2015; Whelan 2016, 586; Wood 2004).

Although network analysis often focuses on structural and relational properties of networks, Whelan (2016, 583) claims that such a perspective can also provide a useful framework for understanding how members of security networks experience cultural change through collaboration. Such informal networks and organizational subcultures are based on trust and commitment rather than structural, formal networks. Drawing on interviews with members of the field of high policing in Australian, Whelan's (2016) study focuses on some of the relational and structural processes of cultural change, and the how network members understand organizational culture and collaboration. The finding of the study suggests that similarities (and differences) between police organizations were more apparent when their staff members interacted and attempted to work together.

Gerspacher and Dupont's (2007) research similarly focuses on new collaboration mechanisms in law enforcement agencies and the importance of informal initiatives by network members. Their study is based on interviews with Interpol and Europol officials involved in international police collaboration. The findings of their study suggest that the staff of the collaborating organizations alter the environment in which they must collaborate moving from a hierarchical, bureaucratic approach toward a networking morphology.

With the perception that international criminal organizations are working in a "borderless" context, collaboration ventures have shifted away from hierarchical, formal structures towards less rigid forms as these are believed to enhance cross-border crime prevention and many organizations. Informal forms of organizing are assumed to facilitate the chances of building trust among actors and overcome some of the collaboration obstacles they encounter (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 347, 361).

Collaboration Obstacles

As already mentioned, researchers have identified a wide range of structural and cultural obstacles that might hinder transnational collaboration and information exchange. Furthermore, researchers have often focused their attention on how collaboration between organizations can be improved (van Duyne 1993). Transnational policing (or border policing) is often obstructed by different organizational, legal, and political

structures, as well as unclear lines of responsibility between collaborating nations (Aas and Gundhus 2015). As argued by Block (2008a, 191) inadequate knowledge of legal systems of collaboration partners can be more obstructive than the actual differences between the organizations in questions.

There are several other internal barriers in national police organizations that might interfere with collaboration and communication between units and departments: the specialisation of units, different ranks, and physical limits such as local settings and distance between the officers (Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017, 584). According to Gerspacher and Dupont (2007, 355-357), one important aspect of achieving systematic cooperation between national police services is to translate political incentive into operational procedures. Cross-border police collaboration might thus be obstructed by unclear guidelines, work procedures or incentives. Also, a lack of expertise, commitment or competence to develop the necessary frameworks or tools to create a joint collaboration strategy.

In the EU, the absence of a common legal framework and differences in the internal coordination of collaboration activities are identified as obstacles of collaboration (Dastanka and Chyprys 2014). With regards to intelligence sharing, excessive bureaucracy and hierarchical organization structures can be particularly troublesome when officers are working under time pressure (Block 2008b, 76). Actors can address such structural or organizational shortcomings by adopting unofficial roles and creating informal networks in order to overcome limitations set by existing structures and practices (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007; Whelan 2016).

Informal social networks entail increasing interpersonal exchange and collaboration between officers and their organizations. Such collaboration can highlight cultural differences, competition, and diverging interests between collaborating partners (Block 2008a; Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017). As noted by Schruijer (2008, 432), a common source of conflict between organizations is the contradiction between organizational interests, identities, and goals. International police collaboration (involving a multi-layered set of actors with ideologies and professional cultures) can thus be a conflict-ridden environment as the specific interests of the actors might differ greatly despite collaboration agreements (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 353, 355).

The creation of inter-organizational collaboration identities is a dynamic process. Collaboration and conflict go hand in hand and it is not uncommon that struggles arise in organizational relationships as actors strive to control or resist the activities of others (Basic 2018; Huxham and Beech 2008, 555-579; Schruijer 2008, 432). Despite agreements of collaboration and obligations to fight transnational crime, many such coordination obstacles can create confusion regarding the roles of actors involved in the collaboration. Researchers (such as Whelan 2016) emphasise the process through which collaborating partners from different units or organizations develop informal networks or organizational subcultures. Participation in these groups is dependent on trust,

commitment to the group, and the work that the group is performing (Al-Alawi, Marzooqi and Mohammed 2007; Cotter 2015; Whelan 2016).

Trust (and distrust) in police collaboration

As argued by researchers of intelligence sharing, information exchange is made possible by and facilitated through collaborative performances among actors in order to establish trust (Al-Alawi, Marzooqi and Mohammed 2007; Cotter 2015). In more general terms, trust is regarded as a basic collaboration mechanism in everyday social life (Bachmann and Zaheer 2008; Hufnagel and McCartney 2017). Similarities between individuals, such as age gender, ethnic background, and social status are also argued to influence trust development in groups (Brewer 1979; Turner 1987).

In police collaboration, the most basic level of trust involves individual police officers who trust one another (even though they might not trust the organizations or state systems that they are part of). On the other end of the spectrum is full institutional trust where law enforcement organizations and their members are equally trusted (Spapens 2017). Sztompka (1999, 42, 139) distinguishes various "circles of trust" in a community: from 1) family members, 2) people we know personally and interact with face-to face, 3) the members of a small community (a neighbourhood or a company), to larger groups of people, such as for example 4) the inhabitants of a country or a global population. As police organizations have comparable goals (such as maintaining public order, protecting the safety of individual citizens and public institutions and assisting victims) they can to some extend be regarded as communities (Spapens 2017).

Spapens (2017) focuses on informal regional networks and describes how informal interaction between collaborating officers results in various "circles of trust". In the study, Spapens concludes that informal networks are crucial building blocks to trust between EU members state police organizations and that informal networks contribute to widening the circles (or levels) of trust. Such networks are thus crucial for establishing inter-organizational and full institutional trust, and are essential in developing standardised collaboration agreements from the bottom up (2017).

However, despite such common goals or agreements, a lack of trust between law enforcement officials and organizations can arguably block or slow down information exchange and expectations of collaboration (for example between EU member states) (Bigo 2008, 105). Trusting collaboration partners is sometimes regarded as risk-taking; partners who experience mutual trust are more willing to take risks because there is a belief that others will not take advantage of you (Deutsch 1973; Hufnagel and McCartney 2017).

Endemic corruption in law enforcement organizations and institutions has especially been identified as a potential barrier to cross-border and transnational collaboration. Block's (2008, 193) study focuses on the collaboration between the European Union (EU) and the Russian Federation (RF), emphasising the significance of law

enforcement liaison officers (stationed by various EU Member States) in the RF. The findings of Block's study suggest that documented, structural corruption hindered intelligence information exchange, forcing the officers to build trust-based relationships and be careful when choosing direct contacts. Trust can thus be described as risk taking (where actors weigh the risks against the gains of collaboration) (Block 2008a), as an active, personal investment or as a leap of faith that one's trust will not be taken advantage of (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2015a).

Hufnagel and McCartney (2017, 1) see institutional legitimacy and trust as closely intertwined and essential within processes of achieving collaboration among organizations in the criminal justice systems. Still, interpersonal trust is often considered as formed on a micro level where individuals can negotiate group roles and motivation (Hufnagel and McCartney 2017). Previous research on collaboration has especially acknowledged the importance of collocation, that is, working in the same place (Lindberg 2009), emphasising that this provides opportunities for social interactions that create a greater sense of trust and motivation, and might eventually result in organization and collaboration efficiency.

As described in the introduction, Project Turnstone was on the one hand the result of changing political demands and legislations in the EU, and on the other hand, seen as a way to overcome the officers' experiences of cultural differences and distrust between inherently suspicious organizations. The next section delves deeper into the specific occupational culture of police organizations and how such a culture can obstruct transnational border police collaboration.

Police Occupational Culture

In previous research, conceptions of culture and identity are used in a number of ways for a variety of purposes and are often regarded as interchangeable metaphors in organization research[13]. In this study, I adopt Alvesson's (2013) view of organizational culture that emphasises the importance of norms, values, rituals, myths, stories, legends, and interpretive grids. Similar to the great scholarly interest in organizational culture, the concept of police culture has been considered and defined in various ways by several

[13] A common view is that organizational identity represents "the form by which organizational members define themselves as a social group in relation to their external environment, and how they understand themselves to be different from their competitors" (Alvesson 2013, 34). There is little consensus of the defining aspects of culture (2013, 3), but the concept is often described as a set of values and assumptions (conscious or unconscious) that explains norms, rituals, and symbols in the context in which they occur (O'Reilly, Chatman and Caldwell 1991; Wicks and Bradshaw 2002, 138). Other variations regard culture as collectively shared forms of cognition, ideas, meanings, ideologies, emotions, and expressiveness. Culture has also been defined as the collective unconscious, behaviour, structures, and practices that members of an organization share (Alvesson 2013, 3).

police researchers (Cain 1973; Chan 2004: Crank 2004; Manning 1977; Paoline 2003; Reiner 2015). There are numerous reasons for the great interest in the occupational culture and habits of the police. First, the police institution in society has a "double and contradictory origin and function"; it is both the agent of the people as well as the force controlling the same people (Robinson and Scaglion 1987, 109). Second, the police are gatekeepers to the criminal justice system and the most visible symbols of state in society (Loftus 2016).

In previous research, the concept of "police culture" is often used in relation to police organizations as independent units of analysis highlighting differences between police organizations (Whelan 2016). Reiner (2015, 324-325) describes police culture as a set of norms, values, perspectives, and craft rules that informs police behaviour, whereas Manning (1977) sees police culture as the cognitions, skills, and affect, which define good police work. These are all traits that officers need to acquire during a socialisation processes of police officers, such as learning behaviour patterns, expressing the right motivation and perspectives, and learning the right techniques and rules, all of which are especially highlighted in studies of new police recruits or officers in academy training (Chan 1996; Chan, Devery and Doran 2003; Prokos and Padavic 2002; Van Maanen 1973).

It is argued that in order to become part of the occupational cultures of the police, officers must learn the craft of policing and what constitutes the behaviour of "good" or "bad" police officers (Chan 1996; Chan, Devery and Doran 2003). Chan's (1997) extensive research on the Australian police looks at police socialisation, police culture, changes in police culture, racial prejudice, and organizational practices of the police. Chan (1996, 109) uses the concepts of habitus in analysing the transmission of police cultural knowledge and the socialisation process in which new recruits learn how to behave and act as police officers. Learning processes in police academy training are also highlighted by Prokos and Padavic (2002). Their study focuses on language use and the cultural practice of creating masculinity in police training and demonstrates how a hidden curriculum encourages features of hegemonic masculinity among police recruits in the USA. As police work might entail potential danger, the symbolism of the "aggressive crime fighter" (Herbert 2001, 66) is often associated with policing. However, police work involves a lot of downtime, most police work is considered to be boring and uneventful, and exciting events are rare (Phillips 2016, 580).

There are some core features that are relevant in all policing situations (albeit under different circumstances and to different degrees). First, the police represent authority which might put them in potentially dangerous situations. Second, the police are under constant pressure to achieve results (Reiner 2015), and third, they possess an inherent ambiguous role in society both as protectors and regulators (Paoline 2003). Police officers acquire what Finstad (2000) refers to as the "police gaze"; the police are trained to spot all that is deviant from the norm and that which civilian citizens would not

notice (Holmberg 2003). The organizational environment of the police has created stereotypical images of police officers as possessing a cynical worldview characterized by suspicion, pessimism, and prejudice. Research has also highlighted that being suspicious helps officers spot trouble in advance, notice offenses, and make them more efficient in detecting and solving crime (Chan 1997).

The idea of a homogenous police culture as a product of society has emerged from ethnographic studies of routine police work exposing a wide range of norms and values taking place in hierarchical structures of police organizations (Cain 1973; Crank 2004; Manning 1977). Early studies of the police have been criticised for providing a stereotypical image of police occupational culture as universal, monolithic, and resistant to change (Van Maanen 1978, 267; Reiner 2010). Much previous research of police organizations puts emphasis on internal characteristics of (national) policing and the occupational habits of street level police officers rather than other law enforcement networks or security nodes (Reiner 2015; Skolnick 1966; Whelan 2016).

Although some defining elements of (the classical understanding of) "police culture" (such as a celebration of masculine exploits, violence, mission, and displays of defensive solidarity with colleagues) are still prevailing in contemporary police environments, there have been a range of developments that have affected and changed police organizations (such as cultural, ethnic, and gender diversification, official critique of the police, and the increasing impact of community policing) (Loftus (2010; 2016).

Although police occupational culture (like any other culture) is not monolithic, (Manning 2007; Reiner 2000, 85), most previous studies of police culture are premised on the assumption that police officers belong to a specific national and or organizational culture by virtue of which they share some basic beliefs, norms, values, and cognitive grids. If we are to look at police organizations and their cultures as different, what holds police officers and their organizations together? One suggestion is a cluster of assumed ideas about police work shared by members of law enforcement organizations (Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017, 584; Manning 2010, p. 217). Reuss-Ianni (1983, 2-4) for instance describes two broad categories of police officers: *street cops* and *management cops*. Although these categories may differ in ranks and reflect different occupational cultures and habitus, representatives from these categories express a common occupational (police) ideology.

The absence of research on border police organizations (and culture) stands in stark contrast to the research of "ordinary" (national, street level) police officers (Loftus, 2015, 119). Some perspectives of organization cultural practices and identity work of border officials, border guard officers, and Frontex officials are provided by Aas and Gundhus (2015). Aas and Gundhus (2015) investigate the growing presence of human rights and humanitarian ideals, describing what may come across as a discrepancy between the activities of the organization and its public-self presentation. Their study reveals a clash between the officers' objectives of protecting state security with needs of

vulnerable groups in precarious situations. Another example is Heyman's (2002) anthropological study of border officials of Mexican ancestry working at the US Mexico, which raises issues of cultural prejudice and national belonging. Drawing on interviews, Heyman (2002) concludes that there are complex processes of identification at play in situations where immigration police and migrants share national origins.

However, one important question thus remains: how can previous studies of the occupational habits and cultures of (national) police organizations help our understanding of transnational (border police) collaboration? As argued by Whelan (2016, 587), the ambiguous role of police officers (as both protectors and regulators) as well as the basic pressure to fight crime and achieve results has made police officers distrusting and suspicious of outsiders. This might naturally have an effect on how law enforcement organizations approach their relationship with other networks and collaboration partners. However, such an argument highlights differences *between* police organizational cultures, rather than the collaboration processes taking place in transboundary collaboration or community formations that might emerge (Whelan 2016). On the other hand, a shared understanding of police work (with similar constraints, obligations, and commitment) might serve as central lubricants in coordinating and joint activities in the pursuit of fighting crimes. Nevertheless, there are still major gaps in existing research regarding change, cultural practices, organizational culture, and organization identity in transnational police collaboration.

Community of Practice in Police Research

The concept of community of practice has been widely used in different fields when analysing group interaction (such as for instance organization, education, business, government studies, development projects, civic life studies (Omidvar and Kislov 2014; Wenger 1998) and the health care sector (Li et al. 2009). With some exceptions, studies of international collaboration and police organizations have yet to explore the relevance of community of practice. The processes whereby police officers learn the culture and practices of policing have drawn much attention from police scholars (Chan 1996; Chan, Devery and Doran 2003; Prokos and Padavic 2002; Van Maanen 1973). Such learning processes are, however, mostly highlighted in studies of new police recruits or officers in academy training (Van Maanen 1973) rather than in collaboration processes of police organizations (Whelan 2016, 588).

For example, Chan (1996, 109) uses the concepts of habitus in analysing the transmission of police cultural knowledge and the socialisation processes of police recruits in Australia. Drawing on Bourdieu's (1992) theory of practice she claims that the notions of habitus, field, and capital provide suitable instruments for understanding the relationship between the structural conditions of policing and of police cultural knowledge, that is, how officers learn how to talk, walk, and behave as police officers

when interacting in the police environment. She accounts for the processes in which police culture is transmitted from one generation to the next through socialization practices where the recruits learn the craft of policing and develop an understanding of what constitutes "bad" or "good" policing.

Other researchers have focused on the different professional habitus and work routines in European border guarding (Bigo 2014) or referred to varied group habitus or moral communities when discussing police occupational culture (Fassin 2013, 23-24). Cambell (2007) uses the concept of communities of practice in developing an understanding of the learning that occurs in early police training. According to Cambell, benefits of combining theories of police culture with the framework of communities of practices is the focus on learning processes of early-career police, their identity as police officers, and their participation in the community of policing. Cambell does not, however look at processes of transnational collaboration or analyse the community building of officers from different units or police organizations (2007).

Similarly, Lundin and Nuldén (2007) investigate the daily mundane work of Swedish police officers and how the use of police tools triggered learning through discussion in police practice. An important part of the socialisation of police officers is to learn how the tools are used and mastered by the community. The tools described ranged from radios, cars, horses and dogs, to computers, reports and warrants. Drawing on Lave and Wenger (1991), Lundin and Nuldén (2007, 223) argue that learning is framed and driven by increased social participation within communities. Their study highlights how police officers talk about police tools, how they talk about the use of tools, and how newcomers learned to master and were taught how to talk about the tools. The introduction of new tools demanded a process of evolving practices (through talking and thinking) and of evolving the competence of the practitioners. These conversations were seen as vital parts of the police community and the learning of that community.

Another example of studying police work through the framework of communities of practice is de Laat and Broer's (2004) research of knowledge management within the Dutch police force. They conclude that the large organization of the Dutch police enjoy a variety of specialised knowledge in different units, both tacit and explicit, that needs to be shared in order to create new standards and developments within the organization. Their study highlights the informal ways in which police officers often discuss work related problems during coffee breaks, over the telephone or during ad-hoc meetings outside their working hours. Despite the bureaucratic nature of the organization, the work of the officers could not always be directly supervised, and there was room for some horizontal decentralisation and deviation from bureaucratic direction (2004).

According to de Laat and Broer (2004), the organization heavily relied on the skills and knowledge of its workers as it operated in a constantly changing environment. Changes in the work environment have required specialists in certain areas, taking advantage of the latest technical advances to enhance communication between those experts around

the country. As the need to keep in close contact with one another became crucial, various communities of practice have spontaneously developed within certain areas of expertise. The communities identified by de Laat and Broer (2004) sustained as well as developed their own practices. Eventually, hybrid networks discussing and sharing both operational and professional knowledge within the Dutch police force developed. The value of this, is arguably the recognition that work experiences might lead to innovation and that the integration of learning and working emphasises the importance of recognising tacit knowledge within organizations.

Additionally, other researchers have looked at the creation of information networks in cross-border police collaboration. Informal networks and informal work exchange, however, requires personal interactions and processes where collaborating partners can get to know one another and build trust (Block 2008a; Whelan 2016). Thus, the existing police research has limited contributions to the understanding of collaboration projects, how organizational culture shapes networks, and how these networks shape and change (police) culture (Whelan, 2016, 588). In the next chapter, I outline a theoretical framework that is apt at capturing the changing nature of border police work, which features an increased degree of transnational collaboration and informal interaction.

3. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter I introduce the theoretical framework and outline the theories that I use when analysing my ethnographic material. I suggest that the concept of community of practice (as developed by Lave and Wenger (1991)), may serve as a theoretical lens to study transnational police collaboration. I argue that the concept of community of practice is suited for its ability to capture structural and political aspects as well as social interaction, language, and cultural practices taking place during the collaboration project.

Community of Practice

The concept of practice has been applied to various dimensions of the social world; from highly structured actions in institutional settings to everyday aspects of social life (Rouse 2007). The specific concept of *community of practice* is used by anthropologist Jean Lave and social learning theorist Etienne Wegner (1991) in order to study mechanisms of group development, identity formation, and the negotiation of meaning within communities. Communities of practice are described as groups of people who share a common concern about a problem and attempt to understand this problem further by interacting with other practitioners on a continuing basis. Through various formal and informal interactions, the group members share advice, insight, and build a collective knowledge base (Mitra 2008, 222-224; Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002).

Communities of practice (or groups with similar focus) come in different sizes, some are local whereas others are global, some interact face-to face and others only interact online[14]. According to Wenger (1998), we all belong to different communities and we travel through numerous group commitments over the course of our lives. Communities of practice are not new phenomena, and Wenger's theory draws on several intellectual traditions. The theoretical backdrop of community of practice are:

[14] Members of a community do not have to continue to work together on a daily basis to sustain the community. New technologies have extended the ways in which group members can interact beyond geographical limits and maintain their bonds. According to Wenger (1998, 131), this calls for new kinds of communities based on shared practice and expands the possibilities for communities.

1) theories of *social practice* and *social structure* (focusing on institutions, rules, norms, discourses, and the social systems of shared recourses by which groups coordinate and organize their activities), and 2) theories of *identity* and *situated experience* (focusing on the social formation of a person, agency, issues of gender, ethnicity, age, class, cultural formations of the body, dynamics of everyday existence, interactional choreography, and improvisation). According to Wenger, learning and participation fall in between these perspectives; learning is a vehicle for the inclusion of newcomers and the evolution of practices, as well a vehicle for identity transformation and development. Wenger's social theory of learning is also influenced by theories of collectivity (addressing the formations of various social figurations in society), theories of subjectivity (focusing on individuality as an experience of agency), theories of power and theories of meaning (1998, 13-14).

Wenger's (1998, 281-283) views on the situatedness of experience is further influenced by sociologists and anthropologists in the fields of symbolic interactionism (Blumer 1962), interactional theories of identity (Goffman 1959; Mead 1934), and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967; Jordan 1989). Wenger's understanding of the concept of practice is influenced by several researchers (such as for example Habermas (1984), Latour (1986), and Wittgenstein (1953)). Drawing on Lave (1988), practice is seen to be the key to grasping the complexity of human thought and action as it takes place in real life. Following Bourdieu (1972; 1979), Wenger (1998, 51) regards a practice as implying not only the "work of bodies and brains but mostly what endows meaning to the motions of the bodies and the workings of the brains". A practice is thus what members of a community *do* in order to be able to cope with their daily activities. In this sense, the concept of practice involves *doing*, but a doing that has a structure and meaning only in a historical and a social context.

Practice is always a social practice, involving both explicit and tacit understanding, what is said and what is unsaid, what is represented and what is assumed, including all the tools, documents, images, symbols, roles, rules of thumb, criteria, codified procedures, and values, that community members share (Wenger 1998, 47). Furthermore, the use of the term "practice" does not refer to a dichotomy between theory and practice, knowing and acting, doing and talking, although a practice involves all of these (Wenger 1998, 48). Even communities specialised in the production of theories (see for example Haas' (1992) study of epistemic communities) are involved in a practice, since "things have to be done, relationships worked out, situations interpreted, meaning negotiated, artifacts [used and] produced, conflicts resolved" and so forth (Wenger 1998, 49). Even though people have different enterprises, pursuing them involves the same kind of embodied, active, social, complex, and negotiated process of participation (1998, 49).

Sharing knowledge

The community of practice perspective has emerged from a view of learning as a social process that is tied to ongoing activities and practices within communities of people rather than isolated individuals (Fox 2000, 854). Drawing on ethnographic observations of practices among Yucatán midwives, Liberian tailors, meat cutters, US navy quartermasters, and recovering alcoholics, Lave and Wenger (1991) describe how apprenticeship helps people learn. The purpose of their research is to understand *how* learning in groups occurs outside of the classroom and how newcomers eventually became established members of the group. The different communities are described through examples and case histories in order to illustrate learning through practice, which they refer to as situated learning. Their observations suggest that newcomers into a group of established practitioners initially engaged in simple tasks, observed the other members, and eventually participated in more complicated practices. As the participants learned through joining these communities and by participating in joint activities, Lave and Wenger see learning as a process of social interaction rather than an individual knowledge acquisition. Communities of practitioners thus evolve when people who engage in the same skill-based activities start to share insights and experiences. Even though few people outside of the group would recognise the knowledge of the community, the members highly value their collective competence (Brown and Duguid 2001; Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998).

Lave and Wenger (1991) illustrate their theory by describing how practitioners acquire tacit knowledge relevant to their trades through informal gatherings. During informal gatherings (such as for example nurses meeting for lunch in the hospital cafeteria) people of the same trade share stories and experiences, gaps in the practice can be highlighted, and solutions can be suggested. In this way, the practitioners can improve their work practices and generate new knowledge. Informal social gatherings might also make it easier for trainees to consult with more experienced workers in a non-threating environment (Wenger and Wenger-Trayner 2015, 2). The main aim of their study was to broaden previous perceptions of apprenticeship from a master-student relationship to a process of identity transformation and changing participation in a community of practice (Wenger, 1998, 11).

Participants in a community of practice share a passion or a concern for something that they do, and when interacting regularly this group might, as they say, "get better" at what they do. This can for instance involve a network of practitioners learning new working techniques, a population learning to survive in a new environment or a group of artists seeking new expression. Meaning is located in a process of negotiation that puts premium on the temporality of practice. Hence, as a practice is sustained over time, it leads to the formation of a community or a community of practice. In pursuing and engaging with their goals and enterprises practitioners develop relationships with one another and with the world. The two parallel processes (the pursuit of common goals and the connected social relationships) lead to a collective experience and social

learning, which over time results in a practice. However, such a community is not static and exists as long as the members consider that they have something to contribute to or gain form the community and continue to perform work practices together (Kietzmann et al. 2013; McDermott 1999).

Communities of practice in previous research

The popularity of the concept of communities of practice has been interpreted in terms of its ability to effectively deal with unstructured, organizational problems, to highlight knowledge sharing outside of traditional structural boundaries, and to describe the development of long-term organizational memory (Storck and Hill 2000). The community of practice approach has especially been used as a theory of learning and has also been incorporated into the field of knowledge management (Hildreth and Kimble 2004).

The observed benefits of communities of practice, for example to capture tacit knowledge, is believed to improve the productivity of organizations. The concept of communities of practice has been adopted by various organizations (in business settings) and there is great interest to support, sponsor, and encourage the development of communities of practice[15] (Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002). Communities of practice are also believed to assist workers to convert theory into practice; to bridge the gap between knowing what to do and knowing how to do something (Duguid 2005, 6). However, this study does not regard the theory of community of practice as a recipe (Wenger 1998, 9) and the purpose is not to serve as a guide for how transnational police collaboration should be organized. Instead, the theoretical approach presented in this chapter serves as a framework for understanding and analysing the collaborative processes and practices taking place during Project Turnstone.

Mutual Engagement, Enterprise and Repertoire

The concept of community of practice has been further developed by Wenger (1998), who defines a community of practice as an assembly of people who are engaged in a joint project and who do things (practices) together. Wenger (1998, 73) identifies three dimensions of a practice that lends coherence to a community: 1) mutual engagement, 2) a joint enterprise, and 3) a shared repertoire. A mutual engagement refers to the ties that bind the members of a community into a social entity. Members of a group build collaborative relationships and establish norms through participation in the community. Practice resides in a community of people and in the relations of mutual engagement which enable the group to "do what they do". Mutual engagement does

[15] The concept of community of practice was not brought up by any participants regarding Project Turnstone or the Power Weeks.

not require homogeneity; it does not imply that all members agree with everything or believe the same things, but that they are engaged in that which is communally negotiated (Wenger 1998, 73-76, 78; Wenger and Wenger-Trayner 2015, 2).

Trough participation, interaction, and (re) negotiation, the group establishes norms, builds collaborative relationships and produces a shared understanding of what binds them together. The result of such collective processes is defined by the participants, being referred to as a joint enterprise. A joint enterprise is not just about stated goals but entails a mutual uncountability that becomes an integral part of the practices of the participants. As part of the shared practices, the community creates a set of communal resources that they use in order to pursue their joint enterprise and negotiate meaning. Through joint pursuit and repeated collaborative work, a group of practitioners eventually develops a repertoire of words, phrases and concepts used by the members in the group which can include both symbolic and literal meaning (Wenger 1998, 77-78, 82-83). The repertoire might also include other various artifacts such as stories, specialised terminology, and metaphors (Alvesson and Billing 1997).

The use of specific terminology indicates the members inclusion and identification with belonging to the group (Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999; Wenger 1998, 80). Words, gestures, expressions or a specific language become important links between individuals in the group and provide a setting where linguistic practices emerge as a purpose of this link (Wenger 1998, 73, 93; Eckert 2006, 1). One example is Holmes and Meyerhoff 's (1999)[16] study of a New Zealand police unit where the members engaged in various greeting rituals, with strict understandings of how much small talk was acceptable in different settings. In the context of the officers participating in Project Turnstone, their linguistic practices included joking, teasing, sharing stories, and eventually developing a set of standards regarding what is appropriate to do and say and what is not, as will be discussed subsequently in this study.

Participation, Reification and Group Identity

In the creation of communities of practice Wenger (1998, 55-56) emphasises the importance of learning as a social practice. The meaning of participation in this context focuses on personal processes (involving our bodies, minds, and emotions) and social processes (our social relations). Participation in this sense combines talking, doing, belonging, and feeling. Such active involvement and participatory action in social

[16] Holmes and Meyerhoff (1999, 180) contrast the term community of practice and the term speech community. The concept of speech community is often used in studies of the heterogeneity of language in social settings. In a speech community, shared norms and evaluations of norms are required, whereas a community of practice requires and focuses on a shared practice. The acquisition of norms is important for a speech community while social processes of learning are emphasised in a community of practice.

processes are necessary for a community of practice to develop. In this context, action and knowledge production, or thinking and acting, are inseparable from the situated social engagement, as people learn through action in co-participative ways (Omidvar and Kislov 2014, 267).

As personal interaction is a main requirement for members to experience group identity and trust, merely having the same job or title does not automatically make a community of practice. The fact that police and border officers around the world have a lot in common and might share information does not automatically make them into one large community of practice unless they personally interact with one another. Joint activities enable members to build trust-based relationships, learn from one another, and to pursue their goals in their particular domain of interest. This is a process that constantly needs to be reproduced, re-negotiated, and reasserted in practice in order to be fruitful (Wenger 1998, 94).

A second important process of community building highlighted by Wenger (1998, 57-59) is "reification". In conjunction with participation, Wenger sees the concept of reification as useful in order to describe how people give tangible form to their collective experiences and negotiate meaning within communities. The term reification refers to the process of using and producing artifacts such as documents and reports that stabilise and convert the dynamics of their doings and sayings into a more durable form. All communities (of practice) produce objects such as tools, abstractions, symbols, terms, stories and concepts that make something seem less abstract and appear more "solid" (Lee 2007; Wenger 1998, 58-59). Elements of reification thus make the group more "real" to the participants and to others, as the artifacts provide physical "proof" of the group's existence and contributions (Wenger 1998, 105).

In this study, I consider both document material and material artifacts to be important to the social interaction and community building of the border police officers participating in Project Turnstone. In the case of Project Turnstone, "physical objects", such as emails, documents, statistics, and reports also made sure that that all members within the community had access to their collective resources. The sustenance of a community is contingent upon how well it is fulfilling its mission, which is usually captured in performance measuring devices involving ratios and numbers. The second meaning of such artifacts is that they play the role of intermediaries between the community and outside institutions on which it depends.

Identity formation

A community of practice emerges in response to a common interest or position that plays an important role in shaping the members' world-view (Eckert 2006, 3). Identity formation is thus a central element to the theory of community of practice. As each member struggles to find a place in the group it adds dynamism and unpredictability to the production of practices. Change can entail that practices and perspectives need

to be imported from one community into another. Knowledge generation occurs through negotiations of meaning, which can transform the individual identity and practice (Wenger 1998, 81, 188).

Contextually continued interaction and performance eventually leads to the experience of group identity (Mitra 2008, 222-224). This identity is highly dependent on participation and the concrete re-productions of the participants' sense of being through their joint activities. The duality of participation (face-to-face) and the development and use of artifacts generate a process of negotiation of meaning and alignment between members that can be achieved if actions, perspectives, and common purpose are co-ordinated. Becoming member in the group thus implies a commitment and a shared competence that distinguish the members from other groups and identify them as members of a specific group.

Negotiation and Power

A community of practice exists because people are engaged in activities whose meaning they negotiate with one another. However, a shared practice does not necessarily imply collaboration or harmony (Wenger 1998, 85). Any attempt to study the social world must confront issues of power (Wenger 1998, 284) and all members of a community of practice will not have the same voice or authority (Mitra 2008, 236). Even if a group identifies a joint enterprise and a mutual goal, the specific work practices of a newly formed community are rarely stated and pre-defined; these must be negotiated by the members. In the process of pursuing their goal and their joint enterprise, the members create relations of mutual accountability. Relationships between people in a group are characterised by complex combinations of power and dependence, alliance and competition, success and failure, resistance and compliance, fun and boredom, friendship and hatred, and trust and suspicion (Wenger 1998, 76-80).

If a community of practice is to "survive" and continue its negotiation of practices, sustained mutual relationships, harmonious or conflictual, are necessary (Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999, 176; Wenger 1998, 47). Activities that develop common practices are for example problem solving, coordination, discussing developments, documentation, organizing visits, mapping knowledge, and identifying knowledge gaps. Even formal meetings should be added to the list, as formal interactions are not completely freed from informal interactions (even though such formal interactions require more intense and specific participation to remain meaningful for the participating members) (Wenger 1998, 67).

In community development, it is not uncommon that boundaries between participants may arise. Boundaries between inside and outside, membership and non-membership, and inclusion and exclusion are often unavoidable. The individual membership in the group might differ, as some are regarded as "core" members and some only as

"peripheral" members (Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999, 176). However, membership is not static and members' position as either insiders or outsiders may shift based on situation or on-going practice. Being in a periphery position (not fully included but part of some group interaction) might be an ambiguous position as access to practice (and participation) is possible, but also a position where outsiders are kept from moving further inward (Wenger 1998, 290).

As the focus of a community of practice is on negotiation of work practices, tensions, disagreements, and conflicts may certainly appear as part of this process. Even if the members identify common goals or share a joint enterprise they might experience challenges, disagreements, and competition as part of their collaborative work (Wenger 1998, 80). Similar to the theories of Simmel (1908/70), conflicts between people who share a common understanding or goal can be seen as indications of the strong commitment of the involved participants. "Rebellion" in the group can reveal a greater commitment than passive conformity (Wenger 1998, 80). Conflicts in a group can thus be integrating and unifying instead of destructive and separating (Basic 2018a; Simmel 1908/70). In the present study regarding Project Turnstone, these perspectives on negation and conflict are used in analysing the collaboration processes taking place during the Power Weeks.

Concluding Remarks

How and why can the perspective of communities of practice add to our understanding of transnational border police collaboration? The notion of community of practice has emerged in the course of my study as relevant as it helps understand how a social group of people informally bound together without taken for granted abstract characteristics (such as for instance gender, class, nationality, common national language or culture), who do not work in the same place, but who are bound together by "a shared practice" engage in collaboration (Wenger and Snyder 2000, 139). Another advantage is that it emphasises informal, face-to-face (participatory) interactions as a mechanism for practitioners to build trust-based relationships, which has been argued as crucial for sharing criminal intelligence information (Block 2008a; Whelan 2016).

As previously noted, existing research on police collaboration often draws on cultural and socialisation processes that presuppose a culturally, socially, and institutionally coherent context (often alluded to as, for instance, the Dutch police, British police or the Gothenburg police). Furthermore, aspects of police socialisation, community building, and collaboration (Cambell 2007; Chan 1996; de Laat and Broer 2004; Lundin and Nuldén 2007) are often considered from a national and culturally specific context. Studies often focus on describing collaboration between officers who work in the same (or similar) organizations (albeit in different areas and work tasks), assuming

a context of similar norms, values, and languages. The officers participating in Project Turnstone, however, stem from different national, cultural, and organizational backgrounds. Despite this, they have identified a common purpose and recognised a need for collaboration and innovative methods. The question of interest is thus: what happens when a temporary organization (a project) consisting of members with a diversity of social backgrounds, cultural practices, languages, and work tasks attempt close collaboration?

Although having identified a joint enterprise and doing similar work tasks, the participating officers did not initially agree on the proper work conduct, claiming that they belonged to different cultural and organizational contexts. The only way to increase their group identity, achieve innovation, and trust one another enough to share secret and sensitive information was arguably to work together; to do things together, to negotiate practices, share experiences, and learn from one another. For these reasons, the framework of community of practice is considered as suitable in analysing my empirical material.

4. Studying Border Police Collaboration

The first time I visited one of the joint activities organized by Project Turnstone I was greeted by a senior officer who showed me around the building. After walking up and down several stairs, through narrow, sterile corridors, and riding an elevator he finally showed me to the room where the intelligence officers were working. I walked into the large, spacious conference room, smiled and introduced myself. I saw a number of men and women sitting around a large table enthusiastically working on their laptops. The officers' attention was one hundred percent focused on the task at hand. Only a couple of people raised their heads as I introduced myself. The senior officer told me that they had prepared a space where I could conduct interviews in private. We stepped out of the conference room and continued down the corridor. The officer pointed at one of the rooms further down the corridor and started to laugh. A few seconds later I understood why; the room at my disposal was an interrogation room used for interviewing suspects. The room was rather small with one bench and two chairs on both sides. When I heard the officer laughing behind me I realised that I had just experienced my first encounter with the officers' proneness to joking with newcomers and had taken my first steps to approaching the field.

Although few officers talked to me on that same day, the data gathering process that later followed would eventually allow me to fully take part in joint practices such as everyday conversations, social gatherings, formal meetings, informal dinners, corridor chitchat, and the occasional visit to the local bar with the officers. I realised early on that gaining the trust of the officers was going to be a significant part of my ethnographic fieldwork and an important step in the progression of completing this study.

This study relies on observation and interview material, as well as secondary material (such documents, charters, PowerPoint slides, etc), conducted in seven border and police organizations in Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Sweden periodically during a two-year period[17]. In this chapter, I outline the methodological procedures of

[17] The data was gathered in 2014 and 2015.

accessing, gathering, processing, and analysing the ethnographic data. Finally, my position in the field, issues of representation, and ethical considerations are discussed.

Fieldwork and Participant Observation

In order to study the social interaction between the officers and the emergence of a (intelligence police) community of practice, it has been necessary to conduct participant observation. Participant observation refers to the method of collecting data in "natural" settings which have not been set up for research purposes (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, 4). I have looked at the everyday interactions of the officers and how these interactions have developed during the course of the project.

According to Silverman (2013, 17), the instinct of the ethnographer is to find ordinary features in extraordinary events. Much of my time in the field consisted of observing everyday work, even when nothing "exciting" happened and the officers worked side by side on their laptops. These seemingly "ordinary" situations have, however, been of importance, as they describe how every-day work practices were carried out in relatively "extraordinary" situations. The officers performed joint work duties as they would do back home, but in another country, and in a foreign office with people whom they did not know and whom they sometimes distrusted.

Speaking the Same Language

Studying organizations operating in several countries present a range of difficulties concerning language barriers, and access challenges due to the geographical locations of these organizations. Since I live in Sweden, the consequence was of course that I had easier access to the Swedish organizations and that it was easier to communicate with Swedish speaking officers (as Swedish is my first language) However, this issue was not as clear-cut since English was the spoken language among the intelligence officers in coordinating their everyday activities. English was not the first language of any of the participants during the Power Weeks. However, English is the official working language of the European border police officers. The EU commission has compiled an English style guide stipulating what terms and phrases are to be used in international work and when writing documents or reports for the EU[18]. There are thus guidelines of certain words and phrases, which the officer should use in order to understand one

[18] English Style Guide: A handbook for authors and translators in the European Commission, Seventh edition: August 2011. Last updated: February 2018.

another. Even a few Swedish-speaking officers preferred talking about their work in English since they had become used to speaking English at work[19].

As a researcher, it was necessary for me to learn specific border guard concepts and terms in order to understand the officers and be able to communicate with them. Of course, not speaking the same language as one's informants might create obstacles as on two occasions when I had to rely on the help of interpreters. The interpreters were employed by the border organizations and were thus familiar with border and police related concepts, as well as being acquainted with anonymity and confidentiality issues. The two interpreters who aided me in my work were police officers themselves, being thereby conversant with the work that the officers performed.

Multi-Sited Fieldwork

Doing ethnographic fieldwork has historically implied the idea of living and talking with the people one studies for an extended period of time. Early ethnographers and anthropologists, such as Malinowski (2014 [1922]) sought to understand how people perceived their world, to find pieces of social systems, and thereby discover how they fit together in the societies under consideration. The method of ethnography or participant observation is, however, not always bounded to a specific place or a physical space. Malinowski's (2014) study of the systematic trade of the *Kula ring* in the Trobriand Islands is considered to be the first multi-sited fieldwork (Nader 2011, 215). In *Argonauts of the Western Pacific,* Malinowski describes a network or trade, friendship, and exchange between Island societies in Papua New Guinea. The trade is viewed as a functional and "rational" system essential to the social life of the people involved. Because of the trade, life-long obligations and expectations of reciprocity were created. In comparison, police and border guard officers in this study described the countries and organizations included in the project as a "triangle of trade" and exchange of information.

The Triangle project (as well as another previous project referred to as Operation Gunder) was the predecessor of Project Turnstone aiming to increase collaboration between Estonia, Finland, and Sweden. However, one of the core purposes of the project was to include other border organizations to extend the collaboration network. This entailed that the officers had to physically travel and meet one another in various locations in the five participating countries. As a researcher studying the participants in a project, my "field" has, in a way been the project itself. I have followed the participants as they travelled between various sites, such as the offices and conference rooms of the seven different organizations partaking in the project, as well as various ports, ferry

[19] A few interviewed Finish officers were fluent in Swedish and asked to be interviewed in Swedish. Other Swedish speaking officers from Finland chose to speak English in the interviews since they were more used to talking about their work in English.

terminals, cargo ships, border guard vans, police cars, and border crossings in the Baltic Sea area.

The idea of what comprises a "multi-sited fieldwork" needs clarification, as noted by Hage (2005). Hage (2005, 463-466) criticizes the extensive use of "multi-sited ethnography" referring to it as a "buzz word". The present ethnographic fieldwork has been multi-sited both for me and for some of the participating border officers. The officers, as well as myself always "travelled" to the "project"; the project was located wherever there was work to be done, regardless of the physical location.

During the first year of fieldwork, I witnessed how border officers who were strangers to one another have gradually developed close work relationships, and eventually conversing and joking as old friends. Although some of the officers were slightly acquainted with one another when the project started, working in new conditions and in new spaces provided a similar working experience to that of doing multi-sited fieldwork. Therefore, I was not the only one new to the environment or the only one unfamiliar with the local language or the area[20]. This sense of insecurity has accelerated the socialization process among us as most of us were out of our comfort zones. The choice of focusing this dissertation mainly on the traveling group of border officers participating in the Power Weeks has in this sense made the multi-sited fieldwork somewhat less multi-sited.

Being involved in more than one place or field at a time requires attention and determination from the researcher. My research was restricted to the duration of the project (which lasted between January 2014 and December 2015), the funding, the available recourses, and by the access granted by the different border authorities. The time frame and funding precluded extensive systematic observation of the operational police and border guard work at the seven border authorities. However, issues concerning access or funding have not provided any methodological obstacles for completing this study.

My fieldwork consisted of several brief visits (a few days up to a week at a time) to the border and police agencies during two years. As the focus of this study can be described as a "temporary" organization, that is, a temporary collaboration project, fieldwork and visits were often arranged in connection with other activities related to the project. Such project related activities, for example, involved the joint work weeks (described as the Power Weeks), a conference organized by the project members, and project related formal meetings.

[20] Naturally, the work tasks were not new to the participating police and border officers and my position is in this sense not comparable to the officers', as I had no education or previous experience of border related work.

The Power Weeks

During the Power Weeks (that took place eight times during two years) I was allowed to participate as an observer. During my first visits, I found it hard to achieve a comfortable balance between observing and interacting. As described by Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, 4-5), the exploratory character of ethnographic research means that it might not be clear from the start where one should begin observing, which setting one should focus on and which actors should be shadowed. Shadowing (Czarniawska 1997) or going-along (Kusenbach 2003) can be described as practices of observing people as they move over time and in different contexts (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, 39).

I started out by following the officers with whom I had previously made acquaintance at the formal project meetings. I soon realised that most of the interactions, negotiations, and decision-making processes took place within the Power Week office. The more informal interactions, such as those taking place during lunches, breaks, and dinners were also insightful in that they provided interesting comparison to the interactions that took place in the office. It is important to point out that each Power Week took place in one of the participating organizations, which meant that the Power Week officers changed location with each Power Week. The venue was usually a conference room or a large meeting room equipped with a big table, white boards, a projector, and various decorations such as maps of the local area, photos of sea vessels, flags or gifts received from visiting organizations. There were days when the officers went on excursions to explore the nearby area or visit other officers at the host organizations. Sometimes, the officers mostly worked in the Power Week office only talking and exchanging information or asking one another questions. My participation during the Power Weeks can be summed up in these activities:

- Taking notes and observing the events taking place in the Power Week office.
- Taking notes of the conversations taking place between the officers.
- Observing the various office settings and artifacts used by the officers (and taking photos of these after asking for permission).
- Following the officers when they went on excursions or visits in border areas (harbours and airports).
- Participating in joint work lunches, lunch walks, and coffee breaks.
- Participating in after work (related) activities such as having dinner at their hotel or drinks at a local pub.
- Talking to officers who participated in the Power Weeks during their breaks.
- Talking to officers who did not participate directly in Project Turnstone but who worked in the five participating organizations.

- Participating in the semi-formal meetings occasionally arranged by the Power Week participants (for example, morning start up meetings where the officers debriefed one another on previous day's work and work activities of the day).

Most of my time was thus spent in the Power Week office listening to, observing, and taking notes of the officers' work and interactions.

A "typical" research day usually lasted from nine in the morning to ten or eleven in the evening. I often stayed at the same hotel as the other visiting officers and we sometimes met up for breakfast in the dining room. One of the host officers would arrive at a quarter to nine and pick us up in a border guard or police van. The officers often joked about feeling tired for staying up late the previous evening. When arriving at the host organization we made our way to the Power Week office and unpacked our laptops. The officers immediately started to check their emails and phones for any new messages or information. Sometimes, there were trouble with the internet connection and it would take some time before the officers were able to access their emails and search engines.

I would usually begin by starting my laptop, opening a new document for taking notes, and getting a cup of tea or coffee at the nearby coffee and snack table. The mornings were often spent taking notes, observing and listening to the officers as they exchanged information about previously committed crimes and updating one another on recent arrests or on-going surveillance activities. I alternated between the Power Week office room (where I often shared a large conference table with the other officers) and the corridor to talk to officers who were on their breaks. Occasionally, other officers from the host organization would come by, share a story and talk to me and the other officers about collaboration or recent events.

Lunch was usually organized in the afternoon, around three o'clock, but the officers took several snack breaks during the day. These breaks provided opportunities for me to conduct short semi-structured interviews with the officers who were willing to do so. I conducted these interviews in empty office spaces, calm lounge areas or some other office that the host organization allocated to me. I usually joined the officers for lunch at a nearby restaurant[21]. Conversations during lunch breaks often focused on the local areas, the local food or other peculiarities about our current location. After lunch, the officers would go back to the Power Week office and would continue working until evening. I would continue to observe their work, take notes of their dialogues, and ask questions when I got the opportunity. Dinner often took place around half past nine in the evening, either at the hotel or at a restaurant nearby. Most of the officers participated in the joint dinners, whereas some stayed on to have a drink or a beer

[21] On a few occasions, the officers thought that they had so much work to do that they ordered lunch or dinner (often pizza) to the Power Week office and ate at their desks.

afterwards. I often stayed on for a bit with the officers before heading back to the hotel where I would often stay up to write notes of the day's events before going to bed.

With one exception I participated in all Power Weeks with the Power Week team members that took place in 2014 and 2015. My field co-researcher Goran Basic also conducted fieldwork during these weeks but in other organizations[22] within the Turnstone project. The project initiators' idea was that the Power Week team would serve as a hub for gathering, processing and analysing intelligence information relevant to the participating organizations. Any information generated or assembled by the team was sent to the other organizations during the Power Weeks. For example, if the officers received information that a suspected car thieve was currently in Tallinn, Estonia, they would contact the Estonian police and border guard board to share the information with them. The purpose of conducting field work in the organization hosting the Power Week team, as well as in other organizations during the same week was to get insight into collaborative work processes generated during the Power Weeks[23]. After each Power Week, Goran and I compared notes from our observations. In this way, we usually found similarities in how various events had been understood or interpreted at the different locations. In between the Power Weeks, the project initiators organized various formal meetings regarding the developments of the project.

Formal meetings

The initiators of Project Turnstone were responsible for organizing the project activities, such as the Power Weeks and some formal meetings. The purpose of the meetings, I was told, was to make sure that everyone knew what to do and understood the main goals and purpose of the project. Because Project Turnstone in itself was an attempt to increase informal collaboration (and thus *de*creases the formal aspects of collaboration), it was decided that the formal meetings were to be kept at a minimum. Despite this attempt, Project Turnstone was generally made up of various meetings (some formal, some less formal) (Åkerström, Yakhlef and Wästerfors 2018). As noted above, I was granted permission to participate in several of these meetings. During the formal meetings (for example, the first introductory Management Board Meeting and a few other project meetings) my role was mostly that of an observer. One exception is a brainstorming session during the Management Board Meeting where I participated in a group discussion of our expectations of the project. During the Final Conference Meeting organized by the project initiators, I held a short presentation of my research and answered questions regarding the reports written about the project. Aside from

[22] Except for our joint participation in some of the formal project related meetings, my co-field research partner Goran Basic and I conducted fieldwork and interviews separately. The reason is that we hoped to compare our experiences and thus achieve a more nuanced research material. In addition to conducting fieldwork in all the participating organizations, Goran and I both conducted interviews with members from these organizations.

[23] In order to protect the anonymity of the officers I have chosen not to disclose the exact locations where the Power Weeks took place.

these occasions, I did not take active part in the meetings but only focusing on observing and taking notes of the events.

When observing meetings, I always tried to write down conversations and comments word for word. Some notes are therefore direct quotations whereas others are descriptions of the meetings. In my notes, I made a clear distinction between direct quotes and observation notes. When I did not have time to write full quotations, for example, during a PowerPoint presentation, I always wrote "person A said that…" or "person B accounted for x in the following way…" in order not to confuse such notes with direct quotes.

During meetings I always took notes on a note pad or in a notebook. These notes were later entered into my laptop. As highlighted by Thedvall (2006, 32), in one's role as an observer during meetings, the researcher has the possibility of paying full attention to the meeting members rather than focusing on one's own input or performance. In addition to taking notes of what was said during the meetings, I focused on describing the tone of voice and facial expressions of the members. I also made notes of instances when the members looked bored, picked up their phones or sighted unabashed. The interactions before, after, and during breaks provided opportunities for talking to the members about the meetings and the project in general. The documents and material created and distributed by the project members during such formal meetings were also important for the analysis underlying this study (as described subsequently).

Visiting border zones: harbours and airports

In addition to observing the Power Weeks and the formal meetings, I visited the participating organizations in order to follow some of the daily work of the police, coast guard, and border officers. I also visited several harbours and airports in the five participating countries after having gained access to these by the project participants whom I met at the formal meetings or during the Power Weeks. Having a "contact" person in each organization, who was very familiar with the Project Turnstone was central for me gaining access. My visits can best be described as shadowing (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, 39), as I followed several officers during their workday in various situations. For example, when following the work of airport border officers, I often received a tour of their work area and a quick introduction to their work tasks. I then spent time in their office, talked with their colleagues, and witnessed some of their work in passport controls. I followed them around the airports or harbour areas when they met other officers or participated in staff meetings.

When following border officers who checked the passport or vehicle content of individuals I always took a step back and observed these practices from a distance in order to be respectful towards the passengers and allowing the officers to conduct their work in an undistracted way. When the officers had finished these controls, I usually had a chat with them about the day's events. The officer's coffee breaks often provided

opportunities for having deeper talks and for asking questions about their work. When shadowing officers in border zones, harbour areas or at airports I always brought a notebook and a pen to take notes. This was not always easy, as described in the next section.

Writing Field Notes

A vital aspect of community of practice is learning by doing. The importance of these issues was apparent to me during my very first encounter with the officers during the first Power Week (mentioned earlier in this chapter). After conducting an interview with an officer in the "interrogation room" that I had at my disposal, I went into the main work room (after asking for permission) to observe the officers at work and to write field notes. Since it was the first Power Week, most of the participants seemed unsure about the process and the outcome of the activity; several officers made phone calls, asked one another for advice and discussed cases that they were pursing at the moment.

At first, I sat down at a small table in the back of the room with my notebook and a cup of tea listening, observing, and occasionally writing. To my left was a small table with coffee thermoses, cookies, jars of candy, and a basket of fruit. The officers were all seated together at a larger oval table placed in the middle of the room. After a while I realised that several officers looked at me strangely when passing to get coffee or snacks on the snack table. An officer who had just grabbed a few biscuits walked up to me and smilingly asked me what I was doing[24]. I told him that I was taking notes of what I saw happening. Out of courtesy, I showed him my note pad with random scribbles. He barley looked at my notepad, said that it looked uncomfortable and proposed that I sit at the big table, next to the officers instead. A few other officers during that same day also commented on me using a notepad and pen instead of a laptop while taking notes.

The next day, I brought my laptop, sat at the big table, and used the laptop for taking notes. As the work days could last up to twelve hours during the Power Weeks, the laptop became a "shield"[25] for blending in and for providing somewhere to rest my eyes during lapses of concentration (such as checking the weather or reading the news, as I also saw several officers do during their breaks)[26]. When "working" on my laptop, no one looked at me strangely or seemed to mind. As an indication of goodwill, I had kept

[24] It is important to add that I had introduced myself and the purpose for being in the room several times prior to receiving this question from the officer.

[25] A so-called involvement shield (for instance, reading the newspaper, as described by Goffman (1963) can be used to discourage involvement in public places, indicating that the person is not paying obvious attention to others and is not ready to get involved in their business.

[26] Thedvall (2006) had a similar experience during her fieldwork among EU bureaucrats in Brussels (described in her dissertation Eurocrats at Work: Negotiating Transparency in Postnational Employment Policy).

my distance from the officers, but instead my behaviour made me stand out more in the relation to the group's behaviour. As all the officers used laptops they seemed to be more at ease with me using a laptop than a pen and paper. Hence, my work practices had changed and adapted to those of the group after only one day of fieldwork.

I continued to write field notes on my laptop during the subsequent Power Weeks and during the formal meetings when other participants used their laptops as well. However, when doing fieldwork in border areas I continued to write notes in a notebook, which I later compiled in a word document on my laptop. When observing police work in the harbours or from the back of a car I always used a notebook. The officers did not seem curious or question why I constantly scribbled in this book during participant observation and field trips. Some situations made it difficult to write proper field notes, for instance when talking to border officers in harbour areas or on cargo vessels, when observing border work in the harbours (from a distance)[27] or when traveling in the back of a bumpy border guard van. In those situations, I made notes discreetly or tried to remember as much as possible until I had time to find a quiet spot to later write my notes down[28].

In order to write field notes that adequately describe the events and people studied Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (2011) encourage researchers to concentrate on tangible details rather than abstract generalizations, and to show rather than tell the reader what you are seeing. Field notes are always selective and it is not possible to describe everything you see. I have thus focused on describing the people, events, dialogues, conversations, and episodes that I have encountered to the best of my abilities (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, 142-142). I have taken great care in remembering and writing down words and formulations uttered by the border officers. The field notes that I later found the most useful for the analysis were those capturing dialogues taking place during informal work conversations, as well as during casual coffee breaks at the stations. As I travelled between different locations in the Baltic Sea area, the field notes became invaluable companions and reminders of the events that had transpired at the different organizations that I had visited.

[27] I did not take notes about the passengers and did not interact with any of the passengers who talked with the border officers.

[28] In addition to my own field observations (conducted during 407 hours in the field), my field notes, and my own recorded interview material I also have access to the field notes and interview material of two other researchers Goran Basic and Malin Åkerström, who were also engaged in writing the two EU reports regarding Project Turnstone (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2015a; 2015b) The project is also discussed in Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström (2016; 2017) and in Basic (2018b).

Interviews

The concept of community of practice is a lens for studying group formation, processes of group learning, negotiation of power relations or conflicts, emphasising a shared commitment and common interests of the participants (Lave and Wenger 1991). This commitment is part of the members' world view and therefore, identity is an important element for the theory of community of practice (Eckert 2006, 2). Every group constellation consists of individuals who struggle with finding their place in the group and who affect the dynamism and practices of that group (Wenger 1998, 145-146).

In order to grasp the motivation, engagement, and opinions of the participating officers, interviews were conducted alongside doing participant observation. Although interviews cannot provide us with information about social action within a given setting and tell us little about how people engage with one another (Atkinson 2014, 60), they have been an important addition to the observations. In the interviews, the officers talked more openly about difficult experiences of collaboration and about the project in general than they would have in a group interaction. The interviews were sometimes "forums of debriefing" when the officers assessed the project, the meetings or other events that had occurred. For this study, the conducted interviews were always compared with observations of social interaction, and the observations often generated questions that were later asked in interviews.

In addition to the several shorter field interviews and conversations conducted during fieldwork and shadowing, 73 pre-scheduled interviews[29] were conducted with 66 members of the police, border and coast guard organizations participating in Project Turnstone. As this was a collaboration project, it seemed important to gather accounts of officers from all participating organizations. Between 6 and 15 people were interviewed from each participating organization. 13 of these were conducted with female officers and 53 interviews were conducted with male officers. The relatively low number of female interviewees is due to the generally low number of female project participants and the low number of female employees in the participating organizations.

Some of the members interviewed were asked to participate because of their involvement in Project Turnstone or because of their general involvement in cross-border collaboration. Others knew about the project and wanted to participate. Informants also recommended colleagues (police, border or coast guard officers) who were asked to participate. A handful of officers were interviewed twice or three times. The reason for this was mainly to gain insight into the officers' opinions of the project before, during, and by the end of project. These interviewees were mostly selected out

[29] The interviews were conducted by me and Goran Basic (separately) in 2014 and 2015. I conducted interviews with 37 officers and Goran Basic conducted interviews with 29 officers.

of convenience (as I met them regularly) and because they had been active participants during the progression of the project.

Semi-Structured and Active Interviews

The interviews that I conducted for this study were semi-structured (Holstein and Gubrium 1995) conversations focusing on the interviewee's experiences and opinions of border (police) work and international collaboration. The interviews were conducted in English or Swedish. Most interviews were casual during which I was able to have a conversation with the interviewee about his or her experience of working as a border officer. The interviewees were encouraged to talk about subjects that they found important or curious and most officers seemed eager to share their knowledge with me. Holstein and Gubrium (1995, 16) refer to this approach as an *active interview.*

Each interview lasted for about an hour; some were a bit longer and some were only short interviews conducted during the Power Weeks when the officers had little time to spare. I asked every interviewee a few questions about their work experience, involvement in national and international collaboration, about the choice of working in law enforcement, and about other issues that they found important regarding their job positions.

As the fieldwork progressed, the semi-structured interview questions about collaboration that had been prepared early in the fieldwork process were slightly altered. As my knowledge of the field and the area of border guarding increased, I added new questions regarding issues that interviewees had mentioned as important. The interviews were transcribed soon after the interview had taken place so as to reduce the risk of forgetting important details[30] and instances that were not possible to capture with a voice recorder (such as the mood and facial expressions of the interviewee).

The interviews usually took place at the offices of the people being interviewed or in a conference room at the interviewee's work place. As I mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, I was once given an "interrogation" room where I could conduct interviews during one of the Power Weeks. A few times, informal conversations (that were not recorded) took place in the lunch rooms, in cars, in harbour areas, in break areas or at cafes or restaurants at the border agencies or in their vicinities. I refer to such conversations as field-based interviews (Emerson, Fretz and Shaw 2011). Usually, I would ask the interviewee a few questions and write down all the notes that I had time for. After the conversations, I structured the notes and added everything that I remembered and which I did not have time to write down during the conversation.

[30] The interviews conducted by me and Goran Basic were transcribed by me. During the interviews, I made notes of the situation of the interview noting the place of the interview and describing the mood, reactions, and facial expressions of the interviewee to the best of my ability. Despite this, I found it easier to transcribe the conversation soon after the interview had occurred in order to remember as much as possible from the event.

For the most part, I rarely encountered any major "obstacles" during the interviews; most officers seemed to like to talk about their work and I often experienced that the interviews resembled "casual conversations". There were, however, a few examples of interviews that were less casual. One example is an interview that I had scheduled with an intelligence border officer at his work place. Another officer had helped me with finding a conference room where I could conduct the interviews. The officer showed up on time, smiled and asked me how my work was going so far. I took a seat on a chair in the conference room and to my surprise the officers took another chair and placed it a couple of metres away from me. The distance between us felt uncomfortable so I put the recorder on the floor between us. Since the officer did not seem to think that there was anything odd with him sitting so far away from me, I carried out the interview anyway. The officer answered my questions, but our conversation was quite strained, perhaps because of the formal way that we were seated. After this interview, I was more attentive to the location of the interviews, asking the interviewees to meet somewhere where they felt comfortable.

Another example is a focus group interview that I had with three members of a border organization. The idea of having a focus group interview was raised by the officers whom I had scheduled to interview that day. They told me that they felt more comfortable talking together as a group, and I felt uneasy to decline their request. The focus group briefly discussed the questions that I asked about their work practices and their experiences of international collaboration, but rarely engaged in any deeper conversation. They answered the questions without sharing any personal experiences of collaboration. In comparison to other interviews that I had conducted the officers seemed hesitant and uncomfortable talking openly about work experiences. Because of this reason, I did not arrange any further recorded group discussion[31].

Power Asymmetry

The social interactions during interviews are sometimes described as a conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee entailing reciprocity and mutual exchange. However, there are several ethical issues and power dimensions concerning interview methodology, as social researchers conduct interviews with a specific purpose. Power asymmetry, however, need not only be one-sided as the interviewee has the power of counter control, such as not answering the questions asked, talking about some other topics or simply talking about what they believe is in the interest of the researcher (Kvale 2006, 481, 484-485).

Several officers interviewed for this study were used to interrogating suspects, and some told me that it was strange to be the ones under "interrogation". In such situations, I tried to balance the power symmetry by telling the officers that I was a novice at border

[31] Informal (non-recorded) group discussions between officers often occurred during meetings and Power Weeks. Such events were described in field notes.

police work (which I was) and that the information and answers that they would give me were useful for my work. I maintained that I was there to learn, and that they were the ones with the knowledge. A few times, the officers also asked me personal questions or questions about my work while joking that I would be an "easy" target to interrogate. I answered their questions without much detail and always tried to uphold the interview as a "conversation". The implication of interviewing a person with much experiences in interrogating or interviewing people in a subordinate position might be that the offices, instead of sharing personal experiences, used the interview to pursue a strong agenda (Jacobsson and Åkerström 2012, 717-718, 728). I experienced several situations when officers tried to correct me or contest supposed misunderstandings regarding border guarding, in attempt to convey a preferred identity or to emphasise success or competence within certain areas.

For this study, self-representation, group identity, and accounts of border police work are topics of interest, and therefore, all such accounts, as well as personal experiences, have been taken into consideration. The focus of this study has not been to discuss the officers' personal life or work histories, but how they experience cross border collaboration taking place in the social domains. *How* the officers describe their work roles (rather than what they actually are and their interactions with one another are the focal points in understanding community building and collaboration.

Although practical issues of confidentiality have discouraged the use of extensive narrative analysis in this study, several officers have shared bits of information about their personal lives, such as the reasons for joining law enforcement organizations, their work motivation, and their emotional involvement in border police work. Still, the officers have always been interviewed as police or border "officers", that is, as officials representing their work organizations. As Jacobsson and Åkerström (2012, 728) claim, respondents belonging to a category of social interest such as criminals or, as in this case the police, might make unjustified assumptions that the researcher is only interested in them because they belong to this specific category. In this study, I have asked officers to participate in interviews based on their involvement in Project Turnstone or their general engagement in international border police collaboration.

Before commencing the interviews, I explained how I would use the interview material and informed the officers that I mainly wanted them to talk about issues that they found important. In most cases, the interviewees did not shy away from sensitive topics and there were only a few instances when officers declined to elaborate on certain issues which they had briefly mentioned. Such topics were, for example previous experiences of failed collaboration, issues of corruption or uneasy work relationships between

organizations[32]. I naturally respected their wishes' and did not bring up the topics in further questions.

Document and Artifact Analysis

It is argued that the cultural practices of an organization are reproduced through the language used by its members (metaphors and verbal symbols), through the rituals performed by the members (such as meetings) and through the use and creation of material objects or artifacts (such as documents, logos or uniforms) (Alvesson and Billing 1997, 177-178). Many of the social settings we study are self-documenting where members circulate and produce various kinds of written material (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007). The meaning that members of a community or an organization attach to various organizational artifacts (such as for example a group logo) arise in social interaction and help establish the group as a less abstract unit (Wenger 1998, 58-59).

Charman (2013) makes the point that researchers studying organizations should not only focus on the values and attitudes of the organization's culture, but also consider the role of material and symbolic artifacts such as objects, words, and expressions created and shared by the organizational members or members of communities within an organization. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007, 121) also encourage researchers not to overlook documentary sources (such as charts, reports, memoranda or manuals) as these provide information regarding the "facts", rules, and decisions that are relevant to social groups.

Although this study is mainly based on observations and interviews, I have also drawn on such artifacts used and produced by the participants of Project Turnstone. Some of this material has been provided by the project participants in print and digital forms. Most specifically, these involve meeting agendas, meeting memoranda, project objectives, minutes, work schedules, to-do-lists, reports of work activity, reports accumulating results, and reports describing the outcome of the Power Weeks. Emails and letters to and from the project initiators are also included as part of this material.

During fieldwork, my co-researcher and I were sometimes allowed to photograph the officers at work, their offices, and other work areas of the officers, such as for instance harbour or border areas. The project participants also took pictures of one another. These were sometimes taken for private reasons or were used in reports and internal news feeds describing the project events.

[32] Naturally, all officers had knowledge about how much they could disclose about certain work practices in order not to affect any on-going border police work. It should also be mentioned that most officers talked openly and generally about the fear of corruption and distrust amongst collaborating partners.

At the very first project related meeting (the Management Board Meeting) the role of material objects in border guarding was evident, as the officers showed pictures and charts of reclaimed stolen goods. Although the officers did not "create" a large number of material "objects" during the project (apart from written documents, images, and lists), material artifacts such as stolen "things" played a vital role in their work. Additionally, a vast amount of time during the Power Weeks was spent talking about, comparing, and repairing their work "tools", as well as assessing the safety of their work equipment.

The equipment under consideration mainly consisted of lap tops, USB memory sticks, phones, cars, vessels, and airplanes. A such, I have considered all these material objects as part of the ethnographic fieldwork setting. Furthermore, news media reports where Project Turnstone or border policing in the Baltic Sea area were mentioned have also been taken into consideration. However, my main focus has been on the written documents jointly produced by the project members, and the work tools that have been instrumental in facilitating and streamlining their collaborative work.

The Role of the Researcher

Being a PhD candidate with the task of writing a project report and collecting data for my dissertation has sometimes placed me in an ambiguous position: I was a student, a researcher, and sometimes mistaken for being a project participant. When following border guards in Lithuania on their routine checks of cargo ships I was once mistaken for a Swedish border guard officer. I have also been mistaken for being a high school student.

In contrast to street-level policing or hands-on border guarding intelligence work performed in offices entails a minimum amount of physical action. The work is characterized by mundane system checks, long working hours, coffee breaks, and the occasional breakthroughs when discovered information led to surveillance work and eventually pursuits or arrest. Observing mundane office work was sometimes very exciting, sometimes frustrating, and sometimes quite boring. It was often difficult to keep my concentration when doing "nothing" (that is, observing people at work). To keep myself occupied during the Power Weeks I constantly wrote notes, took short breaks walking around or talking to people during their breaks. Naturally, great efforts were taken, most of the time, to concentrate on listening and observing the interactions between the officers.

As is preferable during fieldwork, spending a lot of time with the people you study eventually allows you to become more or less familiar with their social context. During my last Power Week research visit a few of the officers told me that they had forgotten that I was even present. After a while, I also found that I had become accustomed to

the work practices of the officers and more easily followed the pace, the jargon, and the events that unfolded. I was less exhausted after a day of fieldwork and did not feel quite as much as an "outsider" as I did initially.

As time went by, I also realised that I had changed my appearance when meeting the officers. I wore less feminine and colourful clothes, applied less makeup, and started to wear more "practical" outfits consisting of black jeans, dark sweaters and leather boots or sneakers. Affected by the jokes and comments about appearance, I realised that I dressed to be "invisible" trying not to stand out. I also started to use police and border guard terminology when I talked about my project and the work that I was doing. For example, I started referring to suspects or information as "hits" and talked about the officers' activities as actions. I laughed at the jokes that were made and was affected by the enthusiasm of the officers when a sought-after suspect was obstructed. As observed in previous research, it is not uncommon that female workers in male dominated work spaces adapt to the norm of masculinity by downplaying gender differences, seeking to become one of the guys (Bloksgaard 2011, 16; Finstad 2000). Even though I was not a member of the staff and did not receive any comments regarding my appearance, I had unquestionably been affected by the relativity "masculine" context of the law enforcement organizations.

I took notes of these realisations and saw this process as an interesting part of the fieldwork. I often talked about these experiences with my field co-researcher, sharing with him my experiences of how my presence was perceived by my informants and comparing them with his. We often had similar experiences and understandings of various situations that we had observed. I have often been asked about my thoughts to hearing police banter (which is often assumed to be sexist or macho), or if me being a woman made interaction with male officers difficult. I did not encounter any specific reactions or comments about my gender and did not find it challenging to talk with the male officers. I did not experience that the officers excluded me from jokes and I could easily chat with the female officers about working in a predominantly male work space. The experiences of my male field co-researcher were similar to mine, and thus we can assume that our genders did not noticeably affect the outcome of the events. We were both told similar jokes and were both subject to the same curious questions and scrutiny.

A few months into the project, I was able to have relaxed informal conversations with some of the officers and was more often invited to participate in after work social events. Police researcher Reiner (2010, 128) has ascertained that one of the hazards of doing research of the police is "the taking of mental notes while sinking under a bar as the consumption of pints mounts". My experience was not as drastic as the one described by Reiner, but there were several instances when I joined officers for dinner or after-work drinks. Such activities seemed to be an important part of the community making of the group but were also important for my own modest acceptance in that group.

However, I always maintained that I was there "to do research". I only participated in after work activities that were arranged during the Power Weeks, in connection with project related meetings or in other work-related social settings.

Interpreting the Material

Theories are derived from a variety of sources; from our first encounter with the field, from our prior knowledge and exposure to phenomena, and from the work of others. Analysis is thus omnipresent and is undertaken before, during, and after fieldwork (Atkinson 2014, 56-58). Despite active attempts not to produce biased research material the ethnographer is eventually the one who will decide how the data should be interpreting and which assumptions of the world that will be highlighted or ignored (Fine 1993). Fine (1993, 274) asserts that "good ethnographers do not know what they are looking for until they have found it", concluding that theory is generated from empirical investigation. However, such a view raises the question as to how we recognise that which is new (or unknown) when we encounter it. Several scholars have argued that one cannot approach the field *tabula rasa,* that is, theory-less, and without pre-understandings (Gadamer 1989).

In this study, the research topic "border police collaboration in the Baltic Sea area" has served as a focus point when accumulating ethnographic data and conducting interviews. In order to understand the socially situated, contextual practices of the border police officers, I have engaged in a cyclical relationship between ideas and data, using an abductive logic which Atkinson (2014) refers to as *ethnographic abduction*. The first step of the process was to carefully transcribe interviews and type the field notes that I had initially written in a notebook. All data needs ordering and indexing (2014, 59), and the assembled transcripts and notes were then carefully read and coded. During the coding process I highlighted certain words, expressions or topics that repeatedly occurred in my notes or in the interviews. Each topic (such as for instance culture, collaboration, masculinity, identity, motivation, the EU or criminals) was given a certain headline colour and the quotes and notes were "cut and pasted" into separate documents. When reading the data, I have asked a combination of questions such as; what do we have here, and which categories, concepts or labels are needed to account for the phenomena occurring in the ethnographic data? What might this be a case of, and what pattern and figurations are present in the data (Atkinson 2014)?

Drawing on Blumer (1954), Atkinson (2014, 56-57) uses the term *sensitising concepts* to refer to the issues identified in this process. Such concepts are used in dialogue with the data in order to further refine, modify, and elaborate these initial ideas. This method is always comparative as I compared across cases in the data. After a first examination, I specifically focused on a few recurring topics (or sensitising concepts), amongst others

hands-on collaboration, trust, learning by doing things together, and practices and rituals performed by the officers during the collaboration processes. I have also taken regimes of power that affect the practices and policies of the officers and organizations studied into consideration. Several interviewed officers had previously experienced "failed" collaboration and put great emphasis on the importance of constructing a common identity, as well as the importance of learning new techniques and methods of intelligence analysis together. When I found the theory of community of practice some time at the end of the data gathering, this approach was adopted for the subsequent analyses. After defining the theoretical framework for the thesis, the ethnographic data was again read through and interpreted in light of the analytical tools in mind.

Ethnographic studies of the police

Police organizations have been under scrutiny since the mid 20th century through methods of fieldwork, participant observation, and long-term observations (Loftus 2016). The scholarly interest in the police was stimulated by two parallel factors: 1) police corruption and brutality during the period of social and political unrest in 1960s and 1970s, and 2) the development and increasing influence of symbolic interactionism and labeling theory in the social sciences (Loftus 2016; Reiner 2010). The emergence of labeling theory inspired a shift in the theoretical attention from those who broke the law towards the institutions of criminal justice[33] (Becker 1963).

Additionally, the methodological turn to ethnography and participant observation provided new possibilities in documenting and exploring the everyday norms and values that guided police decision-making. The culmination of increased concern of police conduct and theoretical and methodological transformations in the social sciences thus paved a new path for critical research of the police (Loftus 2016; Reiner 2010). Such ethnographic approaches are according to Terpstra and Schaap (2013) useful for providing the researcher with an understanding of the complex and sometimes hidden processes of policing.

Furthermore, ethnographic research can help the researcher get insight into tacit police knowledge and rules, the nature and deviation of formal police procedures, attitudes towards criminals, and opinions of what constitutes "real police" work (Terpstra and Schaap 2013). Fassin (2017, 8) underlines, however, that the strength of ethnography is the focus on the ordinary and the mundane, the uncertain and the ambiguous, in contrast to the often spectacular, tragic or heroic accounts provided by commentators or journalists.

Describing how people account for themselves and the world in which they live in entails issues of representation (Wacquant 2002). Regardless of attempts of not

[33] Goffman's work *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and other Inmates* (1968) can be added as another example of this theoretical shift.

manipulating interviews or producing biased research material the ethnographer is eventually the one who will decide which assumptions of the field that will be highlighted (Fine 1993). I therefore follow the advice of Fassin (2013, xii, 23) who implores researchers to use the logics of the insider as well as the perspective of the outsider, and not to promote "otherness". Fassin (2013, xi) refers to this ethnographic method as a "combination of presence and distance"; the "presence" implies getting access to the logics of the insiders through fieldwork, and the "distance" stands for using professional and institutional perspectives when analysing events that have been witnessed. When visiting the border police and coast guard organizations, I never claimed to be anything other than an outsider with a keen and curious interest in the practices of the officers. When asked about my research, I told the officers that my job was to provide "an outsider's perspective" on the everyday work that I observed in the police and border agencies.

Constructing neo-romantic images or being blinded by stereotypes are important issues to consider when doing fieldwork in law enforcement organizations. A couple of years ago I encountered the curious concept of "sonder" in an "urban" (non-standard) dictionary. The meaning of the concept is the realisation that each random person that you pass by has a life as complex and vibrant as your own, rich with friends, ambitions, routines, and worries. This realisation is especially important while doing fieldwork. Researchers will always make choices and should be aware of their assumptions of the world, not only when doing fieldwork and collecting data, but also when writing ethnographies (Fine 1993). Narayan (2012, 47) asserts that much social scientific writing places people into social categories, whereas fictional or creative writing often focuses on very particular individuals and concerns. The task of ethnographic writing is thus to blend these perspectives having to find appropriate ways of depiction.

In Wacquant's (2002, 1523) view, the researcher should not become too close to the research subjects echoing their point of view without critical reflexivity. If the claim of the research is not to take a moral stand (which is not the case in this study), being either too positive or too negative of the informants and their practices could also disrepute the research. Previous researchers have noted that the pitfalls of ethnographic studies of the police might be the risk of emphasizing exceptional events and incidents, and thereby produce a selective and stereotyped version of the everyday work of the police (Terpstra and Schaap 2013). By highlighting the voices of individual people, I hope to avoid traps of flattening the particularity or individual voice (Narayan 2012), of adopting clichés of public debate or of censoring unflattering or deviant behaviour of informants (Wacquant 2002). I have taken great care in discussing stereotypes of police culture and have attempted to discuss and problematize the officers' own thoughts on taken for granted stereotypes of police officers.

Describing people is always a challenge as one wants to be frank and accurate without being offensive, and without violating the principles of anonymity (Narayan 2012). In

a few examples I describe the interviewees as "the officer" or "officers" without indicating where they work, their gender or age. This is mainly due to the fact that the people described work in small and specialized teams. Certain details about their appearance or work tasks have thus been altered in order to ensure their anonymity. However, when I do describe the gender, age or nationality of the officers, these categories have not been altered as they might have an impact on the overall analytic discussion. For example, when describing a conversation of national stereotypes between officers, I disclose the officers' nationality in order to illustrate a point. In such cases, I have altered other minor details of their personality, appearance or personal lives in order to protect their anonymity. I have given all the officers fictitious names, some which connotes their nationality. In reality, some of the officers' real names were not easily associated with any particular nationality.

Ethical Considerations

As a social scientist studying law enforcement organizations, I was confronted with the concern of providing quality research while not enclosing confidential information. Chan (1997) states that when researchers are invited to do research in a specific project there might be a concern that they unconsciously or consciously censor themselves not wanting to bite the hand that feeds them. A reflexive approach of the research process is therefore needed (Aull Davies 1999, 229).

I was initially given access to the field because of Project Turnstone. My task, together with my field co-researchers at the time, was to write one report about the collaboration processes of the project, and one additional report about passenger experiences of border security (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2015a; 2015b). Although the project initiators highlighted the main focus of these reports, the specific strategy of the research and the interview questions were designed by me and my field co-researcher at the time. Additionally, the material gathered during the fieldwork[34] and interviews has been mine to use in this dissertation. The aim of the dissertation is of my own choosing and is not directly linked to the research aim of the EU reports.

Doing fieldwork at police, border, and coast guard authorities entails a number of further considerations. I have signed an agreement of confidentiality about not disclosing any information about on-going police or border related work that might compromise on-going investigations or specific surveillance methods. However, since such information was not crucial for the purpose of this study, I do not consider this problematic. For ethical reasons, I have not interfered with the police or border guard

[34] For this dissertation, I have access to the interview and fieldwork material of my former co-field research partners Goran Basic (Linnaeus University) and Malin Åkerström (Lund University).

work that I have been allowed to observe. I have also never interacted with potential suspects. When talking to one another about suspects or convicted criminals in my presence, the officer always used "code names", such as for instance "Bosse the bandit" or simply "suspect A") in order to protect the anonymity of these individuals. Thus, the data gathered does not include any personal information about suspects or convictions.

The officers interviewed for this study have all agreed to participate and the staff at the different border or police stations were informed prior to my visits. When Project Turnstone was initiated, the different chiefs or personnel in charge were asked to inform the staff about the study. The participants also received a detailed letter describing the purpose of the research. In conversations with informants and before interviews I always highlighted the use of anonymity and informed consent.

I have followed the guidelines of *The Swedish Research Council*[35] and all gathered data has been made anonymous. The real names of people interviewed have not been documented in transcribed material of ethnographic field notes. I have also taken great care in analysing the implications of changing details (such as names of places, objects or people) in personal accounts and stories without changing anything that might affect the outcome of the analysis. During the research process, I have emphasised the point that the purpose of the project reports and the dissertation are not to evaluate the working efforts and productivity of the border officers or their organizations in general. In fact, some officers have occasionally raised that concern suspecting that the purpose of my study was to evaluate their individual work performances. Naturally, this has not been the focus of the present study.

[35] http://www.epn.se/media/1102/personuppgifter_i_forskningen.pdf

5. Problems of Collaboration: A Culture of Distrust

As the areas of organized crime and terrorism have become more emphasised in recent years, law enforcement organizations are facing increasing demands that challenge them to collaborate and coordinate activities across national borders. Such international police collaboration is largely dependent on "trusted" relations, practitioner networks, and more informal police-to-police contacts (Hufnagel and McCartney 2017, 3). Officers interviewed for this study similarly highlighted an increasing demand for international cross border collaboration. Some officers thought that their geographical and social proximity would help them overcome collaboration obstacles. However, despite identifying with a larger "European border guard community", the officers also stated that the organizations participating in Project Turnstone were "on opposite sides of the map".

The officers claimed that cultural, organizational, and political differences had previously obstructed international collaboration, hence the development of Project Turnstone. According to the officers, rumours of corruption and misconduct, especially in Eastern Europe and in the Baltic States, have been detrimental to a trust-based relationship, placing strain on potential cross border collaboration. In their view, the absence of an efficient collaboration "made it easier for criminals" to operate in the Baltic Sea area. Only by developing a trust-based relationship, driven by a common understanding, shared values and goals could international partners build trust-based context for working together.

In this chapter, I first focus on the problems of international collaboration highlighted by the officers. Three main themes are discussed: 1) the problems of collaboration in inherently suspicious (law enforcement) organizations, 2) the skewed power dimensions between participating organizations, and 3) the structural and legal obstacles that caused frustration and hindered collaboration. Amongst others, I draw on Radaev's (2004) notions of trust formation in low-trust societies, and van Maanen's (1973) discussion of the process in which the established members of a group try to determine the trustworthiness, loyalty, and motivation of new members. I use the expressions of established and outsiders (Elias and Scotson 1994) in order to highlight the skewed power dimensions between the project participants and their apprehensive

view of new collaboration partners. Second, I discuss the significance of informal networks and police-to-police contacts in intelligence sharing and conclude the importance of "trusted" relations (Hufnagel and McCartney 2017) within international police collaboration.

The Dilemma of Collaboration

My first encounter with Project Turnstone took place in January when I met the initiators and coordinators of the project (whom I call Lars, Niklas, Mona and Oskar) over a cup of coffee. We talked about their motivations for organizing the project, and what they hoped that the project would achieve. My co-researcher and I had arrived at their work place and were shown into a small meeting office. On the table were red napkins, cups, and a coffee thermos bottle. The initiators looked excited and eager to tell us about their plans for the project. They bickered about the placement of coffee cups and re-arranged chairs before we all took a seat at the table. After a short introduction of everyone's name and work position Oskar folded his hands, cleared his throat and said that he would "start from the beginning".

The dilemma that faced every border organization in the Baltic Sea area, he said, was that the geographical proximity demanded collaboration and mutual understanding of common struggles, while, at the same time, structural, financial, political, and social differences made bilateral collaboration difficult. European border and law enforcement organizations in the Baltic Sea area had already official collaboration agreements. The problem, Oskar said with a troubled look on his face, was that the informal collaboration between border and police officers in the region was not efficient enough. Lars nodded, adding that they needed a "more hands-on collaboration" in order to achieve more tangible results. Niklas intervened, adding that "the Nordic family has a strong sense of commitment to its members". When asked to explain what he meant Niklas clarified that he referred to the long tradition of collaboration between Norway, Sweden, and Finland. "But", he added, "with the implementation of Schengen we have lost control over the Baltic States". Mona, who had followed the conversation and meticulously taking notes said "we are highly affected by the criminality of countries nearby, we cannot be naive!".

The initiators continued talking about cross border criminality in the Baltic Sea area, outlining the various political, structural, and social changes that had affected their organizations in the past decades. A few of them had been involved in cross border collaboration since the 1990s and helped drawing up guidelines for newly included countries and their regulators regarding the new challenges resulting from becoming part of the EU. As Niklas concludes, the most paramount changes for the police and border organization participating in Project Turnstone had been the EU enlargement

and the Schengen agreement. These developments had drastically changed the work environment, demands, and eventually, the daily work practices of the officers in these organizations. Within their national legislations, the border officers still had the power to deny entry, perform checks, and monitor border crossings. They also have the obligation to protect the borders from illegal entries and criminal activities. The Baltic Sea border officers had to perform their border guard duties, such as "fighting" illegal migration, human trafficking, and smuggling of stolen property in a totally new context. Performing these work tasks without systematic passport controls, Niklas explained, had proven difficult, and officers were now depending on international collaboration and information from their work partners. "For now, our greatest problem", Niklas said, "is that the criminals are so mobile, international, operating across borders, and are well organized. If their operations transcend international boundaries, then so must our work do". The initiators agreed that implementing change regarding their work practices was a "natural step" that they had to take.

During our conversation Oskar and Lars mentioned "the Nordic family" several times, emphasising the fact that collaboration with Finland and Norway[36] generally worked smoothly without complications. They had, however, experienced organizational and cultural differences with other countries in the Baltic Sea area. These differences hindered collaboration as the officers did not know or understand one another's work methods, legal restrictions or cultural practices. Lack of resources to organize collaboration efforts and joint operations was also mentioned. There was often a lack of funding for any extensive collaboration efforts to be realised.

However, according to Oskar, the real issue that had hindered informal collaboration so far was not just "money" or the fact that some organizations had less funding than others. Rather, one of the main problems was a lack of information about and knowledge of the working methods of other border organizations. Several of the organizations did not have a call dispatch to help them reach the right person, and it was therefore crucial for them to know how to get in contact with their collaboration partners. The easiest way was of course to have a personal connection with one another, but such a personal collaboration had previously been difficult to achieve as there had been too few or no opportunities for the officers to work together.

One very important benefit of the project, according to Oskar, was the opportunity for the officers to meet and "figure it out together", and thereby "learn to respect one another and build trust". Niklas agreed, saying that the only way to overcome difficulties was to provide space where the officers could meet one another in person. The main reason why the officers had to meet and "figure it out together" was thus

[36] The project initiators rarely talked about collaboration with Denmark. Officers from the Swedish police organizations participating in Project Turnstone were mainly responsible for the eastern coast of Sweden and rarely had any close collaborated with the Danish police. I was told that the Swedish police organizations in the South of Sweden (the Skåne area) collaborated with the Danish police almost on a daily basis.

primarily to be able to (eventually) establish trust-based relationships. The officers were very reluctant to share "secret intelligence information" about organized crime groups with partners whom they did not know or trusted, fearing that the information would end up in the wrong place.

Mona explained that the main assumption underlying the project was the belief that border officers in Europe had shared a common understanding and motivation to fight cross border crimes. Niklas agreed, saying that this was a European project, not a Swedish project, and an important part of it was to make the exchange of intelligence information more efficient. In the long run, he said, they hoped to create a "model of regional collaboration" that could be implemented in other European cross-border collaboration projects. "It would be good to be able to create a joint system that works in other countries where we can share information that is used operatively", Niklas concluded. After a while he added that one reason for receiving funding for the project was the aspiration that the format and the practices implemented by the project could be used in other European collaborations. It was also important to find interesting information that would lead to arrests or surveillance activities in order to "prove" that the project was worthwhile. The initiators hoped that the adjoined mission of border officers to protect international borders to the best of their abilities would encourage officers participating in the project to really try to make Project Turnstone a success.

During that first meeting, I learned that the Schengen implementation and freedom of movement were the main reasons for the birth of this project that they called "Turnstone". In the opinions of Mona and Lars, freedom of movement for Schengen citizens created numerous problems for border authorities and the main purpose of the project was thus to hinder cross-border crimes in the Baltic Sea area that resulted from eliminating passport controls. They saw a great need for collaboration and agreed that new methods of working were crucial for the border organizations to be able to meet the challenges posed and regulations stipulated by the EU. The accounts of the initiators also tell us that, despite such increasing demands collaboration, deficient information about collaborating partners and distrust between organizations and officers hindered any attempts of close bilateral exchange of information.

Troubles with Sharing Information

Legal, Organizational and Structural Obstacles

Legal and organizational obstacles (such as bureaucratic practices, different work processes or a lack of standardised routines for assessing information) were often mentioned by interviewed officers during the course of the project. The complexity of

national internal issues, such as the rights of organizations to access or provide certain information was raised early on during Project Turnstone. Police, border, and coast guard officers were well connected through information exchange networks, but standardized rules and regulations occasionally slowed down the information exchange process. Interviews also revealed that many staff members working with every-day border guarding or police work still had limited knowledge of international partners' work practices, and that knowledge of the working methods of other organizations would be a great advantage when doing their work. Even though the officers did not expect that issues of structural differences (such as legislations, laws, and guidelines) would be solved because of Project Turnstone, many anticipated that improved collaboration and exchange would increase their general knowledge of their international partners, and hopefully make their work more "successful".

As mentioned by an officer named Andris, one major obstacle for collaboration (also revealed by several other interviewees) was the officers' limited knowledge regarding the legal and structural abilities of international collaboration partners. Andris worked in Latvia as an intelligence officer and was a frequent participant at the Power Weeks. When interviewing Andris, he informed me about differences in legalization, restrictions regarding access to information, and difficulties with providing information to collaboration partners. He was frustrated that the organizations participating in the project were obligated to follow different national legislation systems and rules, despite the fact that they all belong to the EU and Schengen area. Different legislations often caused problems when obtaining suspects, confiscating stolen goods or performing undercover surveillance. For example, if a Latvian surveillance team which followed suspects reached the national borders of another country they would have to ask partners from another organization (on the other side of the border) to continue the surveillance. This process would take time and the other organization might be too busy to continue the surveillance. There are several reasons for such lack of collaboration: lack of time and recourses, or that the organization in question does not have the mandate to perform undercover surveillance. Without this knowledge, a lot of valuable time might have been wasted on sending this request, instead of asking other partners to step in. The main difference between police and border organizations highlighted in this interview was the police' ability to perform undercover surveillance, which is not possible for border guard organizations (such as the Latvian and Lithuanian border guard services).

Andris also told me that different countries had different rules concerning detention (how long a suspect could be detained before the police had to present evidence and charge them for a crime) and different legal consequences for harbouring stolen goods. For instance, the countries participating in Project Turnstone had different laws regarding the procedures for keeping suspects in custody and handling evidence.

The issues mentioned by Andris are not unique for the organizations participating in Project Turnstone. As noted by Block (2008a, 191-193), there are two major obstacles for intelligence exchange and collaboration: 1) legal issues and 2) organizational issues. Block suggests that inadequate knowledge of the legal systems of one's collaboration partners can be more obstructive than the differences themselves. In addition, diverging interests, cultural differences, and distrust between officers and organizations (discussed further on in this chapter) also affect collaboration. Furthermore, the failure to make good use of intelligence information is often blamed on the notoriously slow responses of organizations such as Europol and Interpol that rarely keep up with the speed necessary for investigations and pursuits (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 348-349, 357).

One officer who described his frustration with structural obstacles was a Swedish border officer named Carl. I met Carl during my second time visiting the organization where he worked. In that same organization, I had scheduled interviews with several officers who participated in Project Turnstone. At that time, Carl was working as an intelligence officer, having previously worked as a foreign liaison officer, and thus possessing extensive experience of cross border collaboration. After briefly chatting about Carl's work duties (mainly receiving, sending and processing intelligence information about criminal activity in the Baltic Sea area), I asked him about his involvement in the project and how one would define successful collaboration. He took a sip of his diet Coke that he had bought from a vending machine outside the office and said that collaboration was vital for doing his work, that he needed information from other partners in order to "function within his role" at home. "If I don't get that", he said, "I am fairly blind, so we are very dependent on collaboration". He then continued describing the process of analysing intelligence information in more detail, defining it as assembling pieces of an enormous puzzle or as compiling different pieces of a big "cake".

> "The question of investigation cannot be solved in one country, if you have all the information from Finland you can only have a small piece of the cake but thanks to collaboration you will get this larger picture and then you decide in what country you will prosecute these people and collect the evidence from different countries, and especially when we are talking [about] such a mobile and international criminals and the organizing of it, we have to have this collaboration, otherwise it's impossible to do it".
>
> Recorded interview

The main purpose for assembling the "pieces of the cake", I was told, was ultimately to track down and catch "the bad guys". "The criminals are the true Europeans as they don't bother with national borders, and we must do as the criminals and ignore the national borders if we are to perform our work as border officers", Carl added. He then spoke at length about "national police organizations" and their narrow view of

European criminality. Being "narrow minded" focusing only on the national level was not considered a progressive way of thinking since European crime was often part of "a bigger picture", as Carl told me. A while ago there had been several house burglaries in the city where he worked. Carl was convinced that the burglaries were committed by an international crime organization and was frustrated that the investigating police officers did not have the knowledge to estimate that these crimes were related to cross border criminality.

> "With proper education or [through] border police information exchange", Carl said, "they might have recognized the modus operandi of the organized crime group connecting the case to several other crimes committed by the same group. Since such groups are highly efficient, work fast, and most likely leave the country immediately after the crime was committed it is not enough to write a report and leave it in a pile of papers. If there is any chance of catching these guys you have to work fast".
>
> Field notes

In Carl's opinion, it is important that police officers working in national settings are able to see "the larger picture" and connect various offences (such as house burglaries, car thefts or pickpocketing) with wider cross-border criminality. He did not blame any particular organization structure for this problem but saw this as something that was overlooked and as a typical situation where police organizations needed to "catch up". Carl thought that (low-level) intelligence officers working with cross border crime had more realistic understandings of the changes in the Baltic Sea area than management or higher-ranking officers. He also told me that he knew about "ground level" intelligence officers who had taken the initiative to establish international collaboration networks out of necessity. Carl gave me an example of how the process of creating informal information networks might look like:

> "The trend of travelling criminals has increased in a very short period of time […] and these large organizations or countries have not yet though of a perfect solution yet officially, but they have started to adapt piece by piece on […] operative level. Because there has been a great need, and then eventually you learn about who you can contact, and then you think that guy could help me last month, maybe he can help me again. And in this way, the cooperation has slowly increased".
>
> Recorded interview

The "networks" described were created informally on a word of mouth basis and thus very unstable. According to Carl, most border organizations in Europe, and especially in the Baltic Sea area, had not yet fully adapted to the EU enlargement and entirely understood the necessity of forming collaboration networks. He continued: "I think

that people are still surprised that we have Schengen, and actually we don't know how to, how to *react* in a new situation when there are no borders".

Carl then described a situation that he perceived as a failure because of lack of structural alignment between the countries in the Baltic Sea area. A few months ago, colleagues in Estonia had contacted him, saying that they had found a truck loaded with boat engines embarking in Tallinn. The officers suspected that the engines had been stolen in Sweden since the truck had just disembarked from a ferry arriving from Stockholm and the "cables of the engines" had been hastily cut off. Since Carl received the call, it was his job to locate the official police report of the stolen engines, find the police authority in Sweden where the reports had been made, and then to ask for an official European arrest warrant to send to his colleagues in Estonia. On this occasion, this process took too much time, and without an arrest warrant the officers had to release the suspects. The suspects were even allowed to take the boat engines with them, as there was no substantial proof that they were stolen. Carl saw this event as a huge failure and was frustrated that his Estonian colleagues had done a lot of work for nothing.

Andris described similar frustrations. One important issue regarding collaboration, according to him, was the limited working hours of the officers in several border organizations. "Intelligence work is not a 9 to 5 job", he said, bemoaning that it is difficult to reach his colleagues after the "regular work hours". Problems with getting in contact with, for example, the Swedish border police after regular office hours had often led to delayed information regarding suspects and surveillance processes or border check operations. Andris looked annoyed that many suspects had gotten away because of such "structural issues". Quite often, he and his colleagues had been able to handle such obstacles, but he thought it very important to further increase his knowledge of other collaborating partners' practices in order to avoid failed operations based on organizational differences. Andris said that this knowledge of other organizations has been improving" day by day", but that he was often surprised that some procedures were impossible to improve as some organizations were structured differently than his organization.

In a similar manner, a Swedish officer named Marcus mentioned several structural obstacles with intelligence sharing that might be hard to solve in the short run. The most common intelligence models used by many police and border organizations were problematic as they encouraged a work pattern that took a lot of time, and which was only useful when planning regular or predictable events. The models and procedures worked if you planned far in advance and had received a lot of information regarding some event (such as for instance a visit by the American president). In Marcus' opinion, the models were less useful for officers getting information regarding suspects who were planning to leave the country by ferry in a couple of hours. In such a case, the process of analysis and re-analysis would take too much time and would thus be inefficient.

Despite such problems, Marcus had high hopes for the project hoping that the participants would be able to create a new joint regional information system. He explained that the participating officers currently had access to different European, as well as national, systems of information, and therefore, they had to spend a substantial amount of time to process this information before the real work could commence. Most participating officers had access to the Frontex information systems or Interpol, through which they could send requests to other organizations, receive information and arrest warrants, and store important information regarding suspects. These systems were "large", including many organizations. However, in Marcus view, a smaller and more regional information system between the organizations in the Baltic Sea would be more time efficient.

As described by Andris, Carl, and Marcus, one of the major problems with investigating border related crimes was thus the lack of structural alignment between collaborating organizations leading to lengthy communication processes. According to Marcus, cross border crimes were often characterised by complex travel patterns, for it is common for criminals to take long detours to misdirect surveillance teams or border officers". The best-case scenario was if the officers could know when and where the suspects were headed before or immediately after a crime had been committed. The criminal groups were often successful because they moved fast and easily evaded control when entering or leaving harbour areas or ferries. The officers needed to have quick communication between collaborating partners in order to get information about suspects and committed crimes.

By the end of our conversation, I asked Marcus if he thought that it was possible to achieve the joint information system that he had mentioned earlier. Marcus responded with a confident "yes", adding that it was already in the making even if it was still early to tell. The purpose of the "system" would be to send out information to officers on the ground "who could do something with it", to ensure that the information was put to good use and not just stored for the future. However, this kind of small-scale regional system would only work if the officers included trusted one another and have confidence in in one another's institutions and organizations. In Marcus' view, sharing information between a few selected officers would be much safer than using regular email or sending information to various unknown recipients. The only way to achieve this kind of trust, according to Marcus was to meet, collaborate hands-on and create personal work relationships. Marcus had already begun to "collect" important contacts that he knew he could rely on when he needed to make quick decisions. In that same interview, he emphasised that he was eager to get trust-worthier international contacts in order to perform his work duties to the best of his abilities, as he wanted to do "something good" for his country.

"Cultural" Obstacles

My first meeting and conversations with the initiators of the project made me aware of some of the difficulties that faced the officers in a work environment that had drastically changed during recent years. As border policing is no longer restricted to external borders, cross-border surveillance networks, the mobilization of international police collaboration, and transnational policing are often regarded as solutions to organized crime in an increasingly interconnected world (Bowling 2009; Weber and Bowling 2004). Researchers of organized crime have observed amplified efforts to create information and security networks that can match the capabilities of their opponents, mainly the cross-border criminals. However, the "success" of such networks and informal, horizontal exchange of information require effective implementation (Gerspacher and Dupont 2007, 348-349) and high levels of trust between collaborating officers (Al-Alawi, Marzooqi and Mohammed 2007; Cotter 2015).

In addition to structural, organizational, and legal obstacles, the importance of "trust" between collaboration partners was described as most important by the officers participating in Project Turnstone. One significant goal of the project, according to the project initiators, was thus to allocate time and space where the officers could meet and form trust-based work relationships. As trust is culture-bound, cultural issues have come to be significant hurdles to overcome if the collaboration is to "succeed".

Cultural Differences or European Culture?

A few months after the start of Project Turnstone, I travelled to a harbour town in one of the Baltic States to follow some of the officers' daily work and conducted to interviews with some of the participating officers. I wanted to know more about the officers' experiences of international collaboration and the obstacles that had obstructed previous collaborations. As it was my first visit to the town I had arranged to meet a border officer who was to drive me to the border guard board, the home organization of some of the project participants. A stern man in uniform waited for me at the arrival hall of the airport. He introduced himself as Victor and offered to take my bag. He was surprised to see that I only had one small piece of hand luggage, but still picked it up and carried it to the car. Victor had arrived in a border guard van with another officer sitting on the passenger seat. The passenger greeted me in English, without introducing himself, adding that he did not really speak much English.

Victor's stern appearance lightened up as we started our drive. He was a devoted guide telling me about everything that we saw on the way: some important buildings, a bridge, and a popular shopping mall he recommended that I visit during my stay. He had worked in the border guard unit for several decades and shared stories of how much it had all changed in recent years. As I had not scheduled an interview with Victor, I

asked if he would be willing to share his insights with me later during my stay. He looked a little surprised at my question, clarifying that he was not "the boss", but said that he was happy to talk to me about his work. "But first", he said, I will take you to the harbour so that you can see some of the work that we do".

The harbour area was larger than I had expected, crammed with freighters and filled to the brim with container stacks. The natural skyline was disrupted by mechanical cranes in a variety of colours and sizes. Victor pointed at one of the rather small buildings which apparently was the border guard board. We entered the building and he introduced me to some of his colleagues. We then went upstairs to the large office space that he shared with several co-workers, men and women of various ages. They greeted us before returning to their computer screens. A radio was on playing a pop song from the 1980s. I was scheduled to interview a few staff members with various ranks and positions and Victor showed me a small empty office where I could conduct the interviews.

After a few minutes, the first interviewee arrived and I closed the door. I heard the radio in the background and thought for a second whether I should ask them to turn it off. I then decided not to ask, as no one else seemed to take notice. I explained my reasons for being there and then started a conversation about Project Turnstone. The interviewee was fairly positive regarding the project, arguing that criminality in the Baltic Sea area was similar in the entire region, and therefore it was important that the border units around the Baltic Sea set out to build "a common understanding of the basic situation". In the officer's opinion, "the basic understanding" meant that all collaborating organizations shared intelligence information with one another, had the same views regarding which crimes were the most urgent, and share similar occupation goals and motivation.

The following interviewees similarly described that most officers shared a general idea of "European culture" as connected to notions of progress, modernity, and the "efficient" way of doing things". Several officers claimed that they shared a "European culture" with their neighbours in the Baltic Sea area. However, they still saw great barriers between northern, eastern and southern parts of Europe - barriers related to cultural practices and work practices. In terms of "progress" countries belonging to the EU were described as more progressive and countries that wanted to belong the EU were "heading in the right direction".

After the interviews, I left the building and met up with two border officers, Marta and Jakob, who participated in the Power Week as two members of the "surveillance teams" awaiting information from the Power Week office. There had been a few instances during the week when their assistance had been required, but no major arrest had yet been made. After checking a few cars about to board a ferry, they took me for a tour around the harbour area showing me their places for doing surveillance in the harbour. We were now about to take a break in their "border guard van" parked outside the ferry

terminal. I asked Jakob and Marta about collaboration between border agencies in Europe. Marta told me that intelligence officers and border guards in general were "on the same side of the border". The "criminals" on the other hand, were always on "the other side". When saying this, she laughed a little at the pun, clarifying that the criminals are on the wrong side of *the law*, but also often physically on the wrong side of the *border* trying to cross illegally into Europe. Marta was sitting behind the steering wheel and Jakob was pouring coffee from a thermos bottle into three small paper cups. "The European border guard community is quite small", Jacob said, while handing me a cup, "and the people who work together, easily create bonds and strong working relationships".

Marta and Jacob also mentioned some difficult or failed collaborations that they had previously experienced. They were reluctant to give me any details as to which organizations were "the most difficult to work with" but concluded that organizational culture and diverse cultural practices were often huge obstacles for international collaboration. I asked them to clarify what they meant with "organization culture" and Jakob responded by saying that it was important to have an understanding of one another's historical and organizational background, since each organization and each country did things "differently".

A while later, Marta told me that she was positive regarding increasing collaboration with partners around in the Baltic Sea rea. She had previously collaborated with organizations in Southern Europe, which she thought had been very problematic. In her experience, officers from organizations in the South of Europe had little understanding of the Baltic Sea area and were reluctant to collaborate with them: "they say that Lithuania and Latvia are the same, Lithuania and Latvia are the same as Russia, and [they think that] we are Russians, and I do not like it". Marta was not the only officers who mentioned that collaboration with organizations in the south of Europe was often problematic. I rarely received any straight answers as to why this was the case, except for the statements made by Marta who describe it as different cultural understandings, a lack of knowledge about their collaboration partners, and different methods of working.

Juha, a Finnish intelligence police officer whom I had met a few weeks earlier had similarly elaborated on cultural differences and similarities that he had experienced while collaborating with his "neighbours".

> "Eh, well, when cooperating in Scandinavia, with Estonia and Stockholm, you know because we have quite the same mentality when talking about our work, we have similar legal backgrounds and […] border control issues […], and we have quite similar adaptation and, and attitudes towards respecting the legal background, and legal framework […] so in that sense, there is not much misunderstanding concerning cultural differences […], which makes our collaboration with Swedes, it's very easy going and smooth. […] But of course, eh, when talking about southern part of Europe…Then it changes, a lot. But that's not in the sense of Baltic Sea cooperation. Ah, when talking about Latvia and Lithuania, for example … they have quite strict, how would I say, more Slavic kind of hierarchy…when cooperating with them everything must be done in a quite official [formal] way. When changing for example procedures done this summer it is possible to [make] decisions together with Estonia and Stockholm via email. We don't have to have any official meeting to discuss what we should do".
>
> Recorded interview

Since he has learned to know his Swedish counterparts, Juha found it easy to quickly decide on common rules, exercises, and actions. Swedish and Finnish border and coast guard officers regularly shared information and organized joint activities such as patrolling the coastlines, especially during summer when the Baltic Sea has an increase in leisure boat activities. His previous collaboration with organizations in Latvia and Lithuania had been very formal, based on official meetings rather than spontaneous phone calls or emails. Although confessing to only having sporadic contact with Latvian and Lithuanian organizations, the officer described their organizational practices as Slavic and hierarchical. Several other Swedish or Finnish officers also mentioned the communist past of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as a major cultural difference compared to their own national history.

The "post-communist heritage"

The historical background of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (as being part of the Soviet Union) was often mentioned in conversations regarding "cultural obstacles" or "cultural differences". For example, when talking about the EU enlargement in the 1990s, Stefan, a Swedish coast guard officer (who had been an EU observer assisting the Baltic states in receiving their EU membership) said that the Estonian and Latvian police and border authorities had put great effort in regaining their independence. Apparently, the Estonian police and border guard organizations had fired most of their previous staff, employed new workers, and changed their organizational structures in the 1990s. An Estonian officer added to Stefan's description: "Ten years ago we wanted to have some new fresh blood in our organization and therefore old officers were […] friendly kicked out from the organization because we felt that they are stopping progress". According to the officers, this was still noticeable in their organization considering that few members of the staff were past the age of 40.

This attempt to "sweep away" every possible trace of the previous regime in Estonian and Latvian law enforcement organizations (Giordano and Kostova 2002) was perceived as a sign that the organizations were dedicated to being part of the European Union and were open to change. Lukas, a Latvian border officer who had worked in the Baltic Sea area since the 1980s saw several positive differences in his work now compared to the Soviet period. Among other things, the officers were now better prepared for their work tasks, both in terms of equipment, technology and communication devices. The most important change was that officers nowadays had the possibility of bilateral exchange with international partners, feeling now "more included" in the European Union. Lukas also mentioned new and improved education possibilities for their staff, as well as possibilities to increase their qualifications and to raise their status, concluding that: "we are all now part of the Schengen border, and we have quite similar adaptation and attitudes towards respecting the legal background and legal framework". In his words, there was rarely any misunderstanding concerning cultural or differences between neighbouring countries.

Juha (from Finland), on the other hand, had not worked extensively with Lithuanian law enforcement organizations and was of the opinion that the transition had not been as drastic in the Lithuanian police or border guard services. This was perceived as a negative sign that increased officers' distrust in Lithuanian law enforcement organizations more than the Estonian or the Latvian organization. Despite their transition to the EU in 1994 the national organizations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were still often associated with their Russian heritage.

The issue of post-communist heritage was further elaborated by Anna, an Estonian officer I met in Tallinn a few weeks after the project had started. Anna invited me to have coffee with her in the lunchroom after a few hours of interviewing other police and border officers. Anna was curious about the research that I was conducting and thought it was very important to highlight international collaboration. After finishing our coffee and talking about border guarding, Anna kindly offered to drive me back to the hotel where I was staying. We found Anna's red car and started the journey through the small, winding streets of Tallinn. The Russian annexation of Crimea was discussed on every news channel and Anna told me that the Estonian people were worried. That was the topic that she and her colleagues had talked about all day, anxiously following the developments. Our conversation steered towards Russian political relations and I asked her about the Estonian relationship with Russia. She was silent for a moment, and then said that there were things that Estonians could never forget regarding the country's history with Russia, adding "we all have memories, but some people are trying to forget because it is easier". She then realised that she had been driving in the wrong direction. She cursed in English and reversed the car almost hitting a man walking in the middle of the street with a beer in his hand. "Probably a Finnish tourist", she joked, and continued driving through Tallinn's old town.

Outside an old looking three-story building I saw several people, mostly women, standing in line waiting outside a closed door. I asked Anna what they were waiting for and she said that they were Russians waiting for a visa or other official documents. Anna explained that it was important to consider the Russian population residing in Estonia as "Russian Estonians" and not Russians, since they may originally come from Belarus or Ukraine. The Russian-Estonian population is estimated at 320,000, and Anna told me that many of them do not have full Estonian citizenship. She further explained:

> "The Russian-Estonians have this grey passport saying that they do not have a full Estonian citizenship, they are really in between Europe and Russia. If they want to, they can do tests about Estonian language, history and culture to show that they are willing to become real Estonians. But some of them think or hope that Russia will become more influential again, and that it would be better not to be fully European if that happens".
>
> Field interview

We continued our drive, and after a while Anna dropped me off at the hotel.

The next day, I had a conversation with John, a senior officer, about cultural collaboration obstacles and his experiences of international collaboration in general. John said that it had been a long process for the police and border guard board to find their place and their organizational identity in a European context. After the fall of the Soviet Union, members of staff in the police and border units were replaced, and collaboration with other organizations in other countries became possible. Collaborating with Russian border authorities was "difficult but necessary". According to John, Russia was not a "friend" in the same sense as the other Baltic and Scandinavian states.

Anna and John were not the only officers who mentioned collaboration obstacles due to cultural and conflicting work practices with Russian border authorities. Russia is not part of Europe or the EU and was not included in Project Turnstone. However, all participating countries (except for Sweden) share borders with Russia, which entails a certain level of collaboration regarding visa regulations. Collaborating with Russia was more often described as necessary, rather than unproblematic or friendly. In the accounts of interviewed officers, an issue that categorised certain countries or areas as "risky" was usually a close connection or association with Russia. Officers talking about the Soviet Union often adopted a negative position towards Russia and the bureaucratic and structural aspects of "old communist organizations".

As previously stated, officers discussed progress in terms of "who was on the right track", suggesting that some organizations or states were more "European" oriented than others. Lithuania and Latvia were sometimes described as "poor countries" where people generally received low salaries and took every chance to travel to rich European countries nearby (such as Finland, Norway, and Sweden) to commit crimes. This

increased the assumption that some officers were more prone to taking bribes, potentially being regarded as risky collaboration partners.

"Us" and "Them": Opposite Extremes

Although some officers (from Sweden, Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) specified that the Baltic states had been successful in re-defining their organizations in democratic terms, several officers still maintained that the Soviet "heritage" had been hard to eliminate completely for many organizations.

Researchers on post-communist transformations claim that Baltic and Eastern European organizations are still associated with risk and a post-soviet heritage (Fehérváry 2002; Juska, Johnstone and Pozzuto 2004; Marková 2004). In their study of trust in post-communist societies, Cook, Rice and Gerbasi (2004) emphasise the difficulties of moving from a social system of closed groups or networks to more open networks. Despite political, economic, and social changes in Europe, the accounts of officers interviewed for this study suggest that such distrust may still affect international collaboration. The officers associated post-communist societies with corruption and scepticism, referring to reports and surveys of the frequencies of corruption in Eastern Europe.

A few days after meeting Anna and John, I interviewed a Finnish intelligence officer named Dennis. At first, we talked about the up-coming work week (Power Week) that Dennis had planned to attend. I then asked Dennis if he had any fears about the project. He admitted that he was still a bit concerned about sharing sensitive information with people whom he did not know during the Power Weeks. Dennis was not used to this kind of collaboration and expected that it would take some time before the participating officers had gained enough trust in each other, as the following comments show:

> "Even if the Baltic Sea area is relatively small geographically, we still have these opposite extremes, and I can understand that, this, cooperation and trust might be buried under a heavy stone, first you have to find the right people who think like you do, like I mentioned earlier, you need to find people who think along the same lines as you and who are working towards the same goal".
>
> Recorded interview

I did not really understand what Dennis meant with "opposite extremes" and asked if he could explain what he meant. Dennis started drawing on a piece of paper. The drawing was a map of Europe with arrows going back and forth between Scandinavia, and what seemed to be Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and other surrounding countries. He then described his drawing by saying that travelling criminal groups often originated

from southern or eastern parts of Europe (for instance Lithuania, Belarus, Georgia, Poland and Romania) and travelled west (to Estonia, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Germany or Denmark) to commit burglaries or car thefts. Because of this, police and border organizations in the Baltic Sea area could not be "on the same side". Dennis continued:

> Dennis: Let's say like this, if we reverse the problem, if we were to have Swedish and Finnish criminal groups travelling around Eastern Europe committing crimes and then people [police officers from these countries in Eastern Europe] start to ask us about these groups, then how would we look at that problem, and would we see it as a problem that our crooks are abroad? Because then *we* don't have a problem with those guys and there are no burglaries and crimes that they would commit *here*. [5 sec] And the thing is, how much time do you want to put into this, since you have your local problems in your own country, that is the big difference, […] we are on different sides so to speak.
>
> Sophia: And, with that you mean…?
>
> Dennis: Well, it's like this [almost laughing] one country represents the suspects and the other country represents the plaintiffs.
>
> Sophia: Mm.
>
> Dennis: So it can't be exactly the same.
>
> Recorded interview

In Dennis' view, it was not strange that police and border organizations in Eastern Europe were not as interested in fighting crime committed in other countries than their own. Since the majority of property crimes in Sweden, Finland, and in the other northern European countries are committed by people from the Baltic States and Eastern Europe, this could create problems regarding collaboration, as the power dimensions between the officers might be skewed from the onset. As Dennis explained to me, if the problem was reversed (that is, if Finnish or Swedish criminal groups frequently committed crimes in Eastern European countries) Swedish and Finnish law enforcement organizations would probably not priorities solving these foreign crimes (as the "problems" were, in a sense, located in other countries). In this account, the "us and them perspective" is shifted from focusing on police officers versus "the criminal others", to constructing an us and them division between law enforcement organizations. Dennis describes a situation where his international collaboration partners (in this example, other border police organizations in the Baltics or in Eastern Europe) are constructed as the "others"; their lack of commitment to fighting cross border crime places them in a position almost as "bad" as the "real criminals".

Another perspective on the issue of "plaintiffs" versus "criminals" was provided by, amongst others, Jakob and Marta, whom I had talked to earlier. Jakob mentioned that organizations in countries in the Schengen area not bordered by a non-EU country (such as Sweden or Norway) did not considered cases of human smuggling as severely as organizations working to protect the external borders of EU. They were both worried about the large amount of asylum seekers travelling to Europe with false documentation and described the Scandinavian countries as "pull-factors for migrants, causing problems for the border organizations in the Baltic Sea area. In their view, the laws of the Scandinavian countries were too weak and needed to be changed so that Europe would not "lose control over the situation". A large number of cross border criminals in the Baltic Sea area was thus a result of the inadequate control and regulations of the Scandinavian countries. Marta saw no problem with the official process of seeking asylum the legal way, but far too many people ignored these rules, in her opinion, and "disappeared" as soon as they had crossed the border. This, according to the officers, created problems for law enforcement organizations, possibly increasing the number of illegal activities in the area, and posing a threat to public safety in general.

The problem described by the officers was mainly one of distrust and a lacking confidence in the efforts and incentives of collaboration partners. All forms of human collaboration demand shared trust (Hufnagel and McCartney 2017, 3). However, trust is especially perceived as fundamental for building collaborative relationships within criminal justice systems and in the sharing of intelligence information (Cotter 2015; Hufnagel and McCartney 2017). Dennis concurred with such statements, describing that officers working with intelligence were "trained to be suspicious". Although he claimed to be excited about participating in the Power Weeks, he admitted to being somewhat apprehensive about letting his guard down.

> "The intelligence world has a long memory. You don't forget. If trust has been destroyed it takes a lot of effort to be built again, and often it is impossible to regain complete trust. It is easy to destroy trust, all it takes is one mistake, one lie, and the trust is gone".
>
> Recorded interview

In Dennis opinion, organizations working with criminal intelligence were inherently suspicious and apprehensive of sharing what they know because of lack of trust. As the task of border guards and border police organizations is mainly to protect national borders against threats from the other side, information may end up in the wrong hands when collaborating with these potentially dangerous "others". Previous research has ascertained that operative and intelligence-based police work is characterised by constructions of two opposing sides; an "us and them" perspective (Görtz 2015; Holmberg 2003; Reiner 2010). Borders (and thus bordering practices) are inherently associated with collective identification assuming a common sense of belonging (Balibar 2010, 316). Border guarding thus entails the assumptions of an "us" and

"them" and ways of defining community and exclusion (Aas, 2011, 334). "Criminals" or other people who deviate from the norm are categorises as antagonist "others", as opposed to the police officers who are legitimised by their actions (Basic 2018b, 57; Becker 1963). Dennis' story tells us that such assumptions not only involve potentially dangerous "others" who cross borders (cross border criminals or migrants), but also "other" law enforcement organizations on the other side.

Curious about the reason for Dennis' apprehension with regard to the collaboration, I asked him if he could describe any event when the trust between collaborating partners had been destroyed. Dennis and his colleagues had previously (several years prior to Project Turnstone) "tested" some partners by sending partially faulty or incomplete information in order to see where the information would eventually end up. Officers were thus reluctant to provide information to international partners whom they did not know in person, as Dennis later explained.

> "For example, we have a contact person in the Baltics, […] it is really difficult for me who don't know this contact person to ask questions, I must turn to someone who I have had contact with before, one who has contacts with someone in that contact persons' organization, to get that information. And it is used quite often now, that we do it that way, so that extended contacts become a network".
>
> Recorded interview

It was very difficult for Dennis to simply call an officer in another organization and ask for help if he did not know the person whom he was calling. It was not enough to simply state that he is calling from his organization. The anticipated reaction would then be questions such as "who are you" and "what are your reasons for asking these questions?" To my surprise, it was not enough to contact another law enforcement authority asking for information, despite representing a well-know, neighbouring organization. According to Dennis, some level of personal relationship was vital. The officers often engaged in complex networks in order to get information from an organization where they did not know anyone in person. He had to find someone that he knew well, who had contacts within that organization, and ask him/her to make the request for him. The reason behind this rather complex network exchange, I was told, was the risk of information "leaking out" or going to "the wrong hands" by officers who provided organized crime groups with information of border checks. Apparently, this was considered a viable threat constantly existing in the back of the minds of intelligence officers. Dennis added that the issue of trust was not unique for the Baltic Sea area, and that intelligence sharing always entailed a certain amount of suspicion.

Other interviewees subsequently talked about experiences of corrupt border officers in Europe (or elsewhere), of hearing rumours of corruption or of reading reports on the frequency of corruption in governmental organizations. Such reports were often

focused on organizations in the Baltic States and Eastern Europe. In addition to Dennis, several other officers often distrusted "new" collaboration partners and associated them with rumours of misconduct. Only a handful of people stated that they had never heard any mentioning of corruption or faulty intelligence information.

Considering the accounts of interviewed officers, the introduction of new collaboration partners and organizations was often seen as a risk. However, it is important to note that interviewed officers rarely talked about trust on an organizational level. In order for officers to be able to work effortlessly together, they all emphasised that interpersonal relationships and trust had to be created. Naturally, shaping personal bonds might be important in most contexts in order for people to achieve trust. However, in the context of sharing intelligence information trust was not described in terms of loyalty, but as a type of respect and confidence that your collaborating partners would do his/her best on every occasion.

Information exchange or intelligence work can be defined as a process of "keeping secrets" and therefore, being friends or "knowing" the person you work with is vital. Previous studies on trust in police and intelligence networks recognises that trust is often formed on the micro level (Hufnagel and McCartney 2017, 4). Radaev (2004), for example, asserts that trust formation in "low-trust societies" (in this example the former Soviet Union) starts at a micro level of interpersonal relationships and develops through the mutual trust of specific networks. The reputation of the network is then important as other networks may either risk engaging in or refusing collaboration based on the network's alleged reliability (Woodruff 2004). Trust concerns the prediction and expectation of future behaviour and trusting someone is a leap of faith of future performance of roles (Hufnagel and McCartney 2017, 4).

Elias and Scotson (1994) have previously emphasised the impossibility to separate oneself from the figurations of a society, a neighbourhood or other group constellations, as individuals jointly create figurations that steer the acts of the individuals. The present study witnesses a similar tendency of defining members of the collaboration project as either established or outsiders, or as insiders or outsiders (Charman 2017, 99), based on a person's socialisation in the group, or configuration, specific cultural practices, and the identified location of the organization. Officers who had previously worked together, and those who had been early advocates of the project identified themselves as insiders or as "core members", which suggests that the "others", (the newcomers) can be described as "peripheral" members (Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999; Lave and Wenger 1991). Partners with years of experiences of collaboration (such as for example a few of the Swedish and Finnish officers) considered themselves more trustworthy, whereas new collaboration members were often met with suspicion and categorized as outsiders. In order to become trusted core members, these peripheral members would have to take active part in the collaborative work of negotiation and socialisation and prove themselves worthy of the other officers' trust.

Concluding Remarks

Obstructions to Collaboration

Even though their work roles and work practices (as border, police or coast guard officers) were similar (preventing and solving cross border crimes), structural obstacles caused major difficulties for international collaboration. The officers identified several issues that made collaborative work difficult, for example different work practices, legislations, and guidelines regarding the sharing of information and doing surveillance. A general lack of knowledge regarding such differences made collaboration challenging. Interviewed officers blamed various structural features for slowing down information sharing and cross-border surveillance. Their lack of knowledge regarding collaborating partners had resulted in utterly failed operations in apprehending suspected criminals. Such structural differences and difficulties were thus both obstacles for transnational collaboration, as well as a main motivation to collaborate on a more regular basis. The officers argued that repeated interactions would keep them up to date about their partners and their organizations. This would make their joint work more efficient as less time would be wasted on asking various questions.

Although structural differences caused major problems for international collaboration, previous experience had also taught interviewed officers that it might be risky to completely trust information provided by "unknown" collaboration partners. The officers often described their work of criminal intelligence analysis as "risk analysis"; a process where information was managed and graded based on the "risk" it might pose to the public or society. Such analysis might focus on linking pieces of information in order to establish behavioural patterns of known criminals, evaluate the potential number of illegal immigrants or assessing the likelihood of certain crimes being committed[37]. The purpose of intelligence analysis was thus, as previously mentioned, a calculation of risk based on the facts at hand and not always a reactive response to specific crimes (Cotter 2015; Maguire and John 2006). However, sharing this information with unknown partners was another type of risk. Previous experiences had tough the officers that corruption or misconduct (when "secret" information found its way to criminal organizations) was not an impossible scenario.

Cynicism and scepticism amongst police officers are seen as important survival techniques in an occupation that is branded as alienating, dangerous and unpredictable (Goldsmith 1990, 93-94). Interviewed officers exemplified a proneness to suspicion and cynicism. All participating officers were new to this hands-on, daily work collaboration organized by Project Turnstone. However, some officers regraded themselves as more "established", as they had been a part of the EU for a longer period of time and had previously collaborated with some participating organizations prior to

[37] A similar discussion of the concept of risk is also held in Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström (2015b) and Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström (2016).

the implementation of Project Turnstone. New collaboration partners from the Baltic States were regarded with a degree of scepticism based on their nations' previous connections with Russia as part of the Soviet Union. Collaboration partners from Scandinavia were likewise regarded with scepticism based on the large influx of migrants in the Scandinavian countries. The assumption that a high number of cross border criminals committing crimes in Scandinavia originated from the Baltic States further increased the fear of misconduct. As described by one officer, a few participants in the project represented the plaintiffs, whereas other participants represented the criminals. The result of this might be skewed power dimensions between participating officers.

The experiences of the officer interviewed for this study indicate that horizontal, informal exchange of information was perceived as less risky than in connection with official requests, as officers who did not trust one another in the first place would not provide any substantial information. They saw it less likely that officers who they knew and had worked with would provide faulty information, as these officers would possible be personally held accountable for the quality of the information. However, officers often talked about the risk of corruption using, what Reiner (2010, 181) refers to as a "one bad apple framework", arguing that misconduct was often done by a few, rare individuals. Many emphasised that it was unfair to "judge" entire organizations or "punish" a large group of people for the actions of such individuals. If increasing collaboration was the primary goal of Project Turnstone, increasing mutual trust between participating officers was crucial for achieving that goal. The joint activities taking place during the Power Weeks, further described in the following chapters, can therefore be regarded as part of the "gradual incorporation of an "in the same boat" collective consciousness" (van Maanen 1973, 407) or as trial periods allowing participating officers to prove their commitment, trustworthiness, and value for the Project Turnstone community

6. Hoping for Collaboration: Finding Common Ground

Previous studies of police organizations often provide a stereotypical image of police officers as a conservative, isolated, and homogenous group of men bound together by an amplified sense of mission (Van Maanen 1978, 267; Reiner 2010). Although changes have taken place within the field of policing, some habits of police officers frequently observed in previous ethnographies of police organizations still hold relevance in contemporary analyses (Loftus 2010).

For example, Loftus' (2016) study of English rank and file officers reveals that a dominant feature of police culture, such as a celebration of masculine exploits, violence, mission, and displays of defensive solidarity with colleagues was prevalent in the organization. Such claims were also supported during Project Turnstone; officers interviewed for this study identified with a larger border police community held together by a shared sense of mission with their international collaboration partners. However, the officers showed great awareness of stereotypical images of policing and often questioned and analysed the various stereotypical traits of police officers when working together.

This chapter focuses on some common grounds and basic values shared by the officers that made collaboration attempts possible. Even though the officers faced various obstacles (presented in the previous chapter) they still emphasised a strong commitment to a "joint mission". This mission included a will to "do good", a motivation to fight crime, and a desire to help the general public. Furthermore, interviewees claimed that all European border (police) officers identified themselves with a common professional (border police) identity and a "border guard codex" serving as an impetus to their collaboration. The officers saw the development of collaboration as a major stride towards making a positive impact on the world by learning form one another, refining their work methods, and thus, hopefully become more "successful in fighting cross border criminality". Although sharing a common understanding of doing "something good for society", practice-based collaboration processes were still needed. This is due to the perception that previous collaborations had not always been "successful".

Drawing on Wenger and Wenger-Trayner's (2015, 2) approach to community building, my focus of this chapter is thus on the first steps of identifying joint commitment, motivation, and a shared identity defined by a shared domain of interests.

Introducing Turnstone: Goals and Visions

The idea of Project Turnstone emerged after several years of struggling to achieve successful collaboration among law enforcement organizations in the Baltic Sea area. The story of Project Turnstone was outlined to me during my second meeting with the Project initiators. This time I met with Oskar and Mona at their work place in the harbour area. We sat down in their meeting room and talked about the research, issues of confidentiality and the project reports that were supposed to emanate from the project (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2015a; 2015b[38]). They also told me the story of the creation of Project Turnstone.

Oskar had worked with international collaboration for several decades and had already been engaged in numerous projects and collaborations in Europe. He and his colleagues had talked about the necessity of increasing collaboration between European law enforcement organizations for several years before the idea of Turnstone struck root. Two previous collaboration projects initiated by the Stockholm Border Police (referred to as the Triangle project and Operation Gunder) inspired the idea of implementing a new kind of collaboration project. New ways of working were necessary, according to the officers as collaborative methods were not quite up to scratch; law enforcement organizations in the Baltic Sea area had official collaboration agreements, but few hands-on collaborative efforts were implemented.

When realising that there was a possibility to receive funding for a more "hands-on" collaboration project, Oskar and Mona visited neighbouring law enforcement organizations and talked to several officers about the idea. They knew some of the officers well, but some were complete strangers to them. Most of the officers visited conveyed their conviction that their work could no longer be carried out efficiently without increased international collaboration. According to the project initiators, all involved partners saw themselves as belonging to a "border policing community". Working in law enforcement organizations also made the officers identify themselves with a large body of "police officers" that distinguishes them from the rest of society (Campbell 2007, 135-137). Having this idea of a common identity and a shared endeavour was, according to Oskar, vital for the officers to agree to participate in the project. However, despite identifying with a "border community", they lacked the

[38] These reports were later published in Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström (2016) and Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström (2017).

appropriate tools, setting, and possibility for interaction in order to work together. A few officers who were identified as "like-minded people" were invited to continue the process of formalising the idea of the project. In a rather short period of time, an abstract feeling that something "needed to be done" had soon taken shape and became an EU financed project.

When having found "like-minded" officers willing to participate in the project, and with the necessary funding, the next step was to "formalise" the idea of the project into a more "solid form". The project initiators began by finding an appropriate name for the project. After a while, they agreed to call the project Turnstone, named after a type of bird living in the Baltic Sea area. Oskar and Mona explained to me that the name carries several symbolic features; the bird resides in all the participating countries, symbolizing their geographical proximity. The bird's "mission" is to search for and eat water living creatures found in the shorelines of the Baltic Sea. The water living creatures that feed the bird symbolises the criminals hiding in the area whom the officers needed to catch.

After deciding on a name, Oskar and Mona (with the help of Niklas and Lars), began listing the goals, motivations, participants, and activities of the project. They decided to "advertise" the project as one with a specific goal, and that it would be different to previous projects in it places emphasis on being a "hands-on" project. Project Turnstone would stand out from other projects as it would allow the participants to immediately collaborate with hands-on tasks, instead of talking about collaboration in formal meetings or working following formal procedures and planning. In other terms, they were hoping that the project would generate as few meetings as possible, allocating time and recourses for participants to solve problems, negotiate work practices, and learn from one another on their own terms without direct supervision.

The initiators then showed me their plans for Project Turnstone on a large sheet of paper. I looked at the tight schedule (neatly structured in an excel document) where a range of meetings and activities were listed in detail; the date, the cost, the number of participants, and the purpose of each activity was clearly stated in the chart. The time allocated for fieldwork and interviews was not fixed in the chart but the funding allocated for research in each participating country was listed. The different meetings listed in the schedule were named 1) Management Board Meeting, 2) Intelligence Group Meeting, 3) Operative Action Meeting (later renamed into Power Weeks), 4) Operative Action Group Meeting, and 5) Research Follow Up Meeting.

When reading the schedule, I realised that my field co-researcher and I were not invited to participate in some of the meetings (the Intelligence Group Meetings and the Operative Action Group Meetings). I asked about the nature of these meetings, and whether the content of these meetings was secret. Oskar laughed a little in response, shrugged his shoulders and said that the content of the meeting was not secret *per se*, but that it was common curtsey amongst "intelligence people" to keep the meeting

small with only the chiefs and personnel in charge of the operative activities. The Intelligence Group Meeting was supposed to be a "planning" meeting before the Power Weeks and the Operative Action Group Meeting an evaluation meeting that would take place after the Power Weeks. Lars told me that an "orientation" meeting (referred to as a Management Board Meeting) introducing the participants to the project was planned to take place in a couple of weeks, adding that my field co-researcher and I were most welcome to attend this meeting. In order to illustrate the claims for initiating the project, I describe this event in more detail in the next section.

The Management Board Meeting

The Management Board Meeting took place on a cold winter's day in 2014 and can be described as the starting point for the project. The advocates and organizers of Project Turnstone had invited a few members from each participating organization to meet and talk about their hopes and plans for the project, and to jointly define the project objectives. Police, coast guard, and border officers from Stockholm, Tallinn, Klaipeda, Riga, and Helsinki were invited. Additionally, a few middle level chiefs, the project coordinators, operative police officers, criminal intelligence officers, and my field co-researcher and I also participated.

I arrived early in the morning when it was still dark and snow was piling up on the side of the roads. I joined the others and we gathered in the lobby of the conference venue, each receiving a nametag and cup of coffee or tea. Some guests greeted one another and shook hands as if they were old acquaintances, whereas others were reserved, looking a little reserved or out of their element. Most of the guests looked rather formal, wearing suits, ties, skirts or dresses. A few guests wore more casual attire, such as jeans, sweaters, and shirts. Because nobody was wearing a uniform, it was not possible to tell the grade or the affiliation of the guests.

The organizers, Mona, Oskar, Lars, and Niklas, came to the lobby and showed us the way to the conference room. The tables in the room were placed in the shape of a U facing the screen with a PowerPoint presentation. The organizers sat down in front of the screen facing the participants. They opened the meeting by thanking everyone for coming before setting up the agenda for the day's meeting.

Niklas stated that the purpose of this formal get-together was to outline and establish the structure and the objectives of the project. Together with the other initiators, he described the background of the project and gave a brief historical overview of law enforcement collaboration in the Baltic Sea area. According to Lars, the previous collaboration projects, referred to as the Triangle Project and Operation Gunder, were successful in the sense that participating border and police organizations identified common problems regarding cross-border crimes saying that:

> "The Schengen agreement was completed in 2007. A large number of people travel every day within the triangle and where you have people you have problems. The Operation Triangle was the first wave of the organization in 2009. It all started with a meeting between officers from Estonia, Finland, Åland and Sweden. We had a meeting and saw that we had similar criminal activity in all countries and agreed to share a common view regarding crime prevention in the Baltic Sea area. The method used to achieve these goals where the exchange of personnel and to increase the flow of information".
>
> Field notes

Lars also stressed the point that although the Triangle Project had been successful, "we noticed that there was a high demand for organizational competence and for organized dialogue among the participating countries". The participants had agreed that more partners had to be invited in future projects, as cross border criminals move easily between all northern European countries. Oskar said that it was important to agree on which partners to exclude and which additional partners to include in the future of the project. He also said that the choice of the participants was based on the nature of the tasks and the competences that these tasks require. He further suggested that he would like to see standardized forms of daily reports generated by people working together around common issues and areas of interests. The Triangle project had implemented joint collaboration activities, but in each activity participating officers had focused on specific, pre-determined cases. The idea of Project Turnstone was to provide time and space for officers to work with everyday tasks, without knowing in advance which cases and offences would emanate. This had not been done before, especially not in the same design as planned to take place in Project Turnstone.

Niklas leaned forward in his chair, clasped his hands together and said with a serious look on his face: "the mobility of the modern criminal is rapidly increasing and therefore we need to increase our mobility as well, at least "in the mind [mentally]". He continued: "mobile criminals create a problem because different geographical areas have different police divisions and practices and it is difficult for these divisions to co-operate and work quickly enough before the criminals move on to other areas". He explained that cross border criminals were often involved in different types of crime at the same time, such as human trafficking, smuggling, dealing with stolen goods, and drug trafficking. Niklas and Lars then emphasised the point that this collaboration project was to be regional and "hands-on", as there was already a national level of intelligence initiatives. Accordingly, their ambition was that all results should be "action-based", emphasising practical work tasks instead of just formal meetings, formal agreements, and writing formal reports. "It is therefore important", Lars continued, "to establish contact points in the harbours and at the airports of each of the countries involved in this project".

Two participants raised their hands and asked about how to document the findings and results of the Power Weeks. They were also curious about how the work activities during those weeks would be assessed. After some discussion between the officers and the initiators, it was decided that each organization would assign one person the responsibility for documenting all results, compiling them into a report and sending the report to all participants who took part in the Power Weeks.

After the introduction, Mona, who was mainly in charge of issues of funding and organizing events, described the extensive process of formalising the project and of writing the project application. She then presented the financial plan, the allocated funding for each activity, and explained the activity list that I had discussed with the initiators a few weeks earlier. A list of participants was passed around the table, and the group set off discussing a document called "memorandum of understanding" (MOU). The MOU was prepared at a previous Turnstone meeting that I did not attend. Several participants took great interest in the document and it took longer than an hour to reach an agreement that suited all. The expression "serious cross border crime" was heard a few times during the discussion, with some arguing that it was too general a term. Another point in the MOU was that the members should promote "freedom of movement for European citizens". One participant pointed out that "Project Turnstone focuses on freedom of movement of citizens within Schengen only" and that this needed to be clarified in the final version of the MOU. Likewise, the MOU stipulated that it was mandatory for the organizations involved in the project to shoulder certain responsibilities. One officer looked annoyed by the expression "mandatory", suggesting that it should be changed. He argued that "participation is based on members' free choice, there should not be any obligation!" No one else objected to this suggestion.

The next presenters at the meeting were two border officers in their thirties who described the process of intelligence analysis. They began their presentation by showing charts of the organizational structures of their unit and continued with describing their work positions and work tasks. "Much of the intelligence work", they said, consisted of planning, mapping, sending reports, and arranging intelligence led activities[39]. Instead of showing pictures of apprehended stolen goods the presenters showed a drawn picture of the "infinity symbol" (designed as a horizontal number 8) because, as one of them said, "criminal intelligence work never stops".

After a quick coffee break it was time for further discussion of the potential outcome and the goals of the project. The participants (me included) were divided into small discussion groups to explore the potential benefits and pitfalls of Project Turnstone. The groups spread out in the room and some took a seat in the lounge areas outside the meeting venue. I was part of a group with five members from four of the

[39] Intelligence led activities were described as activities with a specific focus (one example is smuggling) when a number of officers were selected to perform border checks or do surveillance together.

participating organizations. Most of my group members were positive regarding the project. They only feared that the collaboration would not last and that the project would become too bureaucratic instead of "hands on". Another discussion group member, a senior officer whom I had talked to during the coffee break, raised the point that the Project Turnstone should be seen as a tool to get better at "creating networks", but she added that it was also vital to focus on the law and "fight the problem of stolen goods". Lars walked around listening to the ongoing discussions. When hearing the comment of my group member he nodded in agreement, saying that "we must focus on creating networks, because if we create networks we will be able to create methods to deal with the outcome of intelligence operations". He continued, saying that "we always have the obligation to fight crime", before he moved on to listen to another group. Feeling a little bit of an outsider, I mainly listened and asked a few questions during the group discussion.

A while later, Niklas and Lars called the participants back to the meeting room. Each discussion group presented the views that had emerged during the conversations. A theme that seemed important for several members was the sustainability of the project. Many feared that all joint efforts would end after the termination of the project. Another point of interest was, as one of my group members had already mentioned, that sustainable networks were useful, but in the end the most important task was to fight crime. As one officer declared: "we need to see results of the operations!". Mona took notes of the comments and said that all remarks would be considered. The discussion eventually died out and I got the sense (by the looks and frowns on some faces) that a few participants were not pleased that the main goal of the initiators seemed to be the creation of bilateral collaboration networks, rather than seeking to achieve measurable results (such as the number of arrests reached). The project initiators again stressed the point that the purpose of the collaboration project was to be "hands on" and practical, instead of bureaucratic and administrative.

Later during that day, a few border officers gave PowerPoint presentations describing work methods and previous cases. After the presentations, the participants looked tired and unfocused; some looked at their cell phones, scribbled on their notepads or yawned unabashedly. Niklas stood up, clasped his hands, and exclaimed that it had been a long day and that it was soon time for dinner. He also reminded everyone that the meeting would continue the following morning. The participants went to their hotel rooms and I joined the initiators for a quick de-briefing of today's meeting. They seemed a bit tired but pleased with the turn-up. "It's often difficult to have open conversations during meetings such as this one", Niklas says, and Lars adds that "many people don't say much, but there is not much we can do about it".

The next morning, the meeting continued early after the participating members (me excluded) were photographed. Lars quickly summed up the discussions from the previous day and said that he had to talk a little bit more about financial issues. Niklas

presented a list of possible mistakes that could result in a withdrawal of funding, such as in the event that the initiators could not present the required documents, that the project participants did not hand in receipts, tickets or boarding cards, if the re-structured the project without approval or if the management of the participant organizations withdrew their support. Niklas emphasised twice that it was really important to follow the rules and Mona added that all participants had to remember to send her their tickets and boarding cards after travelling to project events. Providing enough documentation of the project was very important as the initiators were required to write reports about the project activities. "It is easy to avoid mistakes", Mona said, by setting up routines, having follow-up meetings, carefully reading instructions, and taking the time to write reports on the meetings and the Power Weeks. She clarified that impact in this context meant outlining positive outcomes of the project. One officer asked whether there were any report templates that could be used and Mona promised to send these to each officer responsible for documentation.

A few questions were then raised regarding practical issues such as travel grants and how transportations for exchange officers would be organized. A few participants asked about the possibility for using interpreters during the fieldwork sessions and that they were interested in doing cultural field trips during work exchanges. Unfortunately, Niklas said, "there is no room in the budget for field trips but we will probably manage to arrange for interpreters". Since no one else had any further questions, Mona offered a final comment regarding the funding: "when external funding is used, it may seem a little silly, unfamiliar and bureaucratic, but it is important to be aware of these rules in order to get good results".

Getting Results?

The everyday pressure put upon police officers to achieve measurable results is an important element of the occupational culture of the police (Reiner 2015; Skolnick 1966, 42, 231). Achieving results was also essential for the officers participating in Project Turnstone. However, various accounts and definitions of what results actually entailed were highlighted in conversations with the officers and at the Management Board Meeting. There was a consensus among the participants that the main purpose of the project was to increase collaboration so as to be able to fight cross border crimes more efficiently. Coordinating work methods that could be measured and assessed, as well achieving a high number of arrests were also emphasised by some as vital goals for the project. The hands-on approach, including "real work" (as opposed to formal meetings and administrative tasks) was especially highlighted by the project initiators. As noted in previous chapters, one of the main reasons for the need to increase international collaboration was the changing work environment for border police officers in Europe (for instance, the abolition of passport controls) which invigorated

an action-oriented sense of mission (Loftus 2010; Reiner 2010) of doing something good for society by "getting better at solving crime" through practice.

During the Management Board Meeting, the project initiators set the tone for the project determining that one main purpose was to develop practical knowledge through closer collaboration. In the following quote, a Swedish border officer named Marcus emphasises the importance of doing "real" hands on "police" work: about practitioners working together side by side to achieve the highest level of efficiency. Above all, he pointed out that there was no need to create a large organization and that the project should be kept informal.

> "This project is meant to be on street level involving practical collaboration, establishing more partners. It should be about *real work*, it is important to have a structure but we *don't* need to create a huge organization, we just need to work together".
>
> Field notes

I met Marcus again just after the meeting when he offered to drive me to the airport. During the car ride, we talked a little about the weather and the traffic before Marcus started talking about the meeting. Similar to the initiators stressed, Marcus said that the meeting was as he had expected, adding that it is always difficult to get people to express their opinions during such big meetings. "Language difficulties are always a problem", he said, and told me some of his experiences with using an interpreter during previous collaborations; over a period of two days, only three hours were used efficiently, the rest of the time was spent sight-seeing and exploring cultural attractions. Marcus seemed a bit upset that so much time during that previous collaboration was spent out of the office. Nevertheless, he was quite positive regarding Project Turnstone and said, before he dropped me off, that he was looking forward to the operative activities, which he hoped, would be about real work, not just about meeting.

Hands on results: learning from one another

A few weeks after the Management Board Meeting it was time for the first operative activity to take place at one of the participating border authorities. I arrived early on the first day of the week to talk to the officers about their aspirations regarding the project, why they had chosen to participate, and what they hoped to achieve during the project. The first person I met was one of the "hosts" of the week, a middle level chief of the border police organization responsible for supervising the activity. His face was a little red and sweaty, and while walking me into the building he said that he and his colleagues were a bit anxious about the outcome of the week, since none of them had experienced a collaboration activity of this design[40]. I knew that the project initiators had originally dubbed the joint activity "Operative Action Meeting" and was a little

[40] A more detailed description of my first encounters during the Power Week can be found in chapter 4.

surprised when I saw the words "Power Week" on a piece of paper on the door where the operative activity was taking place. On that same piece of paper, the date of the activity, the EU flag, and the name of the project (Turnstone) were also inscribed. The host officer pointed at the note and said that he and his colleagues had thought that the previous name was "boring" and "complicated" and had therefore renamed the Operative Action Meeting "Power Week". The new name also entailed "a lot more action", the officer added with a smile.

The officers had already started working when I arrived. The officers were sitting around a large, egg-shaped table, with their laptops, phones, coffee mugs, and water bottles. Looking at the scene, the officers could easily be mistaken for IT experts or programmers instead of law enforcement officers. Some were hunched over their laptops, while others leaned back and sipped coffee with a rather bored look on their faces. At this particular Power Week, about one third of the participating officers were women. Most officers were casually dressed in warm sweaters, jeans, and sneakers. A couple of participants were slightly more dressed up in shirts and blazers. I introduced myself and stated my purpose for being there, thanking the officers for granting me permission to attend the Power Week. I took a seat and unpacked my notebook. While working, none of the officers seemed to take notice of me. However, on their way to get coffee or during breaks, some of the officers talked to me about my research, providing me with information about the kind of work they were doing. One of the border officers clarified that all officers had brought their own laptops since they have access to their "home-registers" of criminal offenses, suspects or convictions. "For instance," he said, "there were a few cars stolen in Stockholm yesterday, and we think we know the people who did it. We have organized surveillance that will try to spot and follow these people when they try to take the ferry to, for instance, Finland or Latvia". He also explained that the officers (through Frontex) received information about committed crimes and suspects that might be of interest.

One positive aspects of Project Turnstone, as described by participating intelligence officers was the possibility to work together, share information, and learn from one another. One of them was Jan, a Finnish intelligence police officer and one of the early advocates of the project. Jan was very excited about the work week and agreed to grant me an interview. We met at a cafeteria, one floor down from the Power Week office. The Power Week had started a bit slowly but Jan was convinced that they would soon pick up once they got used to the format. His ultimate hope was that the integration of the diverse stocks of knowledge and methods of the project participants would result in a more elaborate picture of criminal activity in the Baltic Sea area. "This", his said, "might give law enforcement organizations a head start in apprehending suspects in the future". Since the work environment of the officers had drastically changed in a rather short period of time, their organizations had not fully adapted themselves to working with mobile, criminal groups. "No perfect, official solution has been devised yet, but collaboration is slowly developing from the bottom up, that is, starting on the operative

levels", Jan said. He continued: "since there is need for collaboration, I usually think that *that guy* was able to help me with that thing last month, I will contact him again, and from there, the cooperation develops more frequently".

In order to achieve this with all participating members, Jan had to get to know the other officers better and learn from their experiences. He described it like this: "we might realise that the other guys work and think in similar ways, and have similar interests, even if their backgrounds and possibilities and recourses are different from those of my organization". I asked Jan to describe his work for me in more detail, as the structure and practical methods of intelligence work were still not clear to me. Jan described intelligence information as "information that has been evaluated, processed, analysed" and that is received from "two, from one another, independent sources". Jan, as well as the other interviewed officers, regarded his work as a craft where networks, knowledge and know-how needed to be accumulated over time. Becoming a good intelligence officers required dedication, interest, passion, and as many "informal" contacts as you could gather.

As previously described, a few of the officers participating in the project had already started to assemble a number of "informal contacts" who assisted them when the official information channels were too slow. Some pieces of information regarding certain crimes were difficult to find in official databases and sometimes the officers themselves worked faster in connecting various stolen cars, crimes or modus operandi with known criminal organizations or suspects. The work process includes finding, processing, and assessing intelligence information, and eventually the resulting actions. Such actions were mainly surveillance or apprehension of suspected criminals.

Jan continued by describing his main interests as an intelligence officer, mainly mapping, understanding, and finding the "travel routes" for stolen goods. "There are different markets for stolen items", he said, "and different places have different demands. It might be a hearsay, but I have heard that everything that has an engine ends up in Paldiski [laughing]"[41]. Jan laughed for a while and then re-gained his composure. With a more serious voice he then explained that he was curious to learn more about the "flows" of stolen items; where the goods were sold, and to whom. Stolen cars that were rebuilt and then sold were particularly interesting and important, according to Jan, as such cars were difficult to find and could be extremely dangerous. "In order to find such cars, we need to have border check points where we can stop cars and control their legitimacy, otherwise it is almost impossible", he concluded in a serious voice. After a while, Jan continued his line of though stating that it was possible that colleagues in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia might have vital information regarding

[41] Paldiski is a harbour town located south west of Tallinn in Estonia. The town port has been an important point of transit between Sweden and Estonia, and a military port built by the Russian Empire. Today, the port of Paldiski is a transit centre for various trade and cargo.

property crimes committed in Scandinavia, as many crimes are committed by suspects from those countries.

By the end of our conversation he emphasised, however, that it was extremely important that all participating countries would work together, and that no country would take on the role as a teacher, instructing the other participants in how to do their jobs. That would not be beneficial for the officers' motivation, nor would it increase the sense of working together. In Jan's words: "this is not a Finnish problem or a Latvian problem, it is a *European* problem or in any case a northern European problem. We must increase the bilateral collaboration". In conclusion, Jan was fairly positive regarding the outcome of the project, adding that he firmly believed that individuals working together could "bridge" cultural differences.

After talking with Jan, I joined a few officers who stepped out of the Power Week office to get some fresh air. The officers walked around, smoking, talking, and admiring the border guard vessels in the harbour, where the Power Week office was located on this occasion. One officer sat down on a bench unwrapping a sandwich. Another seemed like he was calling his wife or girlfriend back home. It was early spring and a few of us started walking along the dock side. I asked them about their motivations for joining the project. Alexander from Lithuania described his expectations from the project by highlighting the importance of results. He reached for his cell phone and snapped a few pictures of a large freighter that had just docked. He then said: "the project has to be on the right level, it has to be on an operative level, we don't need a lot of chiefs discussing, this is not a discussion forum, there needs to be some results from all this". We talked for a few more minutes before returning to the border office.

A few days later I had arranged to interview a few of Alexander's colleagues. One of them was a middle-level manager and intelligence officer named Lukas. For Lukas, it was important to produce results of this project, over and above the importance of creating interpersonal relations and laying a good foundation for future collaboration. In a subsequent interview, Lukas elaborated on the importance of getting results:

> "To *me*, results mean [that people get] *convicted*. That people get *locked up*. Eh but, *yeah*, and then *of course* it is also important that we find out what the *pattern* is like, how it *works,* and things like that. And, eh *who* travels with who, *why* do you travel and […] why do you fly one way and [take a] boat, ferry, back and so on?"
>
> Recorded interview

Lukas stressed that it was essential to actually arrest and convict as many suspects as possible during the project, not just to increase bilateral exchange between offices. He also found it important to learn more about the suspects and how the crimes were committed. Only then could they get one step ahead of the criminal groups. In his view, the general public would be shocked if they knew the high number of "cross

border criminals" travelling around the Baltic Sea area on a regular basis. Lukas felt it his duty to inform people about potential threats and the urgent need for more resources. This could only be done if there were proof that the project had been successful. Since the officers had little to no experiment of joint collaborative day-to-day office work, he thought that they would have to put a lot of time into familiarising themselves with working with partners who might have access to other information systems and having different legal authorisation.

I then asked Lukas about the future, and what he expected would happen after the project had been terminated. Would everything go back to the way it had been before? And would the collaboration continue after the joint operative activities and meetings made possible by the project? Lukas shrugged his shoulders saying that he "hoped" that interpersonal collaboration would be possible to sustain in the future. His main fear was that nothing would change afterwards; reports would be written, people would shake hands and go back to the way they were before. But, he thought that as long as the project would generate results (that is, an increase in the number of arrests), and that the participating officers remained at their posts, some level of interpersonal collaboration would likely be maintained. Lukas' main hope was thus that the participating officers would be able to compare knowledge, put their specific knowledge to good use, learn from one another's work methods, and hopefully establish a "best practice", that is, to jointly decide on the best ways of solving various types of crimes and the most efficient work procedures.

In a similar manner, a Swedish intelligence border officer named Henrik also emphasised the necessity of personal contacts when working with criminal intelligence. I interviewed Henrik during the Power Week in the "interrogation" room that had been allocated to me for conducting interviews. We started our conversation by talking about the project in general, before moving on to Henrik's hopes regarding the Power Weeks. According to Henrik, the benefit of the project was that he could get to know officers from other organization and learn about what information they could provide. "In the future", he said, "I know what I can ask of my colleagues and they know who I am when I call them". Henrik stressed the importance of meeting his colleagues face to face, in order to establish contacts and achieve "successful collaboration".

> "As I said, the contacts you make in this way are invaluable, even if you cannot measure it maybe as results, in number of arrests or reclaimed goods and so on, this gives us a lot more than what can be measured, simply speaking […] when it comes to international cooperation, I can say that for my part giving and taking information and building trust, are face to face bound, kind of, you have to know the people you are calling! […] Otherwise it's difficult to give information. To know where it [the information] ends up".
>
> Recorded interview

Henrik feared that the collaboration would not last after the project had ended and that everyone would not put enough efforts into preserving and sustaining the interpersonal contacts that might have been gained. Henrik also said that trust or interpersonal collaboration could not really be described in a model or measured by numbers, demanding that the officers themselves put an effort to maintaining it. Henrik was tired of new organizational models that his organization would adopt in order to improve work results, saying "during my years as an officer I have seen many changes and now and then a new organization model is adopted in order to solve all our problems". Henrik continued, looking a little upset saying: "these are all quick-fixes, you don't want to work on the problems or work pro-actively as you can't get statistics of preventive work".

In Henrik's opinion, creating functioning bilateral networks took a lot of time and demanded a lot of dedication from participating officers. Successful collaboration could not be designed and implemented by policy agreements or demands of productivity. He compared the process to making a factory as productive as possible. "The police organization has changed over the years and methods suited for a factory are not suitable for the police", he said, while shaking his head. In his opinion, the most valuable outcome of the project was the opportunity to get to know international partners and the prospect of acquiring interpersonal trust. His experiences of previous collaborations had showed him that it was easy to officially agree to collaborate but much harder to actually work together in practice.

> "In previous cooperation, it has often been hard to find, officially it's not hard to find common grounds, the gentlemen meet and shake hands and say "yes" and agree and so on, but when it comes to what to do specifically, it's harder to know what we are talking about".
>
> Recorded interview

One of the problems, according to Henrik, was that they are too many bureaucratic meetings focusing on the agreements or action plans. An action plan might be a document stating new goals, for instance that there should be an increased focus on the issue of smuggling of stolen goods. "Everyone thinks that this is a good idea to focus on this crime area, but when it comes to actually implementing these decisions it's much harder to know how to go about to actually meet these objectives", he told me. Henrik thought it a very good idea that the participating operative officers could work hands-on with cases and create informal group structures on their own. Endless meetings with partners where official agreements should be made were seen as less useful for collaboration than doing practical daily work together.

A Joint Struggle: The Border Guard Codex

The foundation for a community of practice is the pursuit of a common goal and mutual engagement to achieve that goal. Such social relationships lead to a collective experience which over time results in a practice (Wenger 1998, 47). Various difficulties and differences described by the officers often hindered collaboration, making them hesitant to perform joint work practices together. However, despite various challenges, the officers had agreed to participate in the project as they all believed in having the same goal of protecting Europe from cross border criminality.

As described in the previous chapter, the border police officers were frustrated that national police or street level officers had a narrow view of the "European situation" and a naïve understanding of cross border crime. Such a discourse was described to me by officers from all participating organization. A Swedish border police officers named Jenny said that she and her colleagues had come to realise that they had more in common with other border officers in, for instance, Estonia and Lithuania, than they had with other Swedish border officers in, for example Skåne or Gothenburg in Sweden. All had similar work practices, focused on similar categories of cross border crime, and worked with a particular category of intelligence information. Brown and Duguid (2001) make a similar observation in their study of photocopier repair technicians. The technician worked at different organizations but shared a common practice and could read and understand each other's work. They claimed to have more in common with technicians in other firms than they did with other employees in their own work place. Brown and Duguid (2001, 206) refers to such structures as "disciplinary networks of practice" that cut across heterogenous organization. Officers interviewed in the present study regarding Project Turnstone similarly emphasised that working together was possible since all European intelligence border officers shared a common European "understanding".

In my conversations with the officers I noticed that several of them used kinship metaphors, such as "friends", "neighbours" or "brothers" and "sisters" when talking about successful collaboration. It might seem obvious to refer to bordering nations and collaboration partners as neighbours or friends, however, earning the title of "neighbour" seemed to demand much effort and bilateral exchange. Despite the emphasis on "seeing the larger picture" and adopting a holistic European perspective, kinship metaphors or expressions such as "friends" were never used when referring to European countries outside of the Baltic Sea area[42].

The officers' deployment of symbolic concepts such as neighbours and family can be compared to Shore's (2000, 54-55) analysis of the creation of the European Union.

[42] Swedish and Finnish officers also considered Norway to be one of their closest work partners outside of the Baltic Sea region.

Drawing on Anderson (1993), he sees the process of creating a common sense of European belonging as the creation of one of the "largest and most important new imagined communities to have emerged in the postcolonial era" (2000, pp. 33). Shore (2000, 79) further claims that the notion of blood ties is an integral part in the creation of a shared European culture. Officers interviewed for this study identified with such an imagined community, sharing a view that being part of the EU was a step in the "right direction" away from individualistic, small scale, police work that had been the norm until recent years. In their argument, cross-border crime performed by international, organized crime groups had drastically increased in the Baltic Sea area, and law enforcement organization needed to catch up. One aspect of their mission (as border officers) was thus to make the general public, as well as other law enforcement colleagues aware of the impact of cross border crime.

A Swedish intelligence officers named Petra further elaborated on the "mission aspect" of border policing. Petra explained that there was a "border codex" that united border officers all over the world. The codex basically entails that all border police officers and border guards first and foremost want to protect their nation's borders. Their goal is to make sure that the rules and regulations concerning entry and the use of identification documents are enforced. She also described a few visits that she had made to other border organizations. In one example, she and a few colleagues had visited a border organization in an African country. At first, their hosts had not been happy about their arrival, but after some informal small talk about border related issues they had found some common grounds and identified similar struggles and challenges. Despite cultural differences between border organizations, this codex prevailed over distinctions between border organizations. In Petra's view, it made no difference if you were a border officer in Norway, Somalia, Istanbul or Bagdad. When training border officers, the most important thing was to emphasise this codex and focus on the documents, laws, and routines. According to Petra, if everyone were to follow the codex, international collaboration would be a lot more successful.

Accounts for their Mission

When interviewing officers whom I met during the Power Weeks, I often started by asking them why they had chosen to join the police, the coast guard or the border guard unit. The most common answers received were that they wanted to do something good for their country or that they had been drawn to the work because it seemed exciting and eventful. Over and above creating interpersonal collaboration and achieving measurable results, interviewed officers emphasised the importance of protecting the public from potential harm or risk. I illustrate this by showing a few examples when the officers describe their sense of mission to do "something good" for society. Alberts,

a young officer from Latvia was one of the officers who empathised his aspiration to change the "big picture" and make the world into a better place.

> "It's always some new challenge, actually, because in the border guard board there is something happening all the time, different cases and there are different situations, it's like, every day [there is] something new, some new challenges, not big but small ones, interesting cases and, and then of course for me it was a challenge to make something better. Ahm, what's the name, and the big picture, make the world better [laughing] […] and it's quite challenging and that's the main motivation".
>
> Recorded interview

Alberts also mentioned the "action" aspect of border guarding saying that the challenges of the work motivated him and made his work interesting. Alberts further explained that it was important to feel motivated to go to work, and by doing this job he felt as he was part of something greater than himself.

Although several of the officers admitted that the bulk of the investigative work and intelligence analysis were not as exciting as common perception would implicate, the officers saw several good reasons for remaining in the police, border, or coast guard organizations. The officers especially valued the sense of camaraderie and close working relationship they had with their colleagues, the sense of mission they shared, and the challenges, excitement, and unpredictability of their work tasks still implied, even after decades of service.

Filip, an intelligence officers who attended every Power Week also described why he had chosen to become a border police officer and why he wanted to participate in the project:

> "It is the best feeling in the world to arrest someone. It is worth so much, even if the value of what we find, how should I put it, even if the value of the [stolen] things we find is not a lot, it is valuable, and this is true, we do this for the public for real, you don't become a police officer because of the salary, you choose to become a police officer because you have real ambition to do the right thing".
>
> Recorded interview

In Filip's opinion, few people would join law enforcement organizations because of the salary, but because they had "real ambition to do the right thing". He found great satisfaction when arresting a suspected criminal, thinking that his action would have positive consequences for society. Other officers similarly described that they had chosen this line of work in order to "do good", to help people, to face new challenges, and ultimately, to "catch the bad guys".

Another example is Dima from Lithuania, who described his work task of finding "illegals" that crossed the EU borders as a "very important hobby". I interviewed Dima during one of the Power Weeks and started my interview by asking him why he had chosen to join the border guard unit. Dima said that he enjoyed doing his work, that he was good at it, and that he was eager to perform it well since he found it to be a very important task. It annoyed him that some of his colleagues did not share his sense of mission and only cared about their salary. Dima was, however, very pleased with being involved in an international collaboration project of this design, as it gave him the opportunity to meet like-minded colleagues who shared his sense of mission. He hoped that they together could form networks of dedicated, hard-working officers.

Although practices of police and border guard work differ across the world, I was told that the basic work task of guarding borders generally united border guards everywhere; all identified a shared mission that made collaboration possible, mainly to fight cross-border crime and protect the public from criminal activity. It has been argued that the action-oriented sense of mission of police officers may conflict with some of the more service-oriented aspects of modern policing (Bradford et al. 2013; Loftus 2010; Reiner 2010). Even though their everyday work consisted of administrative tasks, the main motivation for joining law enforcement organizations was to do something good for their country, and thereby also for the EU. Interviewed officers did not reject the "service" part of policing and admitted to wanting to help people and society. Although some interviewees admitted that their idealised images of law enforcement had changed over the years, most claimed that their sense of "doing the right thing" had not decreased.

The officers participating in Project Turnstone hoped that their common work endeavour could overshadow socio-economic or cultural differences imagined to exist between the participants. A shared commitment was thus just as important for them as shared experience over time. The officers were hopeful that differences in terms of organizational structures and cultural backgrounds would only have minor effects on collaboration practices, as interpersonal collaboration was mainly driven by individuals hoping that they would learn to trust one another during the course of the project.

Concluding Remarks

Defining Goals: Good Results or Good Collaboration?

Officers participating in Project Turnstone, despite their ranks or positions, all had in common the idea of and celebrated "real police work" (Manning 2007, 70; Åkerström, Yakhlef and Wästerfors 2018), fearing that the project would become just another formal organization implementing more bureaucratic practices (such as writing reports and requesting additional meetings), which would hinder the officers from performing

"real work". However, the officers did not agree on the definition of "real" border police work. According to some, accomplishing a large number of arrests that could easily be compiled in a report was real work, whereas others maintained that community building was the most important goal of the project. In their view, building personal relationships would benefit their work in the long term, as they would know who to contact in future investigations.

The accounts presented at the Management Board Meeting, as well as the statements made by interviewed officers show two main goals, or rather, two main approaches regarding the purpose of the project: one pro-active approach of focusing on increasing the officers' bilateral cooperation, and one re-active approach encouraging the streamlining of work methods, coordination of information channels, increasing the knowledge of the legal and structural abilities of the organizations, as well as achieving as many arrests as they could. Although many officers emphasised both goals, and their interrelated nature, some did not anticipate that the pro-active goal would be easily achieved.

During the Management Board Meeting, several of the higher-ranking officers advised against a development that would steer away from the "hands-on perspective". As stated by one of the initiators of the project, in order to catch the highly mobile, well-organized "cross border criminals", the border police officers had to be just as organized, mobile, and efficient as the criminals. The officers' accounts conveyed a shared "discourse reflecting a certain perspective on the world" and had similar descriptions of who belonged to their specific group (Cambell 2007, 136). According to Wenger (1998, 125-126) these are two indicators of a community of practice, or at least of a willingness to work together, eventually building a community. The most important thing, according to the participating officers was to focus on establishing good work relationships. They emphasised the importance of learning from one another other, sharing information, and exploring crime patterns that they could not identify single-handedly. This could only be achieved, according the officers, if they found like-minded colleagues in the participating organizations. Tangible results would be a forthcoming effect of these work relationships, as officers, in the future, would more easily be willing to share information and help each other out.

A Joint Enterprise: Commitment and Passion

Individuals working in the same organizations or with similar work positions do not necessarily share the same experiences, expertise or passion for a joint enterprise (Wenger and Snyder 2000). The intelligence officers (stemming from different countries and organizations) claimed to have more in common (as officers focusing on the Baltic Sea area) than they had with other police or border officers in other parts of their home countries. Several law enforcement agencies in the Baltic Sea area had developed collaboration on an operative level out of necessity, as many officers deemed it necessary to have a closer connection with colleagues across the Baltic Sea than they

have with police districts in other parts of their home countries. Similar to the findings of Brown and Duguid (2001, 206), the officers talked about establishing networks that cut across heterogeneous organizations as their specific work tasks were not recognized by their colleagues in their home organizations. A few officers told me that they had previously tried to identify like-minded co-workers across the Baltic Sea whom they contacted through email and telephone. Although sending emails and calling one another created a work relationship, it could never replace face-to-face interaction. Nevertheless, conversations also entailed that previous collaboration had been obstructed by a lack of trust, and hindered by different work practices and different focus areas.

Even though the officers participating in Project Turnstone did not fully agree on the definitions of success and the goals of the project, they all valued their work as border officers. Interviewed officers accounted for their sense of mission and dedication to "fight crime" and do something good for society. Similar accounts are well documented by previous research of police officers and occupational cultures (Gundhus 2005; Loftus 2010; Reiner 2010).

Previous accounts of the cultural habits of police officers often highlight aversion to change, new technological equipment, and new methods of working (Van Maanen 1973; 1978; Reiner 2010). "Police culture", perceived as a set of values plagued by conservatism and pragmatism, is often regarded as the key barrier to implementing change in police organizations (Loftus 2010; Reiner 2010). For the intelligence officers in this study, this was not the case. Even though the officers celebrated "real hands-on police work" and complained about new managerial implementations, they did not have an aversion towards developments of intelligence-based policing. Participating officers embraced change in the sense that they were willing to learn new methods of working and to expand their collaboration networks in order to identify the "best practice" of border policing. The new European context had created new demands that could not be met without close networks of practitioners and the officers agreed that previous methods were no longer efficient. Meeting international colleagues in person, sharing knowledge, new techniques, and information were, according to some, the only way to create new intelligence networks of police communities.

The officers' eagerness to achieve "better collaboration" corresponds well with finding innovative methods, implementing new technological equipment, and expanding their network of contacts. The border police officers claimed that they had a "realistic" view of changes in the European society and saw great value in adapting to those changes.

Officers interviewed during the Power Weeks hoped that the project would eventually allow them to achieve a strong sense of camaraderie with their international partners as well as their everyday colleagues. The officers had taken the first step towards achieving close collaboration and community building by identifying common endeavours and challenges. However, for a group to experience a sense of community, active

involvement and participation in social processes, in other words doing things together, is vital (Wenger 1998, 47). Interviewed officers identified, and negotiated, a shared commitment and common goals, but had previously lacked the opportunity to work and learn together on a daily basis. The next chapter takes a closer look at the "hands-on work" conducted during the Power Weeks, where differences, challenges, and expectations were discussed and common work practices started to take shape.

7. Modes of Collaboration: Working Together

Community membership implies a commitment to the domain of the community and to the shared competence that distinguishes the members from other communities. One important aspect is that the members value their collective competence even though it might not be recognized or understood by people outside of the group. Such a commitment motivates the members to interact regularly and learn how to better perform their work together (Wenger and Wenger-Trayner 2015, 2). Cultural-organizational exchange and various collaborations have previously been important for law enforcement agencies in the EU. However, officers participating in Project Turnstone had rarely, and some even never, worked together (in the same room) with hands-on tasks. A vital issue for achieving "successful" collaboration, according to the interviewed officers, was to meet one another and perform hands-on work together.

In the first part of this chapter I describe the main context in which the officers "worked together", namely the Power Weeks. During the Power Weeks, the officers performed everyday intelligence work similar to their daily work at their home organizations but now in the same room during a collective session. I describe various situations when the officers negotiated practices, discussed technical problems, coordinated their work methods, and resolved minor conflicts. Finding a common langue and ways of expression was an important part for the work to run smoothly. Various misunderstandings requiring clarification and agreeing on specific words and styles of reporting were vital components for establishing a sense of common ground.

The second part of this chapter focuses on the formal meetings organized during Project Turnstone. Although the officers did not regard such formal events as important for collaboration, I argue, based on the empirical material, that such meeting interactions were of importance in establishing common objectives, and eventually, a work community. Formal meetings provided opportunities to jointly discuss, negotiate, and establish the goals, structure, and activities of the project. Various symbolic artifacts (such as linguistic labels of their different activities) and material artifacts (documented reports, lists, PowerPoint presentations, and pictures) were also important for establishing an internally shared language among the participants. These helped them to coordinate their activities and strengthen the social bonds among them.

Although the officers saw administrative practices (such as documentation and project related formal meetings) as sources of frustration that hindered "real" police work, observations suggest that the use, creation, and negotiation of such practices can link people together when they collaborate on a common task (Lee 2007; Schwartzman 1987; Wenger 1998, 103-108). Documents, rules, meetings, and statistics were important for the "formalisation" processes of Project Turnstone, serving as proof of the project's existence and the officers' work progress. Such processes were observed during the Power Weeks as well as during the formal meetings.

The Power Weeks

Working Cases, Finding "Hits"

Members of a community of practice are not merely a group of people sharing a common interest or goal. They are practitioners who, by working or performing a shared practice together, develop a repertoire of tools, recourses, experiences, and ways of addressing recurring problems (Wenger and Wenger-Trayner 2015, 2). For the officers participating in Project Turnstone, the Power Weeks were settings where participants could share lessons of criminal intelligence and jointly define their goals and purpose of their activities.

A few weeks after Project Turnstone had been initiated I travelled to the next city where a Power Week was about to start. The plane had been delayed because of bad weather, and I did not arrive at the location of the Power Week as early as I had planned. It took me a while to locate the right building where the taxi had dropped me off, and I had to call my contact person for guidance. A few minutes later I saw a grey door open in one of the adjacent buildings, and a woman in her late forties in civilian clothes waved. The woman let me in and told me that her name was Ania. I had never met her before and she said that she was one of the participants in this Power Week. She worked as an intelligence officer in Lithuania and was very excited about the project. When we walked upstairs to the office I asked Ania if something "exciting" had happened yet. She smiled and said that they had just started, but that they had a few leads.

The "Power Week office" was a conference room with one large table and several small desks scattered around the room. There was plenty of space for the officers to walk around and talk to their colleagues. The first arriving officers had gathered around the large table and the latecomers took a seat at the smaller desks. Ania pointed me to a table in the right corner where I and unpacked my things (a bottle of water, snacks, my laptop, and a notepad and pencil). I looked around the room and recognised a few faces who smiled and nodded in my direction. I also recognized Filip who said hello and

introduced me to the other officers whom I had never met. They looked at me briefly, before turning their attention back to Filip.

One of the host officers asked Filip if he wanted to introduce the week by having a quick "start-up meeting". An officer who had been standing took a seat behind one of the new Finnish participants named Jüri. Jüri's laptops was on and he turned around and said "are you spying?" to the officer. The officer laughed and Jüri smiled. Filip seemed not to notice and greeted everyone. He began by making a joke about everyone's tired appearance, suggesting that they had been up all-night partying without him. "I am too old for such things", Filip said, looking specifically at an older colleague rolling his eyes. All the officers laughed and one of the participants shouted that he had been forced to drink all night to drown his sorrows in order to "survive" this Power Week. Filip smiled, cleared his throat and said "let's begin".

Filip informed everyone that a few "expensive" cars had been stolen in Stockholm the previous evening and had later been spotted somewhere in the harbour area. A surveillance team was organized to search for the cars and the suspects. He also mentioned a few other cases that he described as having high priority and asked if anyone in the room had any information about them. The officers took notes as they were checking their information systems and phoning colleagues in harbour areas. Since no one had any questions to ask the meeting was quickly over. The officers turned their attention towards their laptops or phones. The officers suddenly looked frustrated that the internet connection was bad; they often lost the connection and had to restart their laptops several times. A service guy was called in and managed to fix the problem temporarily.

The officers worked for a couple of hours by researching cases and recent thefts that took place in the area and in other cities. A female officer listed every case and related important information in an excel document. I was also told, by another officer, that she listed suspects of border related crimes that had recently been committed and the outcome of surveillance. The officers referred to every piece of information, such as for example, a link between two suspects from two separate cases, as a "hit". A "hit" was further described to me as an apprehended suspect, a person who might become the objects of surveillance or some other important piece of information regarding criminal activity. For example, officers in Lithuanian might apprehend suspects in the harbour area. If the suspects had Estonian passports or identification, the Lithuanian officers would call their colleagues in Estonia and ask if there was any information about the suspects in the Estonian registers. If the Estonian officers found information saying that the suspects were wanted regarding a previous crime, that finding would be described as a "hit".

Another example of a "hit" might be a stolen car that was located in a harbour area by border officers. If such a "hit" was located, the officer with the most appropriate contacts (for instance contacts in the country where the suspect was located) would call

and ask the surveillance teams if they had the staff or recourses to pursue the car or the suspect[43]. I heard Ania talk to Filip about a few suspects who had been spotted in the harbour area, probably on their way to Sweden to pick up "women or drugs", and that they should send requests for surveillance.

I went to bathroom, and when I came back, the officers cheered and laughed. Apparently, Jüri had been able to link pieces of information because of his unrestricted access to several search engines. One officer tapped Jüri gently on his shoulder calling him the "key man", the man who "unlocks" information. Another officer disagreed, saying: "no, Jüri is the hit-man", referring to Jüri's ability to find information, or "hits". He then shaped his hand in the form of a gun, jokingly "firing it" in front of him. This gesture suggested that he jokingly referenced a hit-man meaning a "hired killer". The other officers in the room quickly joined the joke and some walked up to Jüri, standing behind his laptop asking him to show them how he worked. A while later, I heard two officers talk about a member of staff at the police academy who had been kidnapped by her husband in a Saab. All officers working in the city were searching for that car, one of them said. To my surprise, no one else in the group commented on this issue.

Lunch was planned at three o'clock at a restaurant nearby. As we left for the restaurant, one of officers had another problem with his laptop and stayed behind. When asked if he would be ok without a lunch break, he claimed that it was more important to fix the laptop, as he could not do anything useful without it. During lunch, I sat next to Ania and a few other officers whom I had met before. One of the officers was frustrated that the host chiefs had not yet been present, and that there were several technical problems that had not been solved. He also said that some of the local officers frequently tried to organize "cultural trips" around the city, instead of working. Ania looked at me and said: "everyone here means well, it must be a cultural difference".

After lunch, the chief of the department waited for us in the Power Week room. He greeted everyone and complimented them for their hard work. He said that he was very happy to see that everyone worked so hard and looked so dedicated. He announced that they all deserved a short break, and that he wanted to give all the participants a guided tour of the building. Most of the officers (and me) readily followed him. The chief showed us around the main highlights of building, such as the command centre, detention centre, interrogation rooms, and the exercise yard on the roof (allocated to suspects held in custody). He walked in to one of the exercise areas and saying that it was important that their "customers could get some air, adding "it's EU regulation!". I asked the chief if he always referred to the people held in custody as "customers", and

[43] Other officers (not taking part in the Power Weeks) might also find or apprehend suspects without having contact with the Power Week team. For instance, a couple of times, street patrol or traffic offence officers apprehended suspects who acted suspiciously or had committed a minor traffic offence. Sometimes, those suspects were found to be in possession of stolen goods connected to cases worked on by the Power Week group. The officers participating in the Power Weeks were thereby informed about these events.

he answered: “sometimes, and at other times we just call them bad guys or crooks [laughing]”.

After finishing the tour, the chief led us back to the Power Week office room. One of the officers immediately announced that there was exciting news; a surveillance team in Stockholm had followed a car from Lithuania with passengers suspected of scouting various leisure boat harbours in order to plan break-ins. The driver of the car was wanted for thefts and smuggling. Filip, who had participated in the tour, rushed to his laptop. He seemed very agitated and complained that it took too much time to log in. A coast guard officer had been on the phone with a few colleagues and announced that they could use an airplane in order to conduct surveillance. Filip seemed surprised and asked how often they used that plane. “The plane is in use eight hours a day”, the coast guard officers said. Another officer was fascinated that they had access to a plane, and Filip said “get the plane up in the air!”. The coast guard officer called someone on his cell-phone and left the room. We could hear him talking in the corridor about the plane.

For a while, we heard nothing more about the ongoing surveillance. The officers talked with one another in various languages. Occasionally, they asked questions, answered telephone calls or shared information regarding recently committed crimes. Most crimes mentioned by the officers during that afternoon were drug related, concerned property thefts or illegal immigration. Occasionally during the day, the officers took short coffee breaks or stood by the large windows admiring the city view.

The work continued for a few hours, often in silence. Marcus, from Sweden suddenly said that a cargo boat from Russia had arrived in a harbour with a dead sailor on board. No one seemed to notice his comment and two other officers continued their conversation in Latvian. One of the coast guard officers suddenly received a telephone call about the on-going surveillance. He seemed very disappointed when he announced to everyone that the weather was too bad for conducting surveillance with the airplane. “Seeing pictures on a live-stream video of the airplane surveillance would have been a better show”, he said, looking frustrated. Jüri announced that his colleagues in Helsinki had arrested three people based on information from the Turnstone office. Marcus responded: “great, now you are in the lead with three zero”. I asked the officers sitting close to me if this was a competition, instead of a collaboration? Everyone who heard my question laughed.

In the evening, the officers started yawning and took several short coffee breaks. Because some officers had taken early morning flights to make it to the Power Week, they had woken early in the morning and their eyes were now blood shot, looking tired. Although complaining of being tired, the officers often joked and laughed, and seemed to experience the work atmosphere as relaxed and informal. One officer played a game on his cell phone, and another one showed two of his colleagues three short satirical clips on YouTube that made fun of border controls and border crossings. In one of the

clips, a woman faked a pregnancy and birth labours in order to cross the border. The officers laughed a little at the films. However, they soon recovered their serious attitude whenever there were some technical problems or an important request or message about criminal activity. Soon, one of the host officers said that it was time to call it a day, and we all headed back to the hotel to have dinner.

The next morning when I arrived at the office a few officers had already started working. They all seemed excited telling me that they had managed to link several suspects to the same case by comparing information from their separate information systems. One of them exclaimed "now it's starting to be fun!". During the next few days, the officers worked with sending and receiving information regarding various cases, for instance regarding stolen cars, stolen bicycles, tools that had been stolen from work sites, and several apartment break-ins perceived to be cross-border related. Similar to subsequent Power Weeks, a number of surveillance and a few arrests were made. In contrast to the very first day, the officers talked more with one another and seemed more comfortable with sharing information.

During a coffee break I had a conversation with Dima about his thoughts regarding the Power Weeks. Dima asked me if I remember that he had told me about a case of smuggled Diesel that he had worked with last year. Thanks to the Power Week, he said, he now knew who the smugglers were and the name of their company. Dima seemed very excited about this, saying that he was eager to continue working with the Power Week team, continue to investigate this case, and hopefully, catch the suspect.

Hands-on work?

During the Power Weeks, the officers often looked intent on taking every opportunity to learn from one another's' experiences of cross border crimes in the Baltic Sea area. Most of their collaborative work carried out during the Power Weeks consisted of discussions and questions about committed crimes and suspected cross-border criminals. The officers focused on crimes that had been committed recently or during the Power Week.

One such case concerned several expensive cars that were stolen one early morning in Stockholm. The Swedish officers received information about the case in the morning and immediately informed the other participants regarding the night's events. When hearing about this case the officers started to assemble all the information that they had and then compared their knowledge of active car thieves who operated in the area. They received information about the theft from colleagues over the phone or via emails. They neatly documented all the information that they had about the thefts in lists or graphs (such as what kind of cars were stolen, possible origin of the cars, the time it had taken for the thieves to steal the cars, as well as any information they might have about previous convicted or suspected car thieves. I learned that it was difficult to steal new cars and that car thefts became more and more sophisticated. The officers agreed

amongst one another that such criminals were highly organized and very skilful, as a successful car theft required a "small army" of technicians.

For a few hours the Power Week office brimmed with activity. As the cars had been stolen less than a kilometre from the harbour area, the officers thought it likely that the suspects would try to ship the cars on one of the departing morning ferries. By the time they had reached their colleagues in the harbour the ferries had already left. The destinations of the ferries were Helsinki, Tallinn, and Riga. The officers from Finland, Estonia and Latvia all contacted their respective colleagues informing them to keep a look out for the cars. As the ferries arrived the next day, border officers were prepared in all harbours to search for the cars. To the great disappointment of the Power Week officers, none of the cars were found. They started to discuss alternative routes, thinking that the thieves had become more careful and chosen to drive the cars from Sweden to Finland, and continuing south. The officers suspected that the thieves originated from Lithuania or Belarus (but I did not fully understand how they came to this conclusion). The cars were not found that week and the officers did not talk about this case before the next Power Week, about a month later. Apparently, two police officers in Estonia had arrested a person for excess of speed and drunk driving. The Power Week officers had sent information regarding the stolen cars which the traffic offence officers had recognised. The suspect was driving one of the stolen cars with a fake registration number plate. This arrest eventually led to information regarding the other car thieves as well.

When this news reached the Power Week office, the officers cheered and congratulated each other. One of the officers declared that this case would hardly have been noticed if the Power Week officer had not been able to send information quickly to all countries in the Baltic Sea area. This is one example of a case that the officers regarded as being successfully solved. According to the officers, they owed their success to the quick work pace of the officers as they were gathered in the same room without the need to call or email anyone trying to find "the right person" to contact. They just had to ask the person sitting next to them. There were several other incidents when the officers focused on various cases of the smuggling of narcotics, cigarettes or stolen goods where no substantial findings were made. Similar procedures to the above-mentioned case were then carried out.

According to Dima, and most other project participants, the Power Weeks were, in many ways successful; the officers worked together side by side sharing knowledge and experiences. Relationships were created, hands-on border work was carried out and work contacts were established for future collaboration. "For example," Dima said, "I was happy to solve a curious case that I have been working on for months". Dima and his colleagues had on several occasions spotted a group of men leaving the harbour in a small motorboat with what appeared to be fishing equipment. The men would always come back a few hours later without any fish. The boat and the men had been searched

several times when they returned but no evidence could be found suggesting that the men were up to "something fishy", as Dima said while laughing at the pun. During the Power Weeks he had found out that a few other participants had a similar experience of a "suspicious motorboat" going back and forth to the harbour. Together (and with the help of their coast guard colleagues) they realised that the men traded goods at sea by leaving payment and stock in waterproof containers attached to fishing nets. This curious case might not have been solved, according to Dima, if he had not participated in the Power Weeks.

Providing information

During the Power Weeks, border police and coast guard officers working in the harbour areas were supposedly informed about the Power Weeks and were urged to view the Power Week officers as a specific source of information. One important function of the Power Week team was thus to serve as a "hub" of information for other officers working in "the field" (harbour areas, border zones or airports). The Power Week officers were often contacted by guards requesting them to check the identity documents of suspicious persons. There were several cases when the Power Week officers could find the true identity of an individual (if the identification document was fake) or find out if the person was suspected of having committed a crime. Again, the reason for this was that all the officers worked together, and it was easy to ask someone to check the information regarding a specific person's identity in national databases. As the officers had access to different national information systems, working from the same office made it considerably more efficient than when working from different countries.

During one of the Power Weeks, I was seated next to Henrik who worked as a border intelligence officer. I was engaged in writing notes on my laptop when Henrik suddenly asked me if I understood the process of intelligence information. When I answered him hesitantly, he showed me a diagram me on his laptop with empty "bubbles" connected by various threads[44]. He told me that he was just about to start working on a "mind map" regarding information that he had received about a well-known organized crime group. "This is what it looks like in the beginning", he said, "and then, with some help from others I can start adding more information". As all the participating officers had access to different databases, creating such "information maps" together saved both time and effort. In Henrik's view, the most important part of the hands-on work conducted during the Power Weeks was to share knowledge, establish routines, and refine work methods. His anticipation was that they would be able to develop a "best practice", that is, the most efficient work methods that would benefit all involved organizations. Henrik further described the benefits of knowledge sharing and of valuing each individual's competencies:

[44] There were no names of suspects in the diagram that I was shown.

> "It is valuable to learn different [work] techniques", Henrik says, "and to see how other people work, we all have similar work systems and work in similar ways, but everyone has different information [and] data bases to search from. Now we can see new and smarter ways to search and see how and which systems you can use to find information in the quickest way possible".
>
> Field notes

In Henrik's opinion, structural or technical problems could not be solved during a few weeks' time, but participants would at least become aware of the issues that they had to deal with.

I was also told by Henrik that their colleagues in their home organizations were well aware and prepared to conduct surveillance during each Power Week. The general idea was that the organizations would call in extra staff to be able to meet the request by the Power Week officers to perform checks or do surveillance. For example, when a Power Week was organized in Klaipeda, Lithuania, officers working in Helsinki, Riga, Tallinn and Stockholm were also supposed to be prepared to work with the Power Week team from a distance. However, observations at the host organizations and the other organizations told us that this was not always the case.

When arriving at the Power Week office one day I was informed that surveillance teams were currently working with searching for or following suspects. The officers talked on their phones almost constantly, shouted questions at each other, and seemed very focused. I asked a few of the participants if there were enough officers to help them with their requests. They assured me that there was enough staff present to meet all their needs. During the week, there was little activity connected to the Power Week and few surveillance teams ready to work. This occurred quite early in the course of the project and I was later told that such dissonance was due to misunderstandings and a lack of established routines.

Generating Routines

Although the interviewed officers were happy that several cases were solved during the Power Weeks, it was not always easy for the officers to work together during the first initiating weeks of the project. In order to get to the point where collaboration was running relativity smoothly, the participants had to work out their differences and agree on common methods of working. A substantial amount of time during the Power Weeks was spent on negotiating and agreeing on *how* to work together before they could actually implement any real border related work. As a visitor during the Power Weeks my first impression was that the officers were quite excited to participate but unsure of how to actually work together. Without the supervision of department chiefs

and management, the officers lacked specific instructions for the Power Weeks and had no specific "leader" supervising their work[45].

Drawing on Strauss (1988), Lee (2007, 334) asserts that projects can be mapped according to two axes or a continuum: 1) from simple to complex and 2) from routine to non-routine. Non-routine projects would, for example, have unclear goals, an unclear division of labour, and inexperienced workers. Complex collaboration work would entail variable worker commitments, more than one explicit project goal, and a complex organizational context. In contrast, a routine project has clear project paths, established division of labour, experienced workers, and stable resources for managing emergencies. A simple project would thus have few workers, a simple division of labour, unambiguous project goals, simple organizational context, and similar levels of commitment from the project participants. If placing Project Turnstone into one of the above-mentioned categories, it would naturally not fit neatly into any single category. However, although the project participants involved experienced border police and coast guard officers, they had little to no experience of hands-on international collaboration. Furthermore, the officers worked in a quite complex organizational context, did not fully agree on the goals of the project, and had unstable routines as well as an unclear division of labour. The question that needs to be asked is thus "how a group of people who lack standardized structures begin to collaborate" (Lee, 2007, 309).

Lee's (2007) ethnographic case study of museum exhibition designers is an example of how collaboration participants used material artifacts (such as notes, tables, concepts, and sketches) and surrounding practices to coordinate their different perspectives. She describes how various negotiation processes eventually brought the participants into alignment, often temporarily, to solve specific design problems. In a similar manner, the officers participating in Project Turnstone had to go through a long process of establishing routines, making decisions of how to work together, and clarifying their work goals.

One of the first joint decisions made by the Power Weeks group was to change the name of the activity from Operative Action Meeting to Power Week. When getting together and talking about their first work week, the officers agreed that the original name Operative Action Meeting was too long and complicated. After discussing several suggestions, the officers agreed to re-name the activity Power Weeks. The name was then used during the rest of the project. Some even said that the name "unified them" as it was jointly created and agreed upon. The officers said that the name corresponded well with what they aimed to achieve, namely to work together for a whole week and

[45] During each Power Week, one officer from the host organization took on the role as an informal "organizer" of the work week. He (there were only male organizers) had no official leadership role as the idea was that the officers should jointly agree on how to perform their work and which cases they would focus on. The host officers often functioned as guides; they organized lunches, dinners or short excursions and called for technical support when it was needed.

to use all their recourses, their different "power sources" (information systems and contacts), their previous experiences, and knowledge to generate new methods of working and learn from one another. The name was also short, catchy and easy to remember. From then on, the group was described as "Power Week team" by other officers. As the EU flag was often present in the Power Week offices on stickers or as small models placed on various tables around the rooms, one officer joked about designing a Power Week flag which they could take with them as they travelled to different locations. Although no flag was created, there was always a sign with the words "Power Week" put on the doors where the officers worked during each remaining Power Week.

In comparison, with Lee's (2007) study, agreeing on certain symbolic artifacts (such as the name of the operative work weeks) brought the officers into alignment, if only temporarily and separated them from the project's initiators. It was thus an important step for the Power Week officers to start to identify themselves as a work group and a community. Although agreeing on a common name for the group was fairly easy, formalising methods of working was a more complex process. In a conversation with Marcus the topic of misunderstandings was brought up. Marcus was one of the border officers who frequently attended the Power Weeks, and we had previously talked about the importance of communication and of speaking the same language. Marcus thought that the Power Weeks were good forums for learning how his colleagues worked and for defining common ways of communicating. Two vital issues were how the officers listed suspects and how they described certain crimes in reports. According to Marcus, an important part of the Power Weeks was thus to take the time to discuss and agree on which concepts and words to use when documenting the findings and proceedings. Marcus added that this was a really important step in increasing collaboration, even though this process sometimes led to misunderstandings and irritation.

The discussion that I had with Marcus reminded me of a situation that I had observed during the second Power Week. It was after lunch time and Filip, who attended every scheduled Power Week, was very frustrated. He stood up from his seat, waved with some papers and called for everyone's attention. I was sitting at the back of the room and could not see what kind of papers he was holding up. Apparently, he had just realised that everyone typed the personal identification numbers and names of suspects differently: sometimes the family name was written first and sometimes after the given name. Additionally, the date of birth was sometimes listed before the birth month, and sometimes the other way around. He had realised this too late and had apparently spend several hours typing names wrongly in the information systems. Filip said that it made him very frustrated to have wasted time on something that he had to re-do all over again. Everyone in the room was silent watching Filip or their computer screens. After a few seconds, one other officer raised his hand and agreed that they had to decide on a standardised form, otherwise it would be difficult or impossible to find the right

information. No one opposed to his suggestion and the rest of the afternoon was spent comparing their notes, lists, the order of names, and specific words used in reporting.

In an interview a few weeks later, Juha from Finland similarly described the importance of agreeing on a standardized system for writing reports about the events that had taken place during the Power Weeks.

> "It is important to decide in advance how things should be reported since this information is saved in our systems, which headlines to use so that you can find everything later, this must be clear, everyone might otherwise report differently and if you want to make conclusions out of it you must have a system telling you how it should look, keywords that should be used and so on. Otherwise it [the information] will end up among thousands of other entries in the system and it will be very hard to find anything".
>
> Recorded interview

The operative teams of each organization (working with surveillance and apprehension of suspects) already had regulations and structures, he said, which guided the officers in how to best perform and document their work. Project Turnstone, on the other hand, had no, or few, guidelines which caused confusion and created a need for formalising such rules. The project initiators later informed me that the officers responsible for writing reports about the Power Weeks had asked for clear instructions and templates for reporting. One of the initiators claimed that he had already informed the participants of what should be included in the reports (such as for instance, the number of participants, a contact list for those participants, summaries of the events that had taken place, as well as lists or performed surveillance, arrests or other important findings)[46].

In spite of these instructions, the officers were sometimes confused about how to report certain events. I heard several discussions concerning the labelling of offences or crimes being committed close to harbour areas or border zones. For example, if an EU citizen was arrested with a large quantity of narcotics just outside a border zone, should this offence be regarded as a cross border crime or was it simply a case of possession of illegal substances? Eventually, the officers seemed to agree that the most important thing was to arrest people who committed criminal offences, despite how the crime would be categorised. As one of the officers said:

[46] I did not see or receive this template but was allowed to read a few of the reports written after each Power Week. The reports basically included the same information, but their style and structure varied. It is important to note that the reports did not include personal information regarding suspects and the cases described were anonymised

> "The most important thing is that we provide information about criminals, where they are coming from, and what crimes they are committing. We don't decide their punishment, we can just provide as much information as possible about what they have done, how the crime has been committed. And even if we don't get results, we will show the problem".
>
> Field notes

Solving technical problems

During the Power Weeks, developing standardised routines was sometimes difficult because of technical problems. During the Power Week described above, I asked one of the group chiefs how everything was going, as I had heard some officers complaining about some "troubles". The group chief said that everything now worked fine, but there had been some technical problems earlier. It had taken some time for the officers to get settled into the office space: unpacking their gear, finding enough power outlets and getting the internet connection to work properly. They had started out using the Wi-Fi connection, but that did not last long. As more and more officers logged in, the Wi-Fi malfunctioned, and they had to look for internet cables. During this process, the officers looked pretty upset, stroking sweat from their foreheads and sighing loudly. One officer told me that the office space was not really suitable for so many people, and he could not believe that there was no air conditioner or at least a few fans in the office.

Later on, someone announced that the internet was up and running again and they all hurried back to their laptops. About an hour later, the officers sitting next to me started to mutter to himself. Apparently, there were some major problems again with the internet connection. "It's one of the start-up traumas to get internet to work", the officers said smilingly.

Problems with the internet connection continued and a "service guy" was called in. He crawled around on the floor, removed cables, and plugged in new cables. A while later he said that the problem should be solved. The officers re-started their laptops and looked happy. The man sitting quite close to me clapped his hands several times, saying "now we can work!". Another officer said: "the work tempo and job satisfaction sway with the internet".

Niklas, one of the project initiators, visited the Power Week the next day. We talked in the corridor and Niklas said that he had heard that there had been major technical problems. He looked a little concerned, saying that all the participating organizations had different working conditions and different opinions regarding the amount of space or recourses needed for this kind of operation such as the Power Weeks. According to Niklas "it is always better if people just put the cards on the table and told us that they needed help. I am sure that we would have been able to manage that!". Niklas then continued saying that the officers were relying on the internet in order to access their

information systems and to send emails. As we were talking, the door opened and the officers stepped out in the corridor. Filip was the first one out, telling us that it was time for lunch and that transportation to a restaurant had been arranged.

Problems with the internet connection continued during the rest of the week, but the officers claimed that they had been able to get some work done anyway. The officers were greatly annoyed when the office setting did not suit their needs. When providing a work space that was not suitable for intelligence work (that is, a kind of work that relies on Wi-Fi or internet connection), it was implied that the host officers did not take the Power Weeks seriously enough. Even though such frustration might hinder collaboration and slowed down the process of community building, the officers' annoyed responses to such obstacles was seen as a sign of the officers' commitment.

One officer commented on the complaints, saying that one important part of this project was to learn about the other organizations, their possibilities as well as their limitations. This would make it easier for the officers in their assessment of what they could ask from their colleagues in future collaborations. The officers generally seemed eager to learn as much as possible about the participating organizations, their organizational structures, as well as their mandates and the nearby work areas. For instance, when the Power Week was held in Klaipeda, Riga or Helsinki, officers travelled from the Power Week office to the harbours to see the layout of the area and the vessels used by the border guard board or unit. Similarly, when visiting other locations, a tour of the nearby harbour was usually included. When the Power Weeks were organized in harbour areas or in the vicinity of their work "boats" (referred to as sea vessels by the officers), participating officers often spent their coffee breaks admiring their colleagues' vessels from the windows or going outside to take photos.

Language and Communication

The community of practice framework encompasses two intertwined processes: 1) the creation of symbolic and material artifacts that formalise the content of participants' actions into more durable forms, and 2) various negotiation processes regarding the language, behaviour, norms and values of the group. The practice-based experiences of a community are perceived as more meaningful when the group develops its own ways of talking and acting (Eckert 2006; Lipsky 1980; Wenger 1998, pp. 73, 93). This process includes both spoken language as well as language less social praxis (Claycomb and Mulberry 2007, 184).

A few months after the previously mentioned Power Week, I met Marcus to ask him about the Power Week, and especially about the communication between the officers. Marcus was very positive regarding the outcome of the previous Power Weeks and asserted that most of the participating officers had now agreed on a common style of reporting. "When all the administrative matters had been dealt with, he said, "there

were no problems with understanding one another and agreeing on which words to use". At this particular Power Week, I had no specific room where I could conduct interviews and Marcus and I had taken a seat at an empty lounge area in the building. Marcus said that he was starving and opened a small bag of nuts that he had brought with him to "try to be a little healthy". It was evening and it seemed that the Power Week participants were the only ones left on that floor in the border police building. From a distance, I could hear the voices and laughter from the Power Week office further back in the long corridor. Earlier that day, I had heard Marcus complain to another colleague about the difficulties of collaborating with partners who spoke little or no English. By the end of our interview, I asked Marcus to further elaborate on the issue of language obstacles.

Marcus began by clarifying that English was the second language of all participating officers, and that none of them were "experts". However, as EU border officers working within international collaboration, English was supposed to be their "work language", and they were required to have at least a basic knowledge of English. Marcus told me that he and his colleagues were trained in "EU English"; they had been taught certain concepts and words (listed and provided by the EU) that should be used in international communication. Misunderstanding one another was still common, however, as some officers ignored or simply did not use the same official terminology despite the efforts of the EU instructions.

To my surprise, Marcus also told me that officers from the same country (but who worked in different law enforcement organizations) occasionally had trouble understanding one another since specific expressions used in their daily work could differ between stations and units[47]. In his view, there was a great difference between working with partners in the Baltic Sea area, in comparison with officers from southern parts of Europe or Eastern Europe, such as Georgia, Belarus or Russia. Some officers from Latvia or Lithuania, he said, had no problem with communicating with officers from Eastern Europe or Russia, since they were fluent in Russian. The communication problems were mainly due to poor English or Russian skills, but also because of a general lack of knowledge of the issues and situation in the Baltic Sea area. Communication between participating officers (and the partners and contacts of those officers) had increased after the Power Weeks as the officers had established contact and knew about one another's abilities, according to Marcus.

In contrast to Marcus previous experience of misunderstandings between different law enforcement organizations in his home country, the Power Weeks had reminded him that intelligence officers working with cross-border criminality could often understand one another despite poor language skills. As Marcus saw it, the work tasks of intelligence officers were generally very similar despite organizational or cultural differences. He

[47] I cannot account exactly for which concepts were specific for the border guard or border police units, as I have no observations from other law enforcement organizations to compare with.

smiled and said "people are often good at solving these problems when you meet them face to face, because you can use sign language or your cell phone for translating, and it all works out somehow".

After attending several Power Weeks, I had the impression that most of the participating officers could, in most cases, communicate fluently with one another in English, despite Marcus' (and others') complaint regarding the poor English skills of several officers. A few interviewees admitted half-way into the project that their original fear of communicating in English had been exaggerated and that they were on more equal terms with one another when speaking English than anticipated. According to Marcus, the next step, after establishing rules and guidelines of how to work with intelligence information, was to establish common ground and "a deeper level" of understanding regarding their work practices and goals. This was not an easy undertaking, and Marcus hoped that this would be accomplished during the Power Weeks.

Formal Meetings

In addition to working together during the Power Weeks, participating officers frequently attended formal meetings organized by the project initiators. There are various definitions of what comprises a formal meeting. Allen, Lehmann-Willenbrock and Rogelberg (2015, 4) focus on hands-on practical issues suggesting that meetings are pre-arranged face-to-face work events that take place in a room allocated for the meeting. Meetings are also regarded as social phenomena. Schwartzman (1987, 7), for instance, defines formal meetings as focused interactions and as communicative situations (with at least three participants (later revised to two participants) characterized by multiparty talk. The assumption is that the "talk" will focus on the ascribed aim of the meeting.

When asked about the role of meetings in Project Turnstone, the project initiators explained that they had tried to keep meetings to a minimum. The project initiators had previous experiences of projects and collaborations that had turned into cycles of endless meetings with "diplomacy" going on year after year when no real work was performed. The initiators' claims correspond well with common cultural assumptions of meetings as meaningless or dull (Kello 2015), consisting of empty talk that does not lead to anything substantial (Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris 1997). Although such criticism is widespread, formal meetings might not especially correspond with common assumptions of police occupational culture and officers' identity as "people of action".

However, the officers expressed ambivalent positions regarding meetings; some meetings were seen as productive meetings (for example operative meetings which focused on "real cases" and thus "real work") whereas other meetings were only seen as

“boring” and bureaucratic, not resulting in anything useful. When asked about the design of the project, most participating officers praised the initiators' attempt to provide space and time for the officers to perform “real work” together from day one. They had therefore tried to schedule as few meetings as possible regarding the project. Despite such claims, there were several formal meetings organized during Project Turnstone. The meeting events regarding the project ranged from formal meetings, network meetings, and conference meetings to more informal encounters. The meetings listed in the EU application (and seen as binding) were: Management Board Meetings, Intelligence group meetings, Operative Action Meeting (renamed into Power Weeks), and Final Conference. Additionally, a number of other meetings were implemented in the project, amongst others telephone meetings, section meetings, decision meetings, morning meetings, and quarterly meetings.

As a researcher, I was allowed to participate at several of these meetings except for the Intelligence group meetings, section meetings, and some decision meetings. The Management Board Meeting was the first meeting that introduced the start of the project. This meeting gathered many participants and was the most formal one where several structural and financial issues were discussed and negotiated. The project initiators (hosting the meeting) acknowledged that such meetings were sometimes necessary in order to make everyone understand what the project was all about. The two final meetings were the two conferences that concluded the project. These meetings also gathered many participants. The first conference meeting included workshops involving the participants, and the second was a large conference with invited researchers in the field of policing.

Despite the informal approach of the Power Weeks, a few officers were responsible for “organizing” the work each week. The host officers of each week would usually set of the first day of work by having a quick “start-up meeting” (sometimes referred to as “morning meeting”), welcoming everyone and keeping everyone up to date as to recent events or cases that they might focus on during the week. By each Power Week, these meetings became shorter and shorter. By the last week, the host officer stood up and said ”you all know what to do, so let’s get started!”. Still, several of these officers also emphasised the necessity of structure, pre-information, meetings, follow-ups, and receiving feedback as important for the collaboration.

On a few occasions when the officers worked on a particularly important case, one of the officers announced that that they should have “a meeting”. In these situations, the group became more focused; the participants usually looked up from their computer screens and the small-talk stopped. There was one speaker at a time with a joint focused attention. These meetings were brief and often concerned work that involved several countries. Sometimes the purpose of such short meetings was just to inform everyone about on-going events, for instance, that an airplane surveillance was conducted in Sweden. The participants' involvement in these meetings can be contrasted with their

reactions to other formal meetings. The quick "info" meetings or "start-up" meetings during the Power Weeks were not described the way formal meetings were, as "just talk", bureaucracy or diplomacy. Over time, the structure of the meetings became less formal and the social interaction that took place was almost no different from other conversations during the Power Weeks.

During the second year of the project, the project initiators and coordinators proudly announced that they had taken away one of the formal meetings to be able to finance yet another Power Week. "We don't need another bureaucracy meeting, the bosses may have to do a field trip to reality", one of them said, suggesting that management staff had an unrealistic view of how border police work was carried out in practice. The officers talked about their work as hands-on policing that helped catch the bad guys, and thus re-defined these week-long office meetings into "real police work". A coast guard officer who participated in most of the Power Weeks concluded in an interview that one of the best things about this project was that there were few formal meetings or unnecessary bureaucratic structures slowing down the work process. "The most important thing", he said, "is that the Power Weeks do not become just regular meetings". In contrast to other formal meetings arranged during the project, the Power Weeks were associated with "reality" rather than with boring bureaucracy.

Even though the work conducted during the Power Weeks can be described as mainly station office work consisting of several bureaucratic practices, such as documentation, administration and reporting, the Power Weeks were not regarded as meetings by the officers. Despite the various accounts of the ineffectiveness of formal meetings, the empirical observations suggest that even the formal meetings organized by the project initiators had some social implications beyond providing information. According to interviewed officers, mutual trust and respect and productive exchange of intelligence information could only be achieved by sharing everyday work and performed common actions on a daily basis. This included having meetings where certain structures or rules of how to work were negotiated and established. When asking Henrik, an officer I met at the Power Weeks, about the number of meetings planned during the project (if there were too many or too few) he responded:

> "I think we have just an adequate amount of meetings, […] and I think that it is important to meet in person, we can't just sign a paper and agree and sign some memorandum or something, that is not, that is not how you affect people, you need a proper foundation, that there is a legality, the bosses want this, it's a foundation but you don't change much with just that [signed agreements], you can affect people through relationships, meetings, and then you create structures".
>
> Recorded interview

Henrik did not separate formal meetings from Power Weeks or other project related activities, and generally emphasised the necessity of "meeting each other in person". To him, all situations where collaborating officers, in a project or on a more general basis, had time to talk about their work were useful for the community building of the officers.

I later talked to Filip, who disagreed with Henrik, saying that there were always too many meetings and "too much bureaucracy" within police organizations. "Everything is slower because of it", he said, "especially when you work with mobile criminals who move in their own pace". According to Filip, the number of meetings and administrative work had increased since the beginning of the project. The officer had more work to do regarding statistical reports, cross checking information, and making sure that everything worked as planned. In his opinion, too many meetings and too much bureaucratization hindered the work of the border officers who need to move quickly before potential suspects have crossed the border into one country and left another. The project also demanded reports and paper work regarding every Power Week or meeting. When I asked Filip if the project related meetings were all useless, he hesitated, and admitted that some meetings were more necessary than others. Filip regarded the Power Weeks as useful (as he did not consider them to be meetings) but thought that other formal meetings were unnecessary unless they focused on planning actions (investigations) or surveillance.

The great aversion towards "meaningless meetings" that obstructed real police work shows a strong dedication to do their work properly and to achieve results. Even if the officers did not agree on how many meetings were necessary, they all agreed that formal meetings should not take up too much of their time. The officers were actively engaged in negotiating the number of "meaningless meetings". Their main goal was to only keep the meetings that provided them with vital information and that had value for them. Re-defining and categorising various meetings as encounters of collaboration (rather than a formal, structural event) was thus unifying and an important part of their collaborative work.

The "unsuccessful telephone meeting"

Another example of the "different status" of meetings was observed a few weeks later when the project initiators announced that they would implement a weekly telephone meeting in addition to the meetings scheduled in the project plan. This meeting would be a way to keep everyone up to date about important events in between meetings (to be a "living agenda") and as a way of giving feedback to colleagues after the Power Weeks. Several officers were sceptical to the idea of organizing this every week, worried that it would take up too much of their time. A few Swedish and Finnish officers were also concerned that other organizations would have insufficient equipment to carry out the phone meetings. A few participants who were informed about the meeting during

the previous Power Week had received the news with silence. One officer said that he interpreted this as a sign of discontent.

Prior to the first phone meeting, Filip had volunteered to contact the members who were scheduled to participate in the meeting. He managed to reach all partners, and all partners promised to participate. In contrast of Filip's previous apprehensive view of formal meetings, he said that short, regular meetings such as this one was important for creating a sense of "comradeship" so that everyone involved feels part of "the same gang" and that everyone "pulls in the same direction"[48]. A few other officers did not agree with him and had low hopes regarding the phone meetings expecting everyone to simply say that they had "nothing to report".

As the meeting was about to commence, a female officer said "this is an historical meeting", referring to the fact that this was the first time that these organizations had a phone meeting together. The meeting started without any technical difficulties. All but one of the organizations (one of the Finnish organizations stated that they had nothing to report) shared information about arrest that had been made, new modus operandi concerning forged passports, and concluded the events that had unfolded since the last Power Week. Oskar later said that he was very pleased with the meeting. When I met one of the other initiators, Niklas a few months later and asked about the phone meetings he said that they had died out since there was not enough time to keep them running. The officers "called each other all the time anyway and asked for updates or information", he said. He concluded that the phone meetings were a bit redundant in contrast to the Power Weeks, which everyone agreed were successful and important.

Although the Power Weeks and some of the formal meetings were deemed as valuable for the collaboration, the weekly phone meetings were not successful despite the anticipation that they would enhance communication and community building. As Shove, Pantzar and Watson (2012, 120) conclude, if practices are to endure the practitioners must be able and willing to keep them alive. As the officers saw no purpose in turning an everyday practice (such as calling your colleagues and asking for information) into a formal, weekly meeting they saw no value in continuing the practice. The officers did not object to most of the other meetings implemented by the project, as many of them saw a need for formulating common goals and agreeing on common styles of working and of reporting.

Drawing on Schwartzman (1987) and Wenger and Snyder (2000), we can conclude that the project related meetings and administrative practices, often described as pointless, were relevant face-to-face encounters and where the project was formed into a social entity and the Power Week group as a community of practice.

[48] Translated by the author from the Swedish expressions *samhörighet, vi är samma gäng* and *att alla drar åt samma håll*.

Documenting Results

Police or border guard organizations (as well as other state funded institutions or organizations) are often described as inherently bureaucratic in their practice and thinking and most organizations are in various ways dependent on showing results (Granér 2007). During the formal meetings and the Power Weeks organized during Project Turnstone the participants were required to document all findings, arrests, decisions, surveillance, and other implementation that followed the project activities. All meetings, joint activities, and "actions" resulting in identity checks, surveillance, or arrests, as a result of the work of the Power Week team, were listed and described in reports. The project initiators also gathered the participants' tickets and travel information. These would later be attached to the final reports and accumulated data that would be sent to their contact at the EU by the end of the project. The project participants generated a large amount of other written material such as meeting minutes, meeting protocols, participation lists, telephone lists, information documents about the project, a detailed schedule of project activities, a financial plan, lists of agreements, and finally, the two research reports (written by the researchers involved in this project (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2015a; 2015b).

In order to receive funding and means to go through with the project it was important to prove that the project generated results and it was valuable for future border police work. I further discussed this dilemma with Oskar and Niklas, two of the initiators who had quite conflicting views regarding the meaning of "results". Oskar highlighted that Project Turnstone was not an operative project as such, suggesting that the main focus of the project should be on information and knowledge sharing. "Catching criminals" or arresting suspects was of course a bonus outcome of the Power Weeks. Niklas was a bit frustrated regarding the high demands for documentation, saying that "the people in Brussels have strict rules about how they want the project to be designed".

According to Niklas everything had to be "on record, even things that seemed obvious to border police officers needed to be written down and forwarded to the proper (EU) authorities in order for it to "exist" outside of the border police stations". Oskar mentioned several times that they needed to "sell the project" to show that their methods were successful and worth implementing in other areas of Europe. In order to achieve this, they had to continue to formalise the project and create reports of the outcome of the collaboration activities. Early on in the project, the initiators also discussed the possibility of designing a project logo and even ordering brand products, such as pencils and USB memory sticks with the project's name. The initiators were, however, unsure if the budget would cover such expenses. To my knowledge, no branding products were ordered but all documents and reports associated with the project were branded with the words "Project Turnstone" and the EU logo.

Documenting progress and "establishing" Project Turnstone as a "success" was not only a task for the project initiators. The Power Week members were eager to advertise their work and their collaborative progress. Despite the emphasis on doing "hands on work" with minimal amounts of administration, the Power Weeks generated a large amount of written material and artifacts. The officers often made sure that all events taking place and all generated information were documented. During each Power Week, one person was given the task of taking notes and assembling all he data in excel documents. Arrests or seized stolen goods apprehended in connection to the Power Weeks were well documented, photographed, and the participating officers shared the images with their colleagues. The participants often took group photos, as well as photos of the everyday work conducted during the Power Weeks. All of this information was compiled in a written report and distributed to the rest of the Power Week participants and their organizations. Some major cases were even noticed by public news media. News reporting on Project Turnstone would state the value of reclaimed stolen goods or estimate the number of "criminals" travelling by ferry in the Baltic Sea region. Interviewed officers claimed that it was important to provide substantial documentation of criminal activity which could inform the public of the high number of criminals moving and "working" in the Baltic Sea area[49].

Documents that serve as contracts or agreements can remove social interaction from time and space and neutralize individuals' impulses and desires. Documents can also be formulated in order to regulate conflicts, settle differences, and reduce circumstantial change (Claycomb and Mulberry 2007). For Project Turnstone, the document "memorandum of understanding" (created during the Management Board Meeting) is an example of such an effort. Although the project initiators had already prepared drafts and documents describing the purpose and guidelines of the project, several issues were still unclear and were questioned during the first meeting by the other participants. Despite the fact that the participants had already agreed on participating and had accepted the goals of the project, the structure of the collaboration was not straightforward.

During the first management board meeting, practical issues such as the financial plan and how operative reports should be constructed were also discussed within the whole group, higher-level chiefs included. Several officers seemed keen on clarifying distinctions, categories, and the phrasing and formulations of rules in the memorandum document that were jointly created during this meeting. The amount of time and effort put on agreeing on specific words, styles of reporting, and rules of conduct regarding the project shows the importance of such written material. Creating and formulating the memorandum document was one of the first steps to establish a

[49] http://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/svensk-polis-skuggade-juveltjuvar-1.90435
https://www.svd.se/ovantat-avancerad-brottslighet-runt-ostersjon
http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=6133601

"work group" or a community, as visons, aspirations, and rules regarding their work were jointly established

Working with objects

As noted by Wenger (1998, 58-59, 105) and Lee (2007) an important part of community building is the joint production of artifacts such as abstractions, symbols, terms, stories and concepts that unify the group and their practices. This process also includes physical objects and tools necessary for a community to jointly perform their practice. In the case of Project Turnstone, the officers did not only have self-created objects and artifacts in common, as much of their work focuses on finding and apprehended stolen, forged or smuggled goods. In addition to documents and statistics, other types of material tools and artifacts were thus important for the documentation processes of Project Turnstone. For example, talking about reclaimed stolen goods, taking pictures of these items, and showing these pictures to other colleagues was important for the collaborative documentation process.

Although it was not uncommon that the border officers encounter smuggling or trafficking of human beings, most of the officers interviewed for this study worked primarily with property crimes, that is, smuggling of stolen, counterfeit or illegal goods across international borders. Despite talking about wanting to find criminals and of "doing something good for society" (presumably helping victims of crime), a great part of their daily work focused on finding, reclaiming, assessing, and categorising "things". These "things" ranged from weapons (however such findings were rare), to stolen cars and counterfeit cigarettes, to boat engines and other types of smuggled goods. One officer told me that when it came to smuggled goods, border police officers were prepared to find "anything from diapers to drugs, basically anything that you can steal, smuggle or sell".

Talking about, comparing or viewing pictures of stolen or reclaimed goods occurred frequently during the formal meetings and especially during the Power Weeks. When news came that a few cars were stolen the officers were eager to know more about the make and colour of the cars. There were often discussions of how easy (or difficult) it was for thieves to steal certain types of cars or which cars were the most valuable to steal. Additionally, officers also shared images of fake identification documents, eager to learn about new methods of the forgers. Other objects, such as legal documents (passports, driver's licence or international identification cards) that had been stolen, forged or were invalid also played vital roles in the everyday work of the police and border officers. The officers "collected" information regarding forgers or people with multiple (fake) identifications or identities. This knowledge was filed and used when colleagues requested it or when a similar case needed investigating. This type of knowledge was valuable as it provided officers with more "know-how" making it easier to identify forgers.

I learned more about the importance of material objects as I met with Ragnar on my way to visit one of the Power Weeks. Ragnar was a middle-level border officer working with collaboration issues at an airport, where we met. He did not participate in the Power Weeks but was highly aware of the project and the work that the Power Week officers performed. Soon after we had introduced ourselves he asked me if he could see my passport as we sat down at Starbucks to talk. The airport was calm again after the morning rush and only a few people moved aimlessly around the area. Ragnar had planned to give me a tour of the airport so that I could see how the border officers worked. He took a sip of his coffee and looked through my passport with great interest, holding it up in front of his face and commenting on the high quality of Swedish passports. "They are difficult to fake and that is why they are so sought after by forgers", he said with a smile. Ragnar also said that my passport was a good example to use as a "template" for forgers, as it contained some stamps and a few visas, which, according to him, made the passport, "look more genuine".

I convinced him that my passport was, in fact, genuine and we headed to the first stop on the guided tour, which was the "forged documents office". Hidden behind a plain looking door in a corridor with several departure gates and awaiting passengers was a large, open office space. The office was busy and several people worked on their computers, talked on their phones or put up notes on a pin board. All officers were men and they all wore uniforms. Ragnar introduced me to a man who seemed happy to tell me about his job as a "document specialist". He showed me a large document cabinet with small drawers filled with passports in different colours from all around the world. He described it as his "reference cabinet" with both genuine and fake passports. It was important to have both genuine and fake copies, he said, as the "real passports" were useful to have when determining how a fake passport had been crafted. We continued into another room with a few "machines" that reminded me of advanced "scanners" or copy machines. The machines were used to test identification documents that were believed to be fake. Ragnar told me that this was one of the places that the Power Week officers would call if the needed information regarding passport identification or forgeries.

During the Power Weeks, the officers often discussed the validity of identity documents and various tricks to identify a fraud. The officers were also eager to take pictures and copies of various identification documents of suspects or wanted individuals. On several occasions, I observed a few officers sitting next to one another comparing information about various cases. As the officers had access to different information systems, it was not uncommon that they had different pieces of information about the same person or the same crime. Suspects might use several identification documents and names in order not to be detected when travelling in Europe. Finding out these names increased the chance of apprehending this or that person in a specific harbour control. They often showed one another pictures of "evidence" of how smuggled goods had been stored or hidden. Everyone seemed eager to hear anecdotes and stories of how stolen goods had

been found (sometimes accidentally and sometimes thanks to tip-offs). The officers documented all information that they shared and "expanded" their databases when combining their common sources and knowledge.

Concluding Remarks

Collaboration Activities

The practice of a community can be developed through a variety of activities, for example problem solving, seeking experience, documenting procedures, discussing developments, mapping knowledge and identifying gaps (Wenger and Wenger-Trayner 2015, 3). The organized collaboration activities referred to as Power Weeks provided space, the necessary equipment, and infrastructure (Wenger and Snyder 2000, 140) for the officers to set in motion their community building process and perform all the above-mentioned activities. The formal meetings required a more focused interaction where the participants discussed the goal of the project, formulated documents, and negotiated the format and structure of Project Turnstone.

Although most participants praised the hands-on approach advocated by the project initiators, some questioned and criticised the project design as it was lacking in structure. Similar to Lee's (2007) research of a newly formed, interdisciplinary design group, the border officers participating in Project Turnstone lacked pre-existing standards and processes for collaboration. As the participants worked in different countries and organizations, they were also used to different work practices and had different experiences and expectations of collaboration procedures. As previously described, a lot of time during the first Power Weeks was spent on deciding how to write and formulate reports, and negotiating work procedures, in addition to getting acquainted with one another. Various misunderstandings, as well as the malfunctioning of technical equipment, led to confusion and initially obstructed the collaboration as recourses were put on solving the issues instead of working on particular cases.

Creating the Project: Cultivation and Formalisation

One of the main goals of the project defined by the project initiators was the "hands on approach" with minimal administration. However, as we have seen, Project Turnstone was in many ways a highly bureaucratic endeavour as the participants were required to create and accumulate a vast amount of written material about the outcome of the project activities. The project coordinators set the tone for the project by organizing meetings, project activities, and the Power Weeks. The empirical examples suggest that, despite being blamed for slowing down every day-work, formal work practices, such as formal meetings, defining clear project objectives, and creating and negotiating administrative documents also played central roles in establishing an

understanding of a collaboration community. As described by one of the project initiators, the initial purpose of the meetings was to make sure that everyone knew what the project was all about, and something that simply needed to be done according to the administrative rules. However, observations tend to tell a different story, showing that formal meetings provided a space where active negotiations of work practices, goals, and efforts were performed. In the example of the border police officers, pictures and reclaimed stolen goods served as proof of their success but were also unifying symbols providing the group with tangible evidence of their shared enterprise and their common purpose.

Technical artifacts (for instance email lists or messages including intelligence information) or other organizational artifacts can also serve as reifying devices or mediators that regulate collaboration between individuals even if they are not physically working together (Wenger, 1998, 60-61, 131). Objects (such as formal documents, agreements, reports, emails, text messages, and the project plan) unified participating officers as being part of a community in between their meetings and Power Weeks. Rather than seeing themselves as different actors from different organizations occasionally spending time together, the officers started to describe themselves as "team", or as a group joint by a common mission.

Another important aspect of symbolic and material artifacts is that they mediate between the community and its external funders (the EU and the two co-funding border police organizations in Sweden and Estonia) on which the members of the community depend for resources and legitimacy. In a structural sense, the creation of reports, lists, memos, meeting agendas, and other documents turned the project, and its Power Week team into a "real" entity.

8. Creating a Community

Within the field of police research, much emphasis has been put on the occupational norms conducted by police officers, especially informal processes where such norms are learnt. A person's entry into an organization is specifically important, as the newcomer will be thoroughly scrutinised by the more established members who will assess that person's trustworthiness, loyalty, and motivation (van Maanen 1973). However, researchers have given less attention to such informal socialization processes in transnational police collaboration where officers from different cultural and social contexts are brought together to work. In the context of Project Turnstone, this process was complex, as "the organization" (the project) was only a temporary one comprising officers from various organizations, bringing with them different work methods, various ideas of what constitutes best practice, and organizational traditions. As noted above, the interviewed officers emphasised that getting acquainted with your partners was vital for successful international collaboration.

In addition to working on specific cases, negotiating work methods, and identifying knowledge gaps the officers engaged in social, informal interactions during the Power Weeks. The officers' interactions were not just "work related" (as in discussing cases or suspects) but were centred around socializing and trust building. The officers shared stories of previous experiences, talked about their personal lives, and discussed their common interests, such as ice hockey, football or travelling. The officers created new stories and memories based on their informal interaction during the Power Weeks. These interactions also had "disciplinary effects": jokes, words, and expressions not accepted by the other group members were questioned, protested or commented on.

In this chapter, I provide examples of the informal socializing taking place during the Power Weeks. The backdrop of these descriptions is the view that learning to work, to collaborate and to build trust is a social process that is tied to ongoing activities and practices within communities of people (Fox 2000, 854). In this process I focus on the sharing of a set of various linguistic practices such as telling stories, jokes, anecdotes, and memories. As will be shown, three categories of such practices have proved very instrumental: 1) success stories of cases or actions, 2) stories of emotional hardship or difficult situations experienced by the officers, and 3) anecdotes, describing previous collaborations or interactions with other border police organizations or the public. The three categories often included various jokes that can be described as a form of "border

police banter". The ambiguous position of the intelligence officers as somewhere in between office workers and rank-and file officers was also noticeable in these narratives.

Drawing on Lee (2007), Collins (2004, 84-85) and Claycomb and Mulberry (2007, 190), these accounts describe how stories and jokes increased the officers' sense of community. Imagination through the sharing of stories can also be a creative process of generating new relations and producing new "images" that appropriate meaning (Wenger 1998, 176, 2013-204). I will also discuss how humour was used to mediate tension regarding the officers' collaborative work practices and their ambiguous work role positioned in between "street cops" and "management cops" (Gundhus 2005, 139; Reuss-Ianni 1983, 2-4).

Joking in police organizations has previously been described as a way of clarifying boundaries between in-groups and out-groups (Granér 2014, 16). In the context of the Power Weeks, such linguistic artifacts were also used to criticise (Billig 2005) improper behaviour and were thus cultivating devices of steering the group habitus. The Power Weeks served as trial periods for the officers to identify those members who are motivated and trustworthy so as to become included into what is referred to as "the circle of trust" by the officers. In order to illustrate the context of the social interactions taking place during the Power Weeks, I describe a few situations when stories, jokes, and anecdotes were shared during the Power Weeks.

Building Trust through Informal Socialising

Social boundaries are consistently present in collaboration, and interaction rituals (Collins 2004) can both diminish and increase social, political, and ideological boundaries (Hjortsjö, 2006). The experience of a community in organizational context is especially believed to improve through the development of a common language as specific ways of talking, and certain words and expression become important links between individuals in the group (Eckert 2006; Lipsky 1980; Wenger 1998, 73, 93). In interviews, the officers emphasised the importance of understanding one another, to literally and figuratively "speak the same language".

Not being able to communicate with international partners created tension, misunderstandings, and prevented personal small talk or chitchat, which was claimed to be a crucial part of successful community building. Joint, informal activities such as eating together, joking, and socializing in a relaxed setting can thus decrease boundaries between participants (Hjortsjö 2006, 189-196). When asking the officers about what was necessary in order to achieve collaboration, many said that informal socialising was the most vital element to build successful bilateral exchange and trust. Andris from Latvia described it like this:

> It is important to meet face to face, if you only email you don't know who the person [that you are contacting] is, and you don't know if you want to send information. But if you have met, you know who the person is and [then] it is easier [to exchange information]. Trust is important. When it comes to exchange of information, you want to know who you are calling. After some jokes, a drink or a conversation it is easier to get to know a person.
>
> Field interview

According to Andris, having an informal conversation, a drink, and joke with one's colleagues increased the feeling that they "knew" one another. Such informal interactions made it easier for the officers to trust one another as they had an idea of "who that person is". In addition to working long days in the Power Week office, after work socializing was an important aspect of the Power Weeks. The officers often relaxed after a long day of work by socializing with one another at a restaurant, bar or a club[50].

After work socializing

It has previously been argued that police officers, instead of verbalizing feelings, often discharge tension and relieve stress by drinking, performing athletic activities or engaging in sexual escapades (Martin 1999). Furthermore, studies show that (both male and female) officers see socializing and drinking together as important events that "promote feelings of group unity, trust, and camaraderie" (Martin, 1999, 123-124). In this argument, drinking is considered to be a "social lubricant" or as a bonding ritual, as well as a stress reliever. The Power Week participants emphasised that participation in such informal activities insures that one's attachment to the group and willingness to get to know one's colleagues. As most of them had never met prior to the project, informal socializing gave them an opportunity to figure out their common interests, and goals. Furthermore, in contrast to a more established work team or group, the Power Week members had few opportunities for informal socializing, as they lived and worked in separate countries. The aspect of bonding thus became more important than simply relaxing or unwinding; it was the only opportunities the officers had "loosen up", talk about their personal lives, and get to know one another on a more personal level outside of the office. Male and female border officers alike participated in such events, agreeing that after work socializing was crucial for increasing group membership.

During one pub-visit a few officers started talking about the importance of informal socialising. One of them told the others about his group chief back home whom, he feared, would not be accepted by the rest of the work team. The group chief had just started working in his organization and had given his colleagues the impression that he

[50] It is important to note that this type of socialising occurred during the officers' free time and was always privately payed for by the officers themselves.

was very health-oriented and avoided alcohol. The officers agreed that there was nothing wrong with being healthy, but his lifestyle would probably prevent him from getting to know his colleagues and from becoming a trusted member or their team. Distancing oneself from the activities of the group sent "the wrong signals" regarding his work commitment. During the conversation, one of the officers suggested that they would have to "conform" the group chief quickly and make him abandon his healthy lifestyle for the sake of positive work environment.

There were several other instances where participants openly showed discontent if some members chose not to participate in the after-work activities. This disapproval was shown by making irritated remarks (suggesting that the officers who did not attend was not committed to the group) and pointing out the officers' absence. During the Power Weeks, the officers who chose not to participate (regardless of gender) were seen a "boring", being teased for being unadventurous and asocial. However, although a high tolerance for alcohol may enhance masculinity for men, women might be considered "unfeminine" and risk criticism for drinking too much (Martin 1999). Some female officers who participated in after work partying or had some drinks with their colleagues were met with much encouragement and positive reactions from the male officers, whereas other female officers were sometimes the target of criticism because of their non-drinking habits.

Despite the normalizing, and often positive discourse regarding socialising and alcohol consumption, the stereotypical, more negative, image of "the alcoholic and unhealthy police officers" was also the subject of jokes. The officers sometimes teased one another for being alcoholics or performed various practical jokes. One example is when one of the officers hid an empty Vodka bottle in another officers' bag that had been left unattended in the office. When the bag was opened, the bottle fell out and all the officers who saw this laughed. The officers who was the subject of this joked laughed as well, saying that it was a "very funny and creative joke". Another example is when a participant who frequently offered chewing gum was jokingly "accused" or trying to drug everyone with rohypnol[51]. Furthermore, when eating dinner or having drinks after work, conversations often focused on drinking and partying. The officers would tell one another stories of fun, embarrassing or unusual things that had happened at previous parties or during visits in other countries. If the practical jokes were not met with laughter, the person making the joke would usually become silent, and someone else would normally change the subject.

[51] Rohypnol is a sedative in the short-term treatment of insomnia, for inducing anaesthesia, and as a pre-medication in surgical procedures. It is more known as a "date rape drug" and as an intoxicant (Nowak 2017).

(Border) Police Humour and Banter

During the Power Weeks, sharing an after-work drink naturally took place after the work day was over but informal conversation was not restricted to off-duty events. Police researchers have previously identified humour as an important and symbolic feature of police occupational culture (Charman 2013; Granér 2014). It is also not uncommon that different national groups joke about their neighbouring countries, for example Swedes and Norwegians tend to tell jokes about one another (Gundelach 2000).

Charman's (2013) study of the working relationship between police officers and ambulance staff reveals humour as an important mechanism for coping with the demands of the work, strengthening the bonds between the two groups, and reinforcing group values. This study is no exception as the empirical data provides numerous examples of jokes or "police humour" in the stories and anecdotes shared by the officers during the Power Weeks.

In the context of the Power Weeks, however, sharing stories or telling jokes was sometimes difficult as these often had to be translated into English and some of the implications were lost in the translation. This forced the officers to explain what they meant and had to work harder to make themselves understood. If some jokes were impossible to translate, they had to change them or come up with new jokes. Over time, the officers started to develop a shared repertoire of words, jokes, and anecdotes that they could relate to. For example, jokes that seemed appreciated by many were often repeated and re-told over and over again.

In this study, in particular, humour did not only serve the purpose of releasing tensions of the job, but to generate a sense of informal community by toning down the differences among the officers and to give criticism in an "informal", non-confrontational way (Wettergren 2013). Joking was also used as a way of handling paradoxical conditions at their work place (Jarzabkowski and Lê 2017, 433-444). The officers faced various challenges and contradictions regarding their work role and the demands of their work; they were "office workers" who identified themselves with "heroic action" of policing. The paradoxes that they encountered during their everyday interactions around work tasks were expressed in terms of jokes during the Power Weeks.

Occasionally, boredom and "lack of excitement" characterising intelligence work also gave rise to jokes and ironic remarks, as the officers were trying to find ways to pass time. Phillips (2016) uses the term non-work when referring to the work activities that officers perform to reduce their boredom. Joking during the Power Weeks, however, should not be reduced to "non-work", as joking was an important part of the officers' collaborative work. The shared inside jokes made by the officers can be described as

part of their "local lore", reflecting a shared discourse and perspective of the world (Cambell 2007, 135-137; Wenger 1998, 125-126).

The Masculinity of "Crime Fighters" and Self-Irony

Jokes referencing "good guys", "bad guys", villains and heroes were common during the Power Weeks, during formal dinners, and after-work drinks. Although some officers regarded other participants as less trustworthy, they referred to all their Power Week colleagues as "the good guys" trying to make a difference in society. Comments about criminals and various punishments were also frequent during the daily work of the Power Week officers. The officers all shared such sentiment (that criminals needed to be punished) and thus distanced themselves from the "bad guys".

Jokes about the "stupidity" of some of the suspects often generating smiles and laughter. One such example is when information from the Power Week team had led to surveillance, a car chase, and eventually an arrest of a person suspected of smuggling narcotics. The surveillance team members were convinced that the man they were after was trying to escape on a moped, as he was driving too slowly on a highway. The officers were worried that they would cause an accident. After stopping the suspect, the surveillance team realised that he was not the man that they were looking for, that he did not even know that he was followed, and that he was unaware of his driving speed because he was drunk. They found several kilos of heroin in his backpack worth a large sum of money, but he was still not the man whom they thought they were initially chasing. This incident was told by Filip, making the Power Week team laugh for quite some time. The main source of amusement was the stupidity of the suspect: they asked themselves several times "how could he have been so stupid to drive very slowly while being drunk on a highway with several kilos of heroin in his backpack?". Several jokes were then made regarding the intelligence of this suspect, as well as the generally low IQ level of some "criminals". As the suspect was not Swedish and had been caught in Sweden, one officer joked that the suspect "wanted to live a life of luxury in a Swedish prison". The others laughed, and one officer responded "that's a shame, I want the criminals to suffer as much as possible".

The jokes shared by the officers often referenced popular cultural phenomena that most of the officers were familiar with. For example, the officers joked about films that they had seen or action heroes that they did not (but maybe hoped to) resemble. Early in the project I asked one of the initiators if *Project Threadstone* inspired the name Project Turnstone, which I had noticed is the name of a secret agent project in the action films about the character *Jason Bourne*[52]. The initiator laughed and told me that the name originated from the Turnstone bird (which I describe in the introduction chapter). A

[52] The films about the character Jason Bourne are part of a series of action spy thrillers.

few days later I noticed that one of the participants had the theme song of one of the *Jason Bourne* films as his cell phone ringing tone. I later asked that man if he liked the *Jason Bourne* films and he responded that "*Jason* is a cool character" and that he liked to watch those films.

A coast guard officer in his forties described the glorification of violence in law enforcement as a "*James Bond*[53] complex"; "you admire and want to be a little bit like the agents and action heroes that you have seen in movies, even if you know that those movies are not the reality", he told me. He was not, however, the only one to talk about action films, secret agents, Hollywood comedies or TV dramas about police work during the Power Weeks. Such references seemed to bring joy and laughter as most officers recognized and were able to relate to these dramas, for instance *James Bond*, the *Jason Bourne* films and the *Hangover*[54] films. The officers jokingly described themselves as a group of "agents" trying to save Europe from the "bad guys".

During the first Power Week, I had a conversation with a border officer from Latvia asking him why he had joined the border guard board. He explained that:

> "My motivation was actually, it was the end of the Soviet period and then some, eh, some, some movies, that were forbidden previously started to be shown here, and for me, it was, police work [was] something new and, and you know, [laughing] when I was young it was quite interesting to see those police officers having their coffee and [then get] some, some emergency call and then dropping [the] coffee and then [laughing] driving [away] quite fast off to the spot and, and to deal with this person or crime, crime-scene and, maybe that's why I became a police officer".
>
> Recorded interview

This officer described his decision to become a border officer with the sense of "doing something new" and of embodying the exciting image that popular culture attaches to the police role.

Even though most of the intelligence officers interviewed appear to be highly aware of and laugh at the stereotypical image of "elite gang busters" or police officers as "crime fighters catching bad guys", these images were constantly mimicked and re-constructed through storytelling and jokes. However, the officers often joked about themselves and adopted a self-ironic attitude. For example, the officers often joked about themselves and the difference between their bodies and those of fictitious action characters. Several officers performed mini "shows" when fetching coffee, candy or chocolate from the always-present coffee table in the room by stating loudly that "this is the kind of food

[53] The character of James Bond first appeared in the novels by Ian Fleming in 1953. Since then 24 films have been made about the British secret agent.

[54] *The Hangover* (2009) is an American comedy about a group of friends who travel to Las Vegas for a bachelor party.

that creates crime-fighters", by doing a little dance, or by loudly complaining that the food would make them fat. One officer was very disappointed by the lunch assortment and repeatedly said that he longed for McDonald's. A few other participants were very eager to exercise before work each morning and proudly talked about how many kilometres they had run or how much time they had spent at the gym while their colleagues were sleeping. Such comments were met with jokes, resent or surprise. Some participants shook their heads in astonishment.

In their accounts of their daily work activities there was a noticeable lack of real "action" or exciting events taking place. This issue was addressed in stories of how the officers had proven that they were "tough and manly", despite the boredom often related to investigative work. Similar observations are made by Gundhus (2005, 139) in her study Norwegian police officers' implementation and use of information and communication technology. Similar to the Power Week participants, the officers in her study made numerous jokes regarding the "passive PC Police" even though they valued their competence in finding intelligence information about suspected individuals.

During the Power Weeks, the lack of "action" in intelligence work was something that all participants could relate to and often talked about. A recurrent joke made by some of the intelligence officers was how disappointed the general population would be if a similar series such as the American reality show *Cops* (1989-) or the Australian documentary *Border Security: Australia's Front Line* (2004-) would be created about the work of Baltic Sea intelligence officers. "It would be like, "now, Mr Andersson is picking up his cell-phone. He is calling a colleague. Now, the border guards have been sitting in front of their computers for five hours", Dennis jokingly told me simulating a dark voice, referring to the lack of action in his daily work[55].

Despite joking about the boring aspects of intelligence work, the potential "risk" of intelligence work and its association with "secret agents protecting their nations against bad guys" was often present in the officers' discussions. One situation that generated much laughter was one officer's account of a small USB memory stick that was placed in a cabinet with glass door in one of the border offices. The Power Week team had gathered at yet another location and some were curiously looking around the large office room before starting their work. The walls were covered with maps of the area, photos of vessels, and cabinets with various items. A few officers looked at the objects in the cabinets, asking one of the host officers to tell them more about the things on display. The host officers said that the cabinets mostly included various gifts that the officers had received from visits by law enforcement organizations from around the world. One of the items at display was the seemingly random USB stick lying next to several flags and models of small airplanes. The host officers pointed at the USB stick,

[55] This is not to say that car chases or other dangerous situations never occurred in the life of the border officers, but following, chasing, and arresting suspects were more recurrent activities for the patrols working within these border and police organizations during the Power Weeks.

laughed a little and asked if anyone could guess why the USB was placed in the cabinet. The USB stick was a gift from an organization that had visited them a while ago. "We were very apprehensive of the USB and immediately placed it in the cabinet", the host officers said while smiling. "This USB might be one of our most dangerous items", he joked and laughed at the ridiculous thought of using a USB stick from an unknown partner, risking to infect their computers with some kind of virus. "We don't want our state secrets to spread", he said, and the other officers agreed.

Smiling and giggling amongst themselves, the officers continued to look at the other items in the cabinet before heading back to their desks and laptops. This conversation draws our attention the officers' construction of their collective knowledge and is further an example of an "us and them" construction; "Us" (the smart intelligence officers) versus the (potential) "criminal other".

Jokes and hegemonic masculinity

Understandings and social constructions of "masculinity" are reproduced in everyday interactions in various social settings. The "culture" of masculinity" highlighted in police departments and academies has traditionally degraded female officers, often through the basic use of language (Prokos and Padavic 2002, 443). Despite the self-ironic attitudes of the Power Week participants, some of the stories, anecdotes, jokes, and interview accounts were "gendered", illustrating hegemonic masculinity (Prokos and Padavic 2002, 439). Female bodies or appearances were, however rarely mentioned and various forms of masculinity were the main topics of such conversations.

The Power Weeks were not only attended by men and most female participants joked in a similar manner as their male colleagues did. Although the female officers joined the group in laughing when the male officers teased one another, few female officers instigated such jokes and few shared stories with the whole group during the Power Weeks. I often observed female officers joking with other colleagues in other situations, such as during coffee breaks or in corridor chitchat. The officers seemed to maintain an "ironic attitude" towards jokes, often adding that the jokes were "just jokes". However, despite the ironic attitude and joking manners observed during the Power Weeks, some interview accounts provided an "un-ironic" male bias. One officer in his early thirties told me in an interview that he was surprised that there were so many middle-level female managers in the police forces nowadays[56]. In his opinion, police work was a "tough business" and he was worried if the female officers would cope with the emotional stress and challenges that working in law enforcement implied. Although I did not hear any such opinions discussed in the Power Week office with the rest of the group, the jokes and stories of toughness and bravery shared by the participants

[56] This officer only participated in one Power Week. It was not clear to me whether he chose not to participate anymore or if the other group members excluded him from the remaining Power Weeks.

focused exclusively on male officers. This might support the understanding of police work as a "tough business" for "tough men".

Hegemonic masculinity has been constructed not only in relation to femininity, but in relation to other "masculinities" (Connell, 1995). Expressions of masculinity are often most visible in situations when the notion of masculinity is challenged, for instance, when men enter occupations traditionally regarded as feminine or when women enter jobs that have previously emphasised masculinity (Prokos and Padavic 2002). The joking and bantering regarding masculinity during the Power Weeks were, in a way, examples of such behaviour. On the other hand, as the officers often joked about their own lack of stereotypical "masculine traits", their bantering seemed to question some general aspects of the stereotypical image of police work that they could not associate with their own work roles as intelligence analysts.

In the case of the border intelligence officers, their work position within the police force is a fairly new one, situated between "office worker" and crime fighter, and thereby not easily defined. The participants all wore civilian clothes and could not easily be identified as law enforcement officers. The purpose of wearing "civilian clothes" is due to the fact that the officers occasionally moved around in the border areas in search of wanted suspects. The location of their offices and the rooms allocated for the Power Week team, were often located in the harbour areas or near border crossings. Some intelligence officers seemed to take pride in their "casual" appearance of plain looking clothes and glasses, as it made them blend in with the crowd. During the Power Weeks (when very few surveillance opportunities took place) a few participants would on a few occasions show up in a suit or a shirt and tailored pants. Filip, who often wore a shirt and tie was often the target of the officers' jokes. The participants would tease him, asking him whether he was trying to "look like a secret agent" or "to look more intelligent"[57].

During one of the Power Weeks, two male officers who had recently gotten to know each other bickered about the slow work pace of the group and the fact that no interesting information was found. They started discussing other jobs that might suit them better, such as a taxi driver or a bouncer at a night club. One of the officers were often teased for his neat hairstyle and his interest in clothes. The officer did not seem to mind and retaliated by teasing his colleague for his shabby appearances of worn out fleece sweaters and track suit pants. He mentioned that he had spotted a second-hand shop nearby that he thought would suit his colleague's taste. Some of the other officers in the room smiled at the conversation, others ignored it and concentrated on their work.

Later that same week, one of the officers received a message that "a new guy" from another organization was joining them. He asked the others if they knew him, and if

[57] I did not observe that the female participants' clothing was commented on during the Power Weeks.

he was a "real intelligence guy"? Another officer pointed at Marcus, saying "he is just like Filip, you know, slick hair, bleached teeth, like that". The officers in the group laughed and Filip stroked his hair back with a smile. As most of the participating officers did not fit neatly into the construction of a "street level crime fighter" this became a common topic to which they could all relate.

Although physical strength is not a requirement for analysing criminal intelligence, stereotypical images of the tough, masculine "crime fighter" were often reproduced in stories and jokes (although such constructions were also laughed at and talked about in an ironic manner) during the Power Weeks. The previous examples show us that the officers frequently contrasted the "ideal type" image of policing or crime fighting with their own experienced work reality. Although seeing their job as exciting and important, they all claimed that criminal intelligence analysis (performed in an office setting) was equally important as chasing suspects in the streets. On the other hand, they all seemed eager to highlight the "action" aspect of their job.

In police studies, this clichéd assumption of police work as a "macho occupation" is often noticed in the storylines shared by officers, both male and female (Chan 2003, 297; Finstad 2000; Gundhus 2005, 140). However, similar to Gundhus' (2005, 140) study, observations during the Power Weeks suggest diversity in the officers' accounts of masculinity, as well an ambivalent approach towards their work roles, and popular cultural references regarding the police work. Officers interviewed by Gundhus (2005) (working in one of the intelligence units under scrutiny) saw themselves as experts in crime fighting even though they worked with information technology. Similarly, the Power Week participants saw their joint office work as ways of cultivating their work skills and ways of engaging in "smarter bandit catching" (Gundhus 2005, 132)[58].

Inside Jokes and Mockery

Whereas most jokes during the Power Weeks focused on a specific subject (such as for instance the conduct of the officers or political events) some conversations and jokes became more "unstructured". As the officers became more familiar with one another, "inside" jokes, difficult for outsiders to understand, became more frequent. The following conversation between three officers took place one afternoon during the second last Power Week. The rain was pouring outside and the officers had been complaining for a while about being hungry and tired.

[58] Gundhus (2005, 134) also encountered negative or contradictory conceptions towards a future oriented risk management approach.

Andris: Does anyone have [their] birthday this week that we can celebrate? [some officers laugh].

Edwin: Who?

Filip: [to Edwin] Just say yes.

Andris: [to Edwin] Do you have [your] birthday this week?

Edwin: No.

Andris: Who has [his] birthday this week?

Filip: Our boss has [laughing].

Andris: Filip is going to have a new baby this week.

Filip: [Laughing] Yes!

Edwin: [to Filip, who has a wife and children] Do you have a new family?

Filip: Yes, one in every country [several other officers laugh].

Andris: And they are going to call the baby Turnstone. Turnstone one, Turnstone two…

Filip: [to everyone in the group] Did you hear that tomorrow is Edwin's birthday?

Edwin: [laughing, but not responding].

Field notes

I could often understand the officers' inside jokes and conversations, but this one was difficult to follow. Andris seemed to start the conversation because he was bored. He continued to tease Filip for having a new family and new children that he would name Turnstone 1 and Turnstone 2. Once they had gotten to know one another better, friendly mockery (as in the situation described above where Filip is teased for having a wife in every country) became more frequent.

Another inside joke (or instance of mockery) that was frequently shared was referred to as the "the shaving foam event". It involved two officers from two separate organizations. The officers, Marcus and Jakob, both participated in Project Turnstone and had, during the course of the project, been invited to speak at a meeting abroad. They had stayed at the same hotel and met up in the morning to go to the meeting. A few hours later (when the meeting was over), another officer had asked Marcus why he

had shaving foam in his face. Jakob had known about this all along without letting Marcus know. When telling this story, Marcus looked at Jakob with a serious face, telling him that he would never trust him again after allowing him to embarrass himself in front of the other collaboration partners. Everyone in the room laughed at the story, and Jakob smiled, shrugged his shoulders and said "at least it is a good story".

Mockery regarding the officers' work performances frequently occurred during the Power Weeks. One example is when a few officers from Finland had caught a suspect who was forbidden to enter Sweden. One of the Finnish officers said (with a smile and an ironic tone of voice) that he "will inform his colleagues to help the man to travel to Sweden", so that Finland did not have to "take care of him". The Swedish officers responded with laugher saying "you are so friendly!". Similar jokes were made regarding the high number of immigrants in Sweden; as soon as a large group of non-EU travellers were checked or investigated, the officers would joke about sending them all to Sweden, since no one there would notice[59]. The officers thus implied that the Swedish immigration and border control was badly organized, taking in many refugees and migrants without any "control", without knowing who they were or where they would end up. Some of the Swedish officers laughed when such jokes were made, whereas others seemed a little annoyed.

Setting Boundaries

Although the joking taking place during the Power Weeks seemed to lighten the mood of the participating officers, joking can also have disciplinary effects and make it easier to share concerns and bring up various problems in a non-confrontational way (Billig 2005). Billig (2005, 161) suggests that provocative jokes can never be just jokes. He claims that the social acts of teasing or laughing is an activity of control; it can be an act of putting someone in his or her place and avoiding self-criticism altogether. Wettergren (2013) draws similar conclusions regarding the emotional and social implications of jokes. In her opinion, humour can be used to give criticism without being entirely held accountable for one's actions. Joking during the Power Weeks thus helps the officers "negotiate" power positions, as well as making the work atmosphere feel more "collegial" and easier going.

Although the officers did not shy away from jokingly criticising one another and or negotiating problems, they often engaged in face saving practices (Goffman 1959) to control various social situations. For example, making a joke to ease a difficult or tense situation or aiding a colleague by laughing at his or her "bad joke" often occurred during the Power Weeks. However, the group soon began to establish boundaries for

[59] Such jokes were especially frequent in the beginning of the EU migration crisis in 2015 (before the border controls were re-enforced).

which words, jokes, and anecdotes were considered appropriate. There were several instances when officers did not seem to agree on the suitability of certain jokes and comments. Officers who did not approve showed their resentment in different ways, for instance, by looking angry, not laughing or simply saying that the joke "was not funny". Similar to the greeting rituals and small talk observed by Holmes and Meyerhoff (1999) in a New Zealand police unit, the officers developed clear understandings for how much "talk" or joking was acceptable during the Power Weeks.

The following observation describes how one officer showed his disapproval during one of the early Power Weeks. The whole Power Week team had finished working for the day and went to a nearby restaurant to have dinner. The hosting officers of the week were eager to explain the menu and recommended local dishes that they thought everyone should try. The mood was relaxed and several officers were surprised by the cheap prices of the food. Pontus and Magnus, two officers working in two different countries and organizations were seated at the table next to me.

> The waitress arrives and the officers start to order drinks. Most of them order beer, coca cola or water. Pontus orders water to drink and Magnus starts to tease him for not ordering beer. The waitress is still standing by the table, looking confused. Pontus tells Magnus that he tries to be healthy. Magnus rolls his eyes, raises his voice, and in a jokingly manner he shouts "come on, be a man!". Pontus sighs and shouts back with an irritated voice, "I don't need to be a man". All other participants at the three tables start to laugh excessively. Pontus keeps looking annoyed and does not laugh. Someone else at their table starts to talk about the food and the décor of the restaurant.
>
> Field notes

The officer who annoyingly uttered that "he did not need to be a man" had several times before this incident seemed annoyed at similar denigrating comments. Still, Pontus often referred to his work as crime fighting despite working mainly from an office and often teased and bantered with his colleagues about other matters concerning police work or conduct. In this specific situation, he seemed to have had enough of the constant jokes focusing on masculinity and macho ideals. His comment suggest that he wanted to demonstrate his self-confidence, showing that he did not need the hegemonic masculinity artifacts (such as in this case, alcohol) in order to be a "man". Pontus' reaction can also be seen as an indication that he took his job seriously. Despite his often-joking manners, Pontus established that he was there to work, and that he put his work first and foremost.

During the course of the project, the officers continued to joke and banter, often about alcohol consumption and hegemonic masculinity. However, by the end of the project, the amount of such jokes had gradually diminished. Most of the participants seemed

to have a clear idea of which type of joke was not favoured by their colleagues and which comments were considered to be offensive.

Storytelling During Project Turnstone

A common language or repertoire developed by a group is described by Wenger (1998) and Charman (2017) as mediated through linguistic recourses such as humour, storytelling, and other cultural artifacts. In previous research of storytelling in police organizations two views can be found: 1) that storytelling is part of a "canteen culture" (Waddington 1999, 291) in order to deal with boredom and lack of excitement, and 2) that storytelling is important for the officers to learn the craft of policing (Fletcher 1996; van Hulst 2013, 624). There are different kinds of stories told by police officers; some stories are short and condensed whereas others are long and elaborate allowing for reflection. Some stories are mentioned only once, and others are re-told over and over again. Stories that are repeated might not portray an objective reality but might instead become part of a mythology carrying the wisdom of several officers (Shearing and Ericson 1991, 488-489).

This study follows in the line with van Hulst (2013, 636) who regards "storytelling at the police station" as "a social practice in which the group members ask about and tell one another what has been going on". Van Hulst's observations at a Dutch police organization suggest that storytelling among police officers is not just a way to kill time, or "educate" other officers regarding consequences of various actions, but a joint practice where officers provide comments, explanations, and analyse the stories. Stories are triggered by other stories, and often, the role and meaning of police work is discussed, evaluated and scrutinised by the officers. This was particularly important for the Power Week members given the participants' different socio-cultural backgrounds and work experiences.

However, in contrast to van Hulst's (3012) research, Project Turnstone included members from various countries and not just officers from one single unit. The practice of storytelling might therefore be especially important, as sharing stories can highlight similarities between the collaborating partners and generate common sense making. Stories can also highlight differences and sometimes lead to arguments or disagreements that needs to be resolved. My empirical data suggest three common types of stories shared by the participants in Project Turnstone that I discuss in the following sections; success stories, stories of emotional hardship, and anecdotes.

Stories of Success

Some of the most frequently repeated stories during the Power Weeks focused on exciting cases, successful arrests or detailed description of a how a particular case had been solved. Such stories often included a beginning (a crime was committed) a middle (the officers worked hard at catching the suspects) and an end (arrests were made and/or stolen goods were reclaimed).

I first encountered a "success story" during the Management Board Meeting when two border officers held a PowerPoint presentation about a recently solved case that involved several of the countries participating in the Project. They described each case carefully; how they had obtained information about the suspected persons or cars, the actual procedure of arresting the suspects, and how they had managed to find the stolen goods that were hidden. They also mentioned the various collaboration partners who had been involved, and eagerly disclosed the high financial value of the reclaimed items. Finally, they showed us (the audience) a picture of what appeared to be a pile of rocks, snow, and pine branches that were used to conceal a large amount of motorcycle boots. The officers frequently changed their tone of voice, made gestures, and jokes when telling the story. The presentation was concluded by one of the officers:

> "The new wave of crime doesn't fit the structures of our police organizations. The criminal organizations pose a challenge - they are highly organized, mobile, and work fast and efficiently. The only way to win this battle is through collaboration".
>
> Field notes

The audience listened attentively, seemingly captured by their descriptions, and asked several questions about how they had managed to deal with certain issues. As seen in the quote, the officers used words such as "new wave of crime", "a challenge", and "battle" when describing the event. When the word "battle" was uttered, I noticed that a couple of members in the audience nodded, as if in agreement with the statement.

During the course of the project, I witnessed several other situations when successful actions, surveillance or operations were described and shared among the Power Week members. Even if the financial value of reclaimed stolen goods was not always high, the officers saw every arrest as a success and happily announced when a "hit" or arrest could be added to the Turnstone statistics. When an arrest was made, they always, congratulated one another on a job well-done and complimented the officers who had helped the case by providing important information.

Another occasion of "dramatic" storytelling that I observed took place when intelligence information assembled by the project participants (from different international information systems) had led to the apprehension of several car thieves. It was the final day of the Power Week and a few officers were due to travel back home

later in the afternoon. There had been several technical problems during the week, and the officers were frustrated about the lack of results so far. There had been ongoing surveillance the day before, and I was told that a few suspects had been stopped and checked, but that no substantial arrests had been made. After a few hours, the (mostly) silent work of the officer were interrupted by another project participant who had not yet showed up at the Power Week. He was one of the officers in charge of leading a group of officers and apparently, he had spent the day joining his team in a surveillance mission based on information assembled by the Power Week team. The officer ran into the room with his wet jacket on, caught his breath, and told all the participants with an excited voice that he had fantastic news. Several "thieves", as he said, had been caught red-handed, and although they tried to escape they had not succeeded. They had "chased" the suspects for several hours according to the officer, and the operation had finally resulted in a "violent car chase" on a golf course where the suspects eventually crashed into a pond. Everyone seemed eager to hear more about the event and the officer borrowed a laptop, took out a USB stick from his jacket pocket and showed several pictures of the crashed vehicles and statistical data of the value of the seized goods that he had just assembled on the large projector screen.

The participants in the room cheered, smiled and congratulated the officer and his team who caught the suspects. It seemed that officers regarded this as an example of "good result" and a well-organized capture. After this announcement, the spirit in the room was more positive after the officers seemed to have gained new energy to continue working. Success stories, such as this one, were re-told several times during the Power Weeks and shared with all officers who had not been present the first time the story was told. The stories often contained detailed descriptions of how information (leading up to an arrest) had been found or processed.

Additionally, the officers often told one another about colleagues whom they admired. One such example is a story about a (now retired) police officer defined as a "legend" during the previously described Power Week. I heard several officers on various occasions talk admiringly about the officer's achievements of solving bank robberies in the Baltic Sea area. Some described him as a role model who managed to catch all the "bad guys". Others described him as a legend, a hero or as a man who "got things done". During one late afternoon during one Power Week when most of the officers looked tired an officer named Per shared another story that caught everyone's attention. Per and a few other officers were working on a case involving stolen cars and jokingly complained that there were not enough car chases during the Power Weeks. Per told everyone about the work of a former colleague of his who worked as a SWAT officer. The story involved "bombs, explosives, and car chases" and resembled much a scene described from an action movie. Per talked very fast and it was hard to follow everything that he said. Apparently, his colleague had entered a building despite his orders to wait, had saved someone from getting blown up, and was subsequently shot while chasing a suspect. Per concluded the story by saying that his colleague was a "tough guy" and that

he admired his bravery. When Per told the story, most of the participants looked up from their laptop screens and seemed to be paying attention. During another Power Week, a young border officer told his colleagues about a popular restaurant where someone was recently shot. This story did not generate as much response or interest as the previous stories, and the officer soon went back to his work in silence.

As observed by several researchers, most police work is rather boring and uneventful (van Hulst 2013). The work days during the Power Weeks were long, and exciting events occurred rarely. The officers talked about their job as "fighting crime" and "catching the bad guys", but most of the work conducted consisted of comparing, sharing, and evaluating information. The "success stories" of arrest and exciting events seemed to be welcome interruptions during the day. When information generated by the Power Week team led to an arrest or car chase, the success stories were described in more detail, as a "proof" to the officers that their work was worthwhile. Van Hulst (2013, 632) observed in his study that some officers were able to "make" a story out of rather mundane events. My observations of the Power Week team suggest that officers who tried to tell an exciting story or make a joke, about something rather ordinary were often ignored by the rest of the team. A few officers were more successful storytellers than others, but if the story was not exciting or focused on issues unimportant to the team, few people would take notice of it.

However, storytelling during the Power Weeks can be described as a joint practice (van Hulst 2013, 632), as the officers told stories together. In the mornings, it was common to hear a couple of officers describing last night's events for the participants who were not present at the after-work dinner or drinks that had taken place. When someone did something funny or embarrassing, the story about his/her actions would be retold several times during the day, often generating much laughter. Officers who did something particularly good would also get much credit and their actions were retold several times. The officers would fill in each other's sentences and make corrections to make the story right. It seemed especially important that all Power Weeks members heard stories of successful arrests that the team had achieved. During "uneventful" work days when no interesting findings were made and the officers seemed bored and disappointed, it was also common that someone would remind the others of a previous successful event. During one such day, Carl, for example, reminded everyone of their previous "spiral of success", as he called it, and re-told a story of an event during the preceding Power Week. A surveillance team had followed a few suspects to a harbour area. The suspects had boarded a truck containing an expensive, stolen boat ready to be shipped abroad. The officers who had participated in the surveillance arrested the suspects and the boat could be reclaimed. Carl had told the same story at the joint dinner the previous evening.

Stories of Emotional Hardship

In contrast to success stories of previous arrests or "legendary" events police officers shared during the Power Weeks, the officers also told stories of hardship that they had faced in their work. Usually, a few officers would share such stories with one another during a lunch break or when taking a break outside the office. These stories mostly concerned frustration regarding structural limitations, difficulties in interacting with the public, and described feelings of inadequacy and sadness regarding troubling events they had encountered during their work.

One such example is a conversation between two officers after a project meeting. It was at the beginning of the so-called migration crisis in Europe in 2015, and several of the officers were worried. The events had triggered memories of situations where the officers had felt powerless and frustrated. The first officer recalled a situation when she had to determine if a mother had kidnapped her child or if the father who reported her was emotionally unstable. Similarly, her male colleague described that it was hard not to be emotional during investigations concerning trafficking of children, child abuse or child murder (although the latter was rare). He told us about a case when he had to collaborate with a neighbouring country as the body of a murdered child had been found in the border zone between the two countries. He described the collaboration process, which had been very constrained, and confessed that he felt like a failure for not solving the crime.

When asked about their work most officers described their work role as "crime fighting" or as following the law, no matter the moral dilemmas that might follow. For the border officers, respecting the law, regulations, and the processes of seeking asylum the legal way were very important features of their work. At the same time, the officers expressed great annoyance that people smugglers preyed on the misfortune of others.

In 2015, the events referred to as the European migration crisis influenced the Power Week officers. A few coast guard officers participating in the project had previously been involved with aiding migrant boats and were deeply affected by the media coverage and news of migrants who had drowned or suffered during their journeys. A coast guard officer described the efforts of the coast guard in the Mediterranean Sea, worried that the help provided would not be enough. In another conversation with the same coast guard, he expressed conflicting views regarding migrants and asylum seekers: "seeking asylum is not illegal", he said, "but crossing a border without permission or with a fake passport is". In the same conversation, the officer said that he was upset that migrants "abused the system" and broke the law by not following the standard procedures of seeking asylum. By the end of the day, all officers, despite their conviction of helping people in need, maintained the importance of following the law and that it was their job to make sure that other people did the same. These events were, however, still often the subject of discussions by the project members.

Stories focusing on cases of human trafficking were rarely described as "exciting" or "thrilling", merely as a good deed where the "bad guys" had gotten "what they deserved"[60]. I heard several accounts of the cruelty of people smugglers who charged migrants high sums of money to be transported illegally into Europe under dreadful conditions.

Policing requires repeated performances of emotional labour when interacting with the public, including both "hard" (anger) and "soft" (compassion) emotions. However, emotions management in policing takes place both on the streets, as well as in administrative and supervisory assignments performed in police stations (Martin 1999, 112). During the course of Project Turnstone, officers participating in the Power Weeks rarely had interactions with the public, and the emotional labour of the officers was thus focused on "dealing" with international partners and their own emotional responses. The sharing of stories was thus part of the emotion management of officers participating in the project.

The officers generally seemed uncomfortable with talking about human trafficking and people smuggling. Some of the officers maintained that they primarily worked with property crimes and were not as affected as other border guards and border police officers working with immigrants and asylum seekers on a daily basis. The most common display of frustration by these border officers could be observed during the Power Weeks when there was no surveillance to follow, no interesting findings or information to discuss, and no recent arrests had been made. When surveillance failed or a suspect "escaped", the officers showed anger by cursing or leaving the room to take a break.

Other negative aspects of police work or difficult situations were sometimes described and joked about during the Power Weeks. "Taboo topics" such as espionage, alcohol consumption during work or bribery were frequent topics of jokes but were rarely (to my knowledge) discussed in a serious manner by the project participants. Additionally, sensitive political issues, such as the Russian annexation of the Crimea peninsula in early 2014 (and a general fear suspicion regarding unknown collaboration partners) were often joked about. One incident took place during the Power Week when the officers were working. A Finish officer had just received a telephone call that a "big fish", that is, a suspect wanted for several serious crimes had been spotted in the harbour area. Moments later a military helicopter flew by the window a few meters from the ground. Everyone in the office immediately locked out of the window and commented the event. One officer shouted (jokingly) they were being attacked. Everyone in the office laughed.

[60] Similar observations are made by Aas and Gundhus (2015) in their study of Frontex official where the officers frame their mission through humanitarianism and human rights.

Even though several officers talked at length about Russia as a potential threatening neighbour in interviews, fear of Russia was usually brought up during the Power Weeks through quick frustrated remarks or funny stories. Considering some of the officers' apprehension regarding the Baltic States, and their association with Russia, this might have been a way of "testing" the general views of the group. It was soon clear to the group that most participating officers had an apprehensive view of Russia. Joking and remarking on troubling events, such as the annexation of the Crimea area in 2014, was thus a way for the group to make sense of and diagnosing the situation together (van Hulst 2013, 632; Weick, Sutcliffe and Obstfeld 2005, 410). By talking about troubling events, the group increased their sense of community and identity. By constructing joint enemies, the group also enhanced their work identities as police and border officer "fighting" (common) cross border "enemies" (rather than one another) (Basic 2018b)[61].

Anecdotal Stories and Folk Theorizing

As described in previous sections, the officers often gladly talked about their previous experiences regarding international collaboration, describing both their fears and hopes for the current project. Their anticipations were frequently steered by previous experiences or based on recounted experiences of other officers. Stories of previous collaboration were sometimes presented as anecdotes and were often part of a more encompassing practice (van Hulst 2013, 630) of taking a walk, drinking coffee or having lunch or dinner with the other project participants.

Anecdotal stories (and teasing) observed during the Power Weeks often focused on the "national characteristics" of the officers. Each "group" (for instance, Swedish officers, Estonian officers, etc.) had its preferred "target" group whom they joked about. The Swedish and Finish officers often discussed the characteristics typical for Sweden (a proneness to having boring meeting with consensus). Teasing Finnish people about their fondness for sauna, the Baltic nationalities about having an excessive alcohol consumption or the Swedes about their tendency to arrange "long and boring meetings" seemed to be acceptable jokes, accompanied by laughter or polite smiles. This kind of teasing occurred throughout the entire project but was more frequent when the officers had established some level of friendship after a few months of collaboration.

The Power Weeks provided several opportunities for anecdotal stories, for instance when sharing a meal or during long hours of office work. When nothing exciting happened during the work day or the officers were seated next to someone whom they did not know, it was common to hear them talk about previous collaboration or

[61] The officers' construction of enemies is further discussed in Basic (2018b).

discussing "curious" organizational and cultural practises that they had encountered in their work.

These stories were often humorous, and sometimes presented as "shocking" or "sensational"; officers raised their voices, made gestures, and imitated foreign dialects. In observed conversations, officers who had worked abroad described experiencing a "culture shock" when encountering practices different from what they were used to. Having information about how other police or border organizations work was considered valuable knowledge by the police and border officers. In this sense, stories and anecdotes played important roles providing information regarding possible scenarios that the officers might encounter. This kind of representative anecdotes (Burke 1969) might seem to simply convey an amusing story or relate to a limited experience. Police anecdotes have also been dismissed as inaccurate stories of police conduct, as well as uncriticised mythology passed on from officer to officer (Shearing and Ericson 1991, 488-489). However, as sharing anecdotes is an important part of police work it is a practice in itself, and one of the things that police officer "do together".

In his study of Swedish and Swedish-Polish businessmen in the Czech Republic, the Baltic States, Poland, and Russia, Wästerfors (2004) concludes that the interviewed businessmen adopted roles as folk ethnographers when sharing stories of linking their enthusiasm for knowledge of their business partners with their motivation for getting things done. Concepts such as culture versus mentality served as organizing schemes of the businessmen, creating a vision of a folk version of ethnography. The interviewed businessmen shared stories of the importance of understanding the "local cultures from the inside" (2004, 240), and of optimism about societal transformation (in the countries where they did business), as well as their contribution to it. In addition to describing the importance of "being there", learning about their collaborating partners, the stories were also theorizing and moralizing (Wästerfors 2004, 241). Claycomb and Mulberry (2007, 191) regard such stories as "formal" or as a practice of "folk theorizing".

In a similar manner, officers participating in Project Turnstone talked about development and progress while also stressing the importance of being on equal terms with their collaboration partners, and to figure out solutions together rather than pointing fingers and lecturing. When talking about strange or funny cultural practices of their collaborating partners, officers often added stories of "self-criticism", emphasising culturally specific behaviour that other partners found strange about *them.* Often, they noted that they were aware of such "strange behaviour" and that they tried to avoid them.

One example can be found in the conversation between three officers, Juha, Henrik and Oskar, one of the initiators of the project. Oskar and I had met several times before, and he was often eager to share anecdotal stories. In this situation, however, Oskar,

Henrik, Juha mostly talked to one another. We sat at a table at the hotel lobby, talking about the next formal meeting that Oskar was organizing. It was the end of a Power Week and Oskar had visited group for a couple of days to observe the work. The theme of their conversation was "event planning" and Oskar described all the work he had to do in order to plan the meeting. The subject of "how to best organize formal meetings" was soon abandoned, and instead they described their experiences of various work events in other countries. Henrik further elaborated on differences regarding informal dinners or cultural events.

> "If I were to ask a colleague from, [a certain country] to organize a staff party, or a Christmas party, that would be exciting! It would be something completely different, anything could happen. Another thing, if I were to arrange their Christmas party, it would probably be a rather boring one. We'll eat and then say bye and go home, right, so that's not fun at all".
>
> Field notes

Juha, who worked in Finland, agreed, and listed several things that other international partners found strange about their Swedish colleagues, for example, their restricted attitude towards drinking alcohol during work lunches or dinners, their tendency to arrange a lot of "boring" meetings, their lack of authority and willingness to achieve consensus. "The police is a hierarchical organization", he said, "and sometimes someone has to take charge and decide what needs to be done!" Although criticising the Swedish way of arranging meetings, Juha also said, while laughing, that the "Finnish way" often failed, since decisions were made quickly without much consideration of the consequences. If the hasty decisions did not work in practice, they had to be re-considered and changed all over again. "This might not be as effective as we think", Juha concluded. Oskar and Henrik agreed that "a lot of boring meetings" were sometimes more necessary than many people would want you to believe[62].

The conversation between Juha, Henrik, and Oskar contained criticism of the curious practices of others, while at the same time, they showed awareness of cultural practices that others found curious about their own work context. In a subsequent interview, Henrik shared a few anecdotes regarding the impression that other officers had regarding the strange behaviour of Swedish officials.

[62] The role of formal meetings is further discussed in chapter 7.

> "Sweden has been criticised for, I read some article about French politicians and French officials who hate eating lunch with Swedes because they don't know anything about anything else except for the work that they do. I agree unfortunately, [with] the French, it's too one-dimensional, the [people in the] Swedish city administration in many cases, have no interests, [which] I think can be a problem, because you [can't] only talk to people about work!"
>
> Recorded interview

Henrik also claimed that he tried to change the perception of Swedish workers as ignorant and only talking about their jobs. He especially highlighted that he liked to talk about sports, such as football, as well as politics and art with his international colleagues. Henrik mentioned a few international colleagues whom he had gotten to know over the years. He knew about their interests and they always had something to talk about when they met, for instance ice hockey, opera music or their families. He added that "it is always valuable to learn more about their opinion regarding these things". Referring to himself and his Swedish colleagues, Henrik concluded the interview by saying: "we are bad at creating relationships with people I think. That is a problem".

In spite of Henrik's comment, the project participants appeared eager to create personal relationships with one another, seeing that the Power Weeks provided adequate space for informal interaction. Claycomb and Mulberry (2007, 190-191) identify story telling (or narratives) as an important exchange between individual that allow for a great amount of shared meaning. When people share stories with collaborating partners they re-experience the events that are told, allowing others to interpret their actions and words that define their praxis. As noted by Collins (2004), sharing stories of situations that you have experienced indicate a willingness from both sides to act as an audience to these stories and to take turns in telling the stories. Even if the content of the stories told is not entirely true, and mainly act as dramatic performances and "fillers" for having something to talk about. Conversational rituals of this kind can thus generate and cement social ties (Collins 2004, 84-85). As seen in the case of Project Turnstone, the officers' tendency to share stories depicting their work, of mishaps as well as successes, the group established a common understanding of their practises, as well as a stronger sense of group solidarity.

The "Circle of Trust"

By the end of Project Turnstone a few participants sat outside of their work office and discussed the outcome of the project. They seemed to agree that the Power Weeks had enabled them to create a group of trusted colleagues. These officers (who had frequently

participated in the Power Weeks and in the formal meetings) were perceived as reliable, had the right incentives, and where willing to go the "extra mile" to do their job well. Working together during the project had made it clear who they wanted to keep in contact with and who was interested in collaborating. This group was referred to as the "circle of trust" by the officers.

The final Power Week organized during Project Turnstone took place in an office building in a harbour area in early autumn. As I approached the building, I saw several of the participating officers standing outside in the morning sun, talking, smoking, and drinking coffee. When they saw me they looked happy, waiving and greeting me as I arrived. They had just been to the nearby kiosk to buy some snacks to keep them going until lunch. We entered the building and I recognized the woman sitting at the reception. It had been more than a year since the previous Power Week members gathered in this same building. Everything looked as I remembered it and the officers worked in the same office as last time. I recognized all the officers in the room. Several of them looked up and greeted me, others were too concentrated on their work to take notice. Several of the officers were smartly dressed in shirts and suits, but the atmosphere in the room appeared relaxed; the officers talked loudly, laughed, and seemed to joke with one another.

Similar to previous Power Weeks, loud phone signals often interrupted the officers' work and no one seemed to mind. One officer sat in front of all the other participants taking notes and listing cases and events in an excel document. Filip walked back and forth in the room while talking on the phone. He announced to the others that there were several officers on call in case something interesting was to be found during the week. One of them gave Filip the thumbs up.

A few minutes later, Henrik loudly complained about having problems with his laptop. After restarting it several times he seemed to have given up and told the host officer that they needed to call some "technical guy" again. I took my chance and asked Henrik for an interview. We went to an empty office in the same corridor as the Power Week room and started talking about the project. I reminded him that the project would soon come to an end and asked him to describe his experiences. The project had exceeded Henrik's expectations as strong bonds and work relations had been formed. He described that the officers now knew exactly who to contact and what to do in various situations. He mentioned the weekly phone meetings that they had tried to implement, saying that such organized meetings were unnecessary now that they all knew one another.

> "Now if we need to ask something we just call each other, we don't need the formal structures to be able to ask questions. We have been able to keep the contacts going in-between the Power Weeks, and we will most certainly try to continue this work together after the project has ended".

I pointed out that Henrik still seemed to have some technical problems with his laptop and asked if they had managed to solve some of these difficulties. Henrik admitted that it was extremely frustrating when the "tools" did not work, pointing out that it was an on-going struggle to keep everything up and running. "It has improved a little during the project", he said, "now we know more what to expect, and we have to deal with as best as we can". I later heard similar accounts of the other officers participating in the final Power Weeks.

Although there were still problems obstructing collaboration (such as technical and structural problems) the officers claimed that they had established their sense of mission, identified themselves as a team or a community, and were eager to finally "get to work". Alexander, for example, happily informed me that he had managed to identify colleagues who were both trustworthy and one hundred percent committed to catching cross border criminals. He referred to this group as a "circle of trust", where only the officers categorized as the "right people" or the "right guys" were to be included. Alexander said that "the right people" were those who were willing to sacrifice free time, uninterrupted meals or sleep to get the job done. He also told me that he had found several people whom he could call anytime, even during weekends or holidays: "They know that we are always short of time, and they will answer anyway. We have this exchange, if I help them when I am off work a few times, they will help me when they have the day off". According to Alexander, the officers who had proved their skills, commitment, loyalty, and dedication were categorised as the "right guys" with the right attitude and work motivation.

Important features for successful collaboration, according to interviewed officers, were to understand one another, and to appreciate one another's work practices and "organizational cultures". Another officer similarly maintained that closer and easy-going relationships with the international partners had developed during the project. "Nowadays I can easily turn to my colleagues and ask questions without fuss, without unnecessary questions that slow down the process", he concluded. He also added that his superiors were very pleased that Project Turnstone had organized a few meetings where several representatives could meet and share information and talk about current problems. "Because of this", he concluded, "we didn't need to have our annual update meeting with the chiefs because they had already spoken and knew all the problems (laughing). In other words, some bureaucratic practices (such as formal meetings) were proven redundant and had been replaced with more informal conversations. Dima also stated that he was more comfortable with sharing information with the people who were included on their email list. Dima referred to the email list where the Power Week members were added. This email list was used to keep everyone up to date about on-going cases and to send feedback on what had happened in between the Power Weeks.

"It's not safe to have to many people on the list, he added, "we only include a few, the few that we can trust".

By the end of the project, the remaining participating officers thus claimed to be more at ease with working together quickly and efficiently without many questions or concerns. Observations during the remaining days of the Power Week also suggest a more harmonious work group with members who knew how to get the work done. The officers started to work immediately when they arrived at the office in the morning. They had a quick start-up gathering where they informed one another of on-going investigations and cases that they were currently working on. They asked one another questions regarding recent information and seemed to know who had the answers for their various questions. The officers joked and laughed during their breaks and quickly went back to work afterwards. Most of them seemed comfortable and familiar with the group and the work tasks that they performed.

Finding "the Right Guys"?

A community of practice is characterised by stability and change, by old-timers and newcomers (or insiders and outsiders), and transformation and reproduction. Members of a community who share social, distributed, and collaborative knowledge have material and social practices for determining who is to be included and who is to be trusted (Van House, Butler and Schiff 1998). The officers' collaborative work included a certain level of apprenticeship, not in the sense that they learned from one "master", but by watching, doing, and listening to other participants. The skills and knowledge possessed by the participants were also negotiated and changed in the process. During the course of the project, the officers were required to document their collaborative work, but the goal of achieving bilateral collaboration was highlighted by the most actively involved officers. The tools and practices of the community were dynamic, and the "border policing community" slightly changed during the course of the project by bringing in new members and by excluding others (Van House, Butler and Schiff 1998).

Frequent participation and active negotiation eventually fostered mutual engagement among the remaining officers. As the group grew closer socially and emotionally, the focus on the participants' national backgrounds or their individual differences slightly shifted towards the skills of each participating officer and reciprocal knowledge sharing. Still, mutual engagement does not necessarily mean equality among group members (Mitra 2008; Wenger 1998, 78). A few participants who had been strong advocates of the Power Weeks from the beginning continued to actively engage in the group.

However, the enterprise of the group was never fully determined by any individual participant. Although the initiators had organized the project and made the joint work weeks possible, the Power Weeks did not have any clear "supervision" or leader; the

participants were left to their own devices to negotiate the community conditions. Even if some participants seemed to have more power than others initially (for example, when encouraging the others to work on a specific case or taking the initiative to have short up-date meetings) the work practices evolved into a communal response to that situation. Officers who did not engage in the mutual practices of the group (for example not participating in joint lunches or dinners), who did not show commitment or talked negatively about the project did not participate in the final remaining Power Weeks. Some officers who were originally only "peripheral members", that is, not fully included and accepted as trustworthy participants became core members after the Power Weeks.

As the group continued to work together, the members were able to take on more responsibility and learned new skills. The communal aspect of a work group could thus be strengthened by establishing clear expectations of the individual's identities within the group (Mitra 2008, 229-230). When the participants had discussed their expectations of the project with one another and had (to some extent) agreed on certain goals, they seemed more comfortable with working together. The remaining officers were identified as integral parts of a team, or as the officers said, as part of the group of "the right guys".

When I first heard the officers mention the expression of "the right guys" I took it for granted that the word "guys" was used in the American sense, referring to a group of people comprising of both men and women. I later heard Swedish officers talk about the group as "a good group of guys" (in Swedish, *en bra grupp med killar*), only referring to male officers. Even though a few female officers were included into the circle of trust, observations suggest that the male officers often determined the content and process of the conversations, levels of jokes, and the general group habitus of the Power Week team. However, I did not observe that the male intelligence officers demeaned their female co-workers or used degrading language towards them (as has been frequently observed in research of street-level police officers) (Prokos and Padavic 2002). Several officers had openly mentioned that they "accepted" female officers, officers of a different ethnic origin as well as officers who identified themselves as homosexual "as long as they did their job".

After these observations, I was interested in hearing more about the female officers' impressions of the group dynamics. One afternoon I asked Mina to join me for a coffee and a chat in the recreation room. Mina usually worked in Finland, she participated in several of the Power Weeks, and had been involved in the project from the very beginning. This week, Mina and two other female officers participated in the Power Week. We were the only ones in the lunchroom, and Mina told me that she felt very much included in the Power Week group. She had not experienced any sexist jokes targeting female officers during the project so far, and she though that there was generally a very high level of respect between the colleagues. Mina, admitted, however, that the field of intelligence policing was still a very male dominated area. Nevertheless,

compared to when Mina started working in the border guard unit the number of female intelligence officers had increased and Mina was positive regarding future progressions. After thinking for a few seconds, she said:

> There are still limits to what you can say and do [as a female officer], but often, the guys joke and act like guys without meaning any harm, and they mostly tease and bully each other. Once you are in the group, no matter if you are women or men, you are accepted as an insider, you are one of the guys.
>
> Field interview

Mina continued describing that her work situation (outside of the project) may be rather specific, as she was a border intelligence officer with only a handful of colleagues working in an office setting. In her opinion, the "macho" behaviour often associated with police work might be more prominent in other more "active" units, such as street level patrols or special task forces. Other female officers whom I spoke to later, also stated that they saw themselves as part of the "team", although in my own observations, the female officers were not as visible or active in the social settings. Most of the female officers said that their organizations were still generally "masculine" and that women still represented a minority, especially in the field of intelligence analysis. They also claimed that the masculine ethos or "macho culture" not necessarily excluded women from group solidarity, maintaining that they felt like "one of the guys"[63].

Previous studies of gender and the labour market have observed various strategies of survival for women working in male dominated work. For example, women can downplay gender differences and seek to become "one of the boys" in order to live up to the male norm (both socially and professionally) (Bloksgaard 2011, 16; Finstad 2005). In a similar way, Prokos and Padavic (2002) highlight the often-ambiguous positions of female police officers; "strong women" are compared to men, which is unsuitable, and weak women are not fit for the physical and emotional demands of police work. The accounts of interviewed female officers convey a dominant masculine ethos, and that female colleagues often adapted to the "collective delusion" (Waddington 1999, 299) of masculinity and crime fighting, identifying themselves as one of the "guys". One female participant stood out from the group as she was often wearing stereotypical feminine attire compared to other female officers (such as skirts, blouses, and dresses) and noticeable makeup. I did not hear the officers comment on her appearance but noticed (what I interpreted as) a few sceptical glances the first time she participated. After a while, when the other officers realised that she was skilled at

[63] When I heard other officers use the word "guys" in English, I asked them to clarify how they used the word. One officer always said "guys and girls" when talking about his colleagues. The term guys", which referred to men only was more commonly used throughout the project.

her job and liked to make jokes, one of them said that he was "happy that she was included in the group".

In the context of Project Turnstone, the criteria for being included into "the circle of trust" or "the right guys" mainly seemed to be one's dedication and skills rather than personal characteristics or gender. In this sense, by "right guys" the officers meant both men and women who passed the "test", who measured up to the criteria (or the rites of passage) of the community. As the collaboration process developed, more women participated in the joint activities, and as a result, the voices of the female officers became more dominant by the end of the project. However, as this project mainly consisted of male officers, by the end of the project, most of the core members of the group were male intelligence officers.

In-group mentality

As noted above, by the end of the project, the officers referred to their work group as "the circle of trust", arguing that their collaboration and performed practices had allowed them to identify trustworthy members with the right "attitude and motivation". According to Cook, Rice and Gerbasi (2004), one disadvantage of closed networks or groups of exchange is that they limit access to opportunities outside of the group. The officers admitted to being wary of including new partners, emphasising that the close collaboration would only continue as long as the same members remained in the group. If new members were to be included, the negotiation and formalisation processes would again be necessary.

I was made more aware of the "in-group mentality" of the Power Week team during my conversation with Matti, an intelligence officer with the task of coordinating intelligence information with surveillance and other types of "actions" during some of the Power Weeks. As I rarely observed the work outside of the Power Week office during the Power Weeks, I scheduled an interview with Matti who was in charge of deciding which of the cases worked on by Power Week team were important enough to follow up[64]. After processing and assessing the information sent, the task of Matti and the other officers at the command centres was to delegate surveillance or operative work. The problem, according to him, was that the information that was sent by the Power Week participants was unstructured and difficult to assess. The officers at the command centres only received fragments of information and needed more thorough information regarding the various cases in order to estimate which cases were the most urgent. Even though the project initiators claimed to have sent reports about the Power Week activities and operative actions, Matti had not read these reports and also requested more feedback concerning the outcome of activities taking place during the

[64] Similar procedures were arranged at all the participating organizations during the Power Weeks and the team members were always in close contact with their home organizations via phone or email.

Power Weeks. He claimed that a lack of feedback and information made him distance himself from the work task, prioritising other cases or assignments.

The fact that officers outside of the "Power Week office" requested more information regarding their work, and felt excluded, suggested an increased "in-group" mentality of the Power Week team. Matti needed information and reports regarding previous events in order to perform his job properly and with enthusiasm. He said that "rational decisions" of which cases to focus on were often based on sentiment as well as guidelines and organizational rules. As he was not given such information from the Power Week team, he did not feel included in the group or shared their engagement with the cases that they worked on.

The Emergence of a (New) Community

Police work that is carried out in the streets has often been regarded as more "valuable" than station work which is often associated with service work, consisting of meetings, bureaucratic practices and other "boring" aspects of police work (Waddington 1999, 299). This pragmatic and anti-theoretical perspective is typical for the occupational habitus of street-level police officers who claim that few work hours are spent on what they consider to be "real police work", such as catching or chasing criminals (Chan 2004, 343; Reiner 2010). On the one hand, the intelligence border officers participating in the Power Weeks (who also worked with analysing intelligence information even in their everyday work) rejected administrative paperwork, and glorified the same hands-on, pragmatic view of police work as the street level officers described by Chan (2004) and Reiner (2010). On the other hand, the collaborative office work performed during the Power Weeks was definitely regarded as important and "real" police work by the participating officers. Criminal intelligence was described as an important pro-active (as well as re-active) version of policing that was often undervalued by other law enforcement officers.

Interviewed intelligence officers took pride in learning their trade to the best of their abilities, describing their job as "problem solving". Identifying patterns and collecting data regarding complex, international criminal networks or organizations was considered quite complicated and demanding, requiring lots of practice and dedication. By the end of the project, interviewed officers stated that they were more comfortable with sharing information and helping each other out, trusting that their partners would return the favour some other time. Interviewed officers claimed that they had reached a "new level of collaboration" that distinguished them from other law enforcement organizations in Europe. During the Power Weeks, the interactions, discussions, stories, and jokes shared by the officers did not only establish their group as a "work community", but also enhanced their shared understanding of their role as "international border police officers". Although the implementation of joint

investigation teams (fostering international police collaboration) has existed since the late 1990s (Block 2010), the project participants regarded the work structure organized during the Power Weeks as "something new". Although a majority of officers had previously participated in various forms of international collaboration, most described that such collaborating efforts had lacked the context necessary for community building.

Studies of the growth of transnational policing (Bowling 2009, 149; Sheptycki 1998b) have taken major interest in new institutions and payed less attention to how local police officers have become part of a more global world order (Sausdal 2018). Project Turnstone can be regarded as such a global network involving "local" intelligence officers working in a more "global arena". The rise of international and transnational police collaborations can create new policing communities where cultural practices of policing and notions of "what it means to be a police officer" are re-negotiated and changed. As described in the previous chapters, officers interviewed for this study often displayed an elitist view, distancing themselves from national police organizations which, according to them, had an inadequate view of cross border crime. Such a "border police identity" separated from national police forces united the officers who participated in the project. In contrast to understandings of the public police (bound up to the individualistic, traditional and "justice"-oriented) (Gundhus 2005, 130) interviewed police officers saw themselves as future oriented and collaboration-driven.

The Power Week participants argued that criminal intelligence was "the future of policing" in a world which they described as increasingly connected and intertwined. When asked if they believed that the EU would have only one "international EU police force" in the future, they responded that they were already heading in that direction. However, many of them were sceptical regarding this, claiming that national differences and different cultural practices would always obstruct hands-on, bilateral police collaboration. They nevertheless regarded the collaborative format presented by Project Turnstone as one of the most constructive methods of achieving ("successful") cross border collaboration between intelligence officers.

During my final meeting with the project initiators the "success" of Project Turnstone was further discussed. I met Lars, Oskar, and Mona at their office in Stockholm to discuss the outcome of the project and the future of Project Turnstone. Oskar, Lars, and Mona had just started working on the final reports regarding Project Turnstone and told me that they saw the project as successful. Oskar was also very excited to tell me about the recent developments; the Power Week team had been invited to work with officers from Europol and Mona said that it was a sign that the project was efficiently and successfully performed. The initiators seemed proud that the information channels of Europol sent to officers in Europe had featured a story of Project Turnstone. According to Oskar, this was an important acknowledgement serving as a "quality stamp" for the project. Oskar told me that the most important

thing for him and the other officers to do during the last remaining months of the project was to "advertise" Turnstone. The main goal was to be able to continue with the Power Weeks, and maybe to expand the project model to other European countries.

A few months later, I was told that Oskar and the others were shooting a short film about the project. I received a copy of the film on a USB stick a few weeks after our final meetings. In the film, key participants were interviewed about the project, the project initiators described the benefits of the project and their main motivation for initiating the project in the first place[65]. I was told that the film would serve as a "commercial" for advertising the project and to inspire future collaborations with other organizations.

Sustaining Collaboration?

Although regarding Project Turnstone was perceived successful by most participants, several interviewed officers were worried that the commitment and collaboration would die out alongside the termination of the project. In my conversation with Alexander about the future of Project Turnstone during a Power Week, he described that the collaboration that had been established during the project certainly would continue "as long as the same people stayed on their posts". For Alexander, the long process of establishing the right partners was necessary if collaboration operation should be achieved at all. Alexander further stated that the networks created by Project Turnstone were highly based on a few individuals included in this group. These individuals had been assessed and categorised as trustworthy, mostly during the interactions taking place in the Power Weeks. This was an important process for the "intelligence world" he said, and he hoped that one day the system of exchanging information would work even if new members were included in the group. Here, Alexander confirms that the group was apprehensive of "strangers" and would take precautions when accepting new partners. He nevertheless wanted to expand their collaboration, and if possible, include more partners into their "circle of trust". This would, nevertheless, require more time, effort, and future collaboration projects similar to Project Turnstone.

Before the officers could include new partners, they had to make sure that their recently established community would be sustained. Keeping communication channels up to date, I was told, was a full-time occupation well worth the effort. When not meeting one another in person, the easiest way for the officers to communicate was via phone or email. If the officers knew one another fairly well phoning was the preferred method as it was the quickest way of getting or giving information. Prior to Project Turnstone,

[65] After the project's termination, the film was distributed to the participating organizations on USB memory sticks. My co-field research partner and I did not participate in this film.

however, phoning your colleagues had been a rather formal process often involving a few curtsey comments and questions in addition to providing or receiving important information. Most participating officers whom I talked to during the last two Power Weeks agreed that they all had several new contacts whom they could call and ask for help at any time. This would mean that slow, bureaucratic email processes could often be avoided. A few officers had put their minds into sustaining interpersonal contact and called their partners regularly to ask about the current situation, even if they had no pressing information to share. The Power Weeks had in some ways simplified this process, as the officers met on a regular basis and always were up to date regarding the events and issues taking place at the other organizations.

Filip was one of the officers who was most dedicated to keep information channels and personal contact networks up to date. By the end of the project, he was happy that he had gotten to know several new colleagues whom he could contact at any time. He was also a little worried that the collaboration would become slow and difficult if the informal communication channels were not sustained. "Now when I know people and whom to call, I can easily call someone and ask questions and get an answer in a few minutes. I also go the official way and send requests, but it takes so much longer, time that we don't have", Filip explained. He added: "it's important that we don't forget anyone, that we keep in touch regularly and keep each other up to date". He also said that if such efforts should be useful there had to be an interest from all collaborating partners in continuing their collaboration.

Loyalty and feedback

For the Power Week officers, a strong commitment and loyalty were required in order to become included into the "circle of trust". According to Peterson and Uhnoo (2013, 37), loyalty is institutionally enforced and demanded in certain life enclaves, amongst others the police force. They further argue that the structural mechanisms of the police organization, and especially police culture strive to harness the commitment of police officers (2013, 40). In this study, documents with intelligence information and written feedback were valued as important artifacts, that were only exchanged between trusting partners.

The implication of sharing important artifacts (in the form of emails and reports) was thus a sign of great trust and commitment. A sign of continued loyalty was to keep communication channels up to date and continue to share information and feedback about joint missions and cases. Although interviewed officers claimed to have solved most communication problems during the Power Weeks, poor language skills still obstructed daily contact between collaborating partners in terms of written feedback; it was more difficult to sustain collaboration with someone who had poor English skills over the phone or email than when talking to that person face to face. "Sometimes we send a report to for instance Latvia or Finland, and we don't get any answer", a young intelligence officer said. "Next week we send another report or information and we get

so much feedback! I think it depends on whether the person who works at that time has trouble writing in English or not, you never know what you are going to get back".

Several other officers mentioned that they felt less committed when not receiving any feedback or reports about the work that they had performed. In general terms, the lack of feedback had been a great source of frustration for many officers after the previous Power Weeks. A senior officer whom I interview in the end of project especially brought my attention to the importance of giving and receiving feedback when working with intelligence information. The lack of feedback from partners in Europe had previously been a recurrent problem but the officer had now seen a great improvement after the implementation of Project Turnstone. "Our organizations, and others have taken more initiative and it has improved greatly", he said. He then repeated the process of analysing intelligence: 1) collecting, 2) processing, 3) analysing, 4) and sharing. "The last step is the most important one, he said, "there is no *point* if a few people here in my office create an intelligence unit and start sending each other documents and sharing secrets with each other, no one else outside this office benefits from that!" After thinking for a few seconds, he added: "it is quite a human thing, don't you think, if you always send someone information and never get anything *back* you eventually lose interest". Failing to provide feedback and keeping in touch made the officers question the commitment and loyalty of these group members. In conclusion, the officer said that collaboration is about exchange, about helping each other out, and getting help in return. In his view, collaboration would cease to exist when the officers saw different goals and visions, and ultimately, stopped working together.

Concluding Remarks

Generating a Shared Knowledge Base

The focus of this chapter has been on the informal practices that helped the Power Week participants to build a community of practice. The underlying assumption is that working, socialising, and learning are social processes (Lave and Wenger 1991). Learning and socialising are intertwined, being the outcome of social interactions, rather than the intentional, cognitive work of isolated individuals (Lave and Wenger 1991; Brown and Duguid 2001; Wenger 1998). In this sense, the Power Weeks were forums in which the participating officers "compared" experiences, work methods, and conduct. This was achieved through sharing stories, anecdotes, joking, and informal socializing.

These informal interactions were necessary for the officers to be able to collect and discuss the lessons and tricks that they had learnt into a knowledge base. Officers shared stories focusing on 1) success or exciting events, 2) stories of difficult situations or emotional hardship, 3) and anecdotal stories focusing on previous experiences of

international collaboration or observations of socio-cultural practices of other border police officers. At the same time, jokes, as well as anecdotal stories shared during Project Turnstone were often analytical and argumentative, incorporating opinions regarding the practices of other collaborating partners (Claycomb and Mulberry 2007, 191).

The most frequent jokes shared by the officers focused on various national characteristics, the officers' appearance and conduct, the behaviour of suspected criminals, and difficult situations (such as for instance the Russian annexation of the Crimea area in 2014) and a general distrust of unknown collaboration partners. When talking about collaboration obstacles, several officers (from all participating organizations) described a general distrust and fear of Russia. Jokes regarding the "dangerous Russian", as well as jokes regarding criminals (the "others") helped the officers establish joint enemies and gave them a sense of group identification and a common goal. The events taking place (as well as the stories and jokes shared) during the Power Weeks were often described and retold several times during the duration of project. In this sense, the officers created a common repertoire of experiences that they had been involved in together, as a group.

The informal aspects of the Power Weeks, when the officers shared stories and jokes, talked about their personal lives over a beer, had dinner together, watched YouTube clips, talked about their favourite films or teased one another can be regarded both as a means of increasing group identification (Wenger 1998, 80), and building a community knowledge base by testing the limits of opinions of their partners. In the course of the Power Weeks, the interactions enabled the officers to establish a set of words, stories, and cases that have become a shared repertoire for their practice (Wenger and Wenger-Trayner 2015, 2).

Finding Trusted Colleagues

Communities of practices might become sources of trust, as insiders have undergone scrutiny by questions such as speaking the same language, sharing the same interpretive grids of seeing the world, of whom to trust and whom not to trust, who can be regarded a core and who a peripheral member of the community (Lave and Wenger 1991; Van House, Butler and Schiff 1998).

One of the most important questions asked by the participating officers was "can he or she be trusted with the secret and sensitive information that we work with?" For the project participants, the Power Weeks were arenas where such questions needed to be answered. According to interviewed officers, successful collaboration was not just about agreeing on specific ways of working or streamlining rules and legislations, but also about building trust and getting to know one another.

The aspiration of the officers was that hands-on work would allow them sufficient time and space to determine whether the participants were trustworthy, and ultimately, whether they are the "right guys". If the commitment was there, as one officer

described, they could always work on building trust and hopefully, establish a collaboration network of trusted practitioners. Observations also suggest that positioning between one another was necessary. The Power Week team had no formal supervision and negotiated work methods, positions, and practices jointly as a group. However, a few core members often set the tone for what was appropriate behaviour of the group. Jokes and stories helped officers mediate tensions, and conflicts, but were also used to criticise officers and to demonstrate to someone that he or she was not completely accepted or trusted by the group. For instance, when some jokes were made by a few participants, other officers refrained from laughing, saying that "such jokes are not fun". On the other hand, jokes or stories that were appreciated by the majority of the participants were retold over and over again, since they corresponded with the general aims of the group. In this way, the group established norms of "proper group conduct" during the Power Weeks.

Despite the seemingly relaxed and collegial jargon of the group, participating male officers occasionally used a gendered language, for instance by referring to the whole group as "guys" (meaning men). This type of gendering might be based on taken-for-granted tendencies and not necessarily a form of hostility (Prokos and Padavic 2002; Reskin 2000). Female officers were not the subject of jokes, teasing or downgrading comments and did not convey feelings of alienation by the rest of the participating male officers. On the other hand, being excluded from various jokes, stories, and anecdotes made it more difficult for the few female participants to fully partake in the community building of the Power Week group. Positions in the group were, however, not static and the members' position as insiders or outsiders shifted during the project based on situation or practice. For example, a newly arrived member might be ignored by the group until he or she provided the group with an important piece of information that helped solve cases. Officers who did not seem interested in collaborative work or the project were not perceived as core members and were eventually excluded from social gatherings, informal conversations, and work sessions of group.

9. Concluding Discussion

I started out my ethnographic investigation of Project Turnstone with the idea of studying the barriers to and facilitators of transnational collaboration, focusing on the broader context of cultural, institutional, social, political differences, and similarities. However, during the course of the project, it has become clear for me that collaboration may be better understood by following the officers in their everyday work practices and interactions. Thus, the main question that has come to the fore is: How have the officers, through their joint activities and in spite of the diversity of their socio-cultural backgrounds, developed a trust-based relationship that has served as a basis for sharing sensitive information and knowledge - elements that were central for collaboration? Such a question has led me to focus on the Power Weeks, which consist of the main activities performed by the project participants.

Project Turnstone was a response to the changing environment of border policing in the EU and the increasing demands of cross-border collaboration. Growing security concerns regarding trans-boundary criminality and enhanced transport and communication technologies have led to various developments within transnational policing. In several instances, responses to such changes have been the implementation of transnational police work, joint investigation teams, and intelligence sharing (Stenning and Shearing 2012). As ample research has shown, cross-border or transnational collaboration often entails a myriad of obstacles, for instance, structural, legal, and organizational differences regarding the work methods, ranks, and mandates of officers that can hamper collaboration. Collaboration between organizations can also highlight differences regarding identities and goals, and competition between collaborating actors (Schruijer 2008). Inadequate knowledge of work partners, different incentives and interests, physical and technological limitations, as well as excessive bureaucracy are other obstacles that collaborating officers might face (Aas and Gundhus 2015; Block 2008a; Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017).

The officers interviewed for this study described similar obstacles but maintained throughout the project that individuals could bridge such structural and bureaucratic obstacles by working together. The participants had previously encountered "failed" or ineffective collaboration and thus organized the project in a manner that they thought would foster personal, face-to-face interaction and more "successful" collaboration. Distrust among officers and organizations is generally perceived as a major obstacle for collaboration; police and border officers are expected to handle secret and sensitive

information regarding transnational crime with care, and thus, sharing such information with international partners requires a high level of trust (Bigo 2008; Block 2008b; Hufnagel and McCartney 2017). As claimed by officers interviewed for this study, the only way to achieve mutual trust and respect between officers was to share experiences, work together on a hands-on, everyday basis, and get to know one another. Interacting with one another during work, as well as during more informal after work activities, was the only way, according to the officers to achieve trust-based relationships and eventually a work group engaged in collaboration.

Methodologically, this study draws on ethnographic observations of everyday work practices and interviews with the officers participating in Project Turnstone. I have observed the participating officers while working together, attending formal meetings, producing reports, sharing sensitive information, and profiling suspects, as well as during the more informal practices taking place during after-work activities. The project has enabled participant observation in a recluse environment not often accessible for social researchers. During the Power Weeks, I have sought to observe the various face-to-face interactions and negotiations that have taken place as the officers were performing their work activities together. I have paid attention to the ways they told one another jokes, heroic and less heroic stories, and shared informal and formal exchanges.

Central to my interest were the negotiation processes as they attempted to define who they are, the meaning of their mission and determinants of its success, and how their work should be performed. This joint mission, shared linguistic repertoire, and common sense of identity have been instrumental in creating a "transnational border community", a community based on their own work practices. This community of practice has proved to be the basis for pursuing their collaboration. Such a community was not the outcome of an external mandate, rather, it evolved in an informal way, through processes of interactions, negotiations, and working together.

Drawing on my ethnographic material, informal interactions and negotiations have enabled the creation of a work group identity bound by motivation, alignment, and practice. In this setting, coordinating challenges arise on a daily basis, prompting the officers to develop a practice culture of their own making. Participation in a practice entails taking part in both formal and informal activities (Pacanowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo 1982, 116-117). In this sense, occupational identities and cultures are not only shaped by formal work practices and organizational structures, but by also by informal social practices that straddle organizational borders.

Accounting for Motivation and Joint Enterprise

Police work has been often accounted for in terms of essential categories, such as the type of vocation or calling by officers who strive to make a difference in society (Gundhus 2005; Loftus 2010; Reiner 2010). Other studies also treat police work in terms of an underlying tension between the expectations of what police work involves and the daily realities of police work. The intelligence officers participating in Project Turnstone face various specific contradictions regarding their sense of mission. On the one hand, the task of border police officers is to protect their national borders against outside threats. On the other hand, European border police officers are brought together to collaborate with officers from neighbouring countries. This place the officers in an ambivalent position: their neighbouring countries are both their work partners and the "source" of the cross-border criminals. This particular ambivalence make collaboration difficult, demanding that the officers create a common understanding and interpersonal connections.

One of the central aims of this study has been to describe the officers' accounts of engaging in transnational collaboration despite a general apprehension of sharing secret and sensitive information with unknown partners. The study provides a processual account of trust-building that has occurred ongoingly over a period of two years, focusing on how trust and a community of practice has developed from on the ground level. In line with previous research (Bigo 2008; Block 2008a; 2008b; Hufnagel and McCartney 2017), cross-border and transnational intelligence sharing is often perceived as a risk-taking by collaborating officers. Officers interviewed for this study especially highlighted the risk of corruption, fearing that secret information regarding organized crime groups could end up in the "wrong hands".

The question is thus: how have the officers handled their distrust and apprehension of working with unknown cross-border partners? When asking the officers why they had chosen to participate in the project, most claimed that working together was the only way to "win the battle" over cross border crime. The officers expressed an amplified sense of mission of doing something good for society. In order to work together, the officers constructed a joint enemy, the "cross border criminal", whom they all struggled to apprehend. Although the officers mostly talked about having apprehended cross border criminals from the Baltic Sea area, interviewed officers emphasised the importance of protecting Europe from threats from outside of Europe.

Furthermore, the officers formed an identity of "European border police officers" who were united in their mission to protect the EU against external threats or cross boundary criminality. Despite working in different organizations and in different countries, the officers agreed that they (as intelligence border police officers) had a better understanding of the contemporary crime situation in Europe than street-level officers. Previous experiences of collaboration and meetings with international partners had also

taught them most European border officers (and officers in the rest of the world) shared a "border guard codex", meaning a shared sense of mission in fighting cross border crime. This sense of mission and "joint effort" thus served as the incentive to engage in transnational collaboration. Additionally, when talking about the project, interviewed police and border officers were often eager to emphasise that collaboration would be easy to implement as all countries participating in the project belonged to the EU and, despite their historical pasts, shared a common European "understanding". The reason for implementing the project was a shared understanding that the Baltic Sea area was a location with specific problems and challenges that only border (police) organizations in that area could fully grasp.

Despite observed claims of wanting to protect the public, police officers have often paradoxically demonstrated profound cynicism towards the people that they police and towards police work in general (Loftus 2010; Van Maanen 1978, 117). The border officers interviewed for this study similarly regarded their street level or rank and file police colleagues in the Baltic Sea area as rather naïve and "unaware" of the extent of cross-border crime in the area. The officers also shared an understanding of the naiveté and lack of knowledge of the general public concerning issues of cross border criminality.

Such shared understandings emphasised the benefits of themselves as especially competent and this coupled with an assumption of the benefit of hands-on collaboration. They were convinced that the only way to "get better at what they do" was to work together and share their eclectic knowledge, which is difficult to catch in formal reports.

The officers held their collective competence in high esteem and were eager to find more like-minded officers. The officers were thus engaged in a joint practice and eager to sustain and develop this practice over time (Brown and Duguid 2001; Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998). Indeed, despite the officers' strong incentive to perform practice-based work and learn from one another, previous experiences and reports had thought officers to be apprehensive of sharing secret and sensitive information with unknown partners. A "strong conviction" and joint sense of mission had so far not been enough to establish successful collaboration.

If increasing international collaboration was the primary goal of Project Turnstone, increasing mutual trust between participating officers was crucial for achieving that goal. Even if some officers did not see the establishment of bilateral networks as more important than providing proof of their immediate work effort, all participating officers agreed that the only way to develop and "get better at what they do" was through working together and getting acquainted with one another. Interviewed officers identified a shared commitment and common goals, but had previously lacked the opportunity to work, share knowledge, and learn together on a daily basis. The officers emphasised the importance of performing their work together at the same location since

personal interaction was the only way to truly get to know one another, learn from each other, establish trust, and recognise common goals and motivation.

Working Together

As noted above, one of my main aims was to understand how collaboration became possible. My empirical observations suggest that the joint work weeks, referred to as the Power Weeks, organized during the project were essential for establishing a sense of community.

The Power Weeks were joint work activities when a group of officers met and worked together for a week at a time periodically during two years. The main focus of these weeks was to provide space where participating officers could work together proactively with every-day work tasks. The Power Weeks were scheduled by the project initiators, but the officers were free to organize the structure and focus of these weeks without direct supervision. The name (decided by the participating officers) implies action and joined forces putting all their available "power" into their work. Although several officers highlighted that the main goal of these activities was to catch and apprehend suspects, a majority of the participants claimed that bilateral exchange between the officers was the main "success" of the Power Weeks. As the officers usually lived and worked in different countries, these weeks were crucial for them to create a sense of camaraderie. During these weeks, the officers engaged in negotiation and formalisation regarding the project (Wenger 1998), their work goals, and their own occupational identities. The Power Weeks were thus important participatory events where the officers worked together but also, more importantly, could discuss, negotiate, and re-establish differences, challenges, expectations, and everyday work practices.

Negotiation and formalisation

Although having identified a common goal and motivation (mainly to fight transboundary criminality and protect European borders from external threats), the interactions during the Power Weeks were not conflict free. The Power Weeks were modes of collaboration where officers negotiated the norms, rules and habits (Wenger 1998) of their community-in-making and re-interpreted organizational discourses and demands that were required of them. A large amount of time was spent during the first Power Weeks to decide on how to work with information and negotiating which cases they should focus on.

The officers sometimes disagreed on how to approach certain problems and which offences (for example, smuggling of cigarettes or thefts) was the most important to focus on. Various technical malfunctions and lacking infrastructure often caused frustration and slowed down their work. The officers' collaborative work included a certain level of apprenticeship, not in the sense that they learned from one "master", but by

watching, doing, and listening to other participants. The skills and knowledge embodied by the participants were also negotiated and changed in the process. As previous research has shown, collaboration and conflict go hand in hand (Huxham and Beech 2008; Schruijer 2008) and disagreeing on how to work together was an important part of the officers' community building. Disagreement, discussions, and negotiations demanded interaction and dialogue, and continued collaboration. In this sense, the community evolved and was sustained by the officers' repeated interactions, harmonious or conflictual (Holmes and Meyerhoff 1999; Wenger 1998, 47).

Although the officers (and researchers adopting the community of practice perspective (Wenger 1998, 67)) emphasised the importance of informal interaction in community building, observations suggest that formal work practices also played central roles in establishing a community. Such practices included formal meetings, defining clear project objectives, and the creation and negotiation of administrative documents. Although viewing the Power Weeks as successful activities, the officers initially lacked pre-existing standards and collaboration practices. Stemming from different national and organizational contexts, the participants had different experiences and principles of collaborative work and intelligence analysis. Similar to previous observations (Claycomb and Mulberry 2007; Lee (2007), artifacts such as memoranda, logos or symbols made the efforts and work processes of project group seem less abstract to participants as well as for the stakeholders outside the community.

The formal meetings and administrative practices thus provided a form of cultivation and formalisation relevant to establishing the project as a social entity and the Power Week group as a community of practice. Organizing meetings within Project Turnstone established the project participants as a group, as the members together negotiated and created the goals, norms, and procedures of the project. Ample time during the first Power Weeks was spent on deciding how to write and formulate reports, and negotiating work procedures. Various misunderstandings, as well as the malfunctioning of technical equipment, led to confusion and initially obstructed the collaboration as all recourses were put on solving the issues instead of working on particular cases and sharing information. Objects and artifacts (such as formal documents, agreements, reports, emails, text messages, and the project plan) unified participating officers as being part of a community in between their meetings and Power Weeks.

A shared repertoire and identity

The officers' described that previous collaboration efforts had often been hampered by excessive bureaucracy and various structural obstacles. The officers claimed that it was a lot easier to understand and maybe even figure out solutions to such structural obstacles if they knew one another on a personal level.

During the long work days, the officers did not only share information regarding cases and suspects but tried to get acquainted with one another by sharing stories of themselves, their work, and previous events. Over time, the group developed a shared repertoire of phrases, words, concepts, metaphors and stories used by the members. This repertoire is part of the norms and shared understandings established by the community of border officers during the project (Alvesson and Billing 1997; Wenger 1998, 77-78, 82-83). As the Power Week participants lived and worked in separate countries (and were not colleagues at the same work place) they had few opportunities for informal socializing.

The Power Weeks offered such opportunities; they got to know one another a bit on a more personal level during lunch breaks and dinners outside of the office. Alongside negotiating work practices during the Power Weeks, ample time was also spent in the office on informal small-talk and on sharing stories and jokes. Similar to previous studies of police officers' emotion management joking was often a way of handling frustrating and difficult situations (Charman 2013; Granér 2014), such as for example the European migration crisis, the annexation of the Crime region, and allegations of espionage. Sharing stories or joking with one another was a way of co-producing a common understanding in conversation, and thereby creating a stronger sense of group solidarity (van Hulst 2013).

Joking and telling stories also helped the officers create a relaxed and easy-going environment and made it easier for the officers to get to know one another. However, it was sometimes also used to question a persons' opinions or demonstrate that someone was not completely accepted by the community. For instance, when an officer made a joke that the others thought inappropriate (for example regarding the origin, behaviour or appearance of some of the other officers), other officers refrained from laughing, saying that "such jokes are not fun". On the other hand, jokes or stories that were appreciated by the majority of the participants were retold over and over again, since they corresponded with the general aims of the group. In this way, the group established norms of proper group conduct during the Power Weeks. The most frequent jokes focused on various national characteristics, the officers' appearance and conduct, the behaviour of suspected criminals, and difficult situations.

In this study I see humour, stories, and jokes as mediating practices for collaboration and trust development between the officers. The stories shared during the Power Weeks can roughly be divided into three different categories: stories of success and exciting events, stories of emotional hardship and troubling events, and anecdotes of previous experiences and other collaboration partners. The anecdotal stories shared during Project Turnstone were often analytical and argumentative, incorporating opinions regarding the practices of other collaborating partners (Claycomb and Mulberry 2007, 191). Stories generated new stories, and sharing stories allowed the officers to re-visit previous experiences, often from someone else's perspective (Wästerfors 2004).

Storytelling allowed the officers to establish and construct joint "enemies" (criminals, corrupt officers, and distrusted organizations and nations), as well as admired heroes (successful colleagues). Despite the seemingly relaxed and collegial jargon of the group, participating male officers often used a "gendered language", for instance by referring to the whole group as "guys" (meaning men). This type of gendering is not uncommon in studies of police occupational behaviour (Gundhus 2005; Reskin 2000; Prokos and Padavic 2002). Even though participating female officers expressed inclusion in the group, the male officers were more prominent in discussions and were often the ones sharing stories.

The informal aspects of the Power Weeks, when the officers shared stories, joked, and teased one another are thus regarded both as means of increasing group identification (Wenger 1998, 80), processing information that they had learned about one another, and handling frustration and difficult situations. I see the Power Weeks as important sites trial where the manner of the officers was scrutinized by the other participants, but also as important sites for meaning making and community building. The commitment and trustworthiness of participating officers was inspected and officers who complained about the long work days or who did not participate in after work activities were not regarded in a favourable way. As also argued by Wenger (1998, 73) showing engagement for their mutual practice (their work) was the first step of the officers to engage in the community of practice. However, it was important for the officers to maintain this engagement throughout the project in order to develop an identity of participation and be regarded as full-members of the community.

The "Circle of Trust"

An outcome of the community of practice is what the participants named the "circle of trust". According to participating officers, the only way to develop trust, and to openly share intelligence information was to meet in person and to find the "right", likeminded people. All participating officers were new to this kind of collaboration. However, some regarded themselves as more "established", as they had been a part of the EU for a longer period of time and had previously collaborated with some participating organizations prior to the implementation of Project Turnstone.

As the collaboration developed and the group of insiders started to take form, several members with a periphery position (as neither trusted insiders nor complete outsiders) were excluded from the group work. Those that remained, rather than seeing themselves as representatives from different organizations occasionally spending time together, the officers started to describe themselves as "team", or as a group joint by a common mission. By the end of the project, the officers referred to this group as the "circle of trust", arguing that hands-on everyday work and close interaction had allowed them to identify trustworthy members with the right "attitude and motivation".

According to the officers, this was paramount in order for them to "actually work together"; to share information and together generate new knowledge based on their individual experiences and tacit awareness of solving cross-border crime. However, collaboration is a dynamic process and "the circle of trust" would only continue to exist as long as the same officers continued to work together performing their joint work practices.

Implications and Further Research

The purpose of my study was to expand on previous research of border police collaboration by suggesting the concept of community of practice as framework for understanding how trust could be built, thereby increasing the chances of the success of collaboration. In consistency with previous research on international police collaboration, intelligence-based policing, and police culture which stresses the importance of informal networks and trust-based relationships, this study has shown how a collaboration community has been formed on ground level by officers engaged in face-to-face interactions.

However, previous studies of intelligence exchange often focus on collaboration taking place within national, cultural or social contexts. Extant knowledge of the social theory and previous ethnographic studies of police occupational culture and practices do not provide a deep understanding of how transnational police collaboration takes place on a day-to-day, situated basis, overlooking the dynamics behind creating collaboration communities. There is also a tendency to over-emphasise the significance of structural, organizational, and cultural differences (Whelan 2016) between participants as an explanation of (taken-for-granted) collaboration facilitators or inhibitors. Officers participating in this study maintained that collaborating partners can bridge structural, cultural, and organizational differences by working together. However, collaboration obstacles amongst police and border officers are not unproblematic and warrant further scholarly attention.

Although the recent years have seen an increasing focus on informal collaboration networks, border politics, sovereignty, and the globalization of policing, the cultures and practices of those responsible for policing borders and cross border crime have gained surprisingly little attention by social researchers (Loftus 2015, 115). Furthermore, our understanding of how border policing practices intersect with national policing, and how cross-border, inter-organizational, and transnational collaboration plays out on the ground level needs to improve (Loftus 2015). There is no doubt that contemporary border policing, and policing in general, is affected, shaped, and differentiated by transnational processes. Therefore, new perspectives on police collaboration reaching beyond the national and international are needed (Dupont, Manning and Whelan 2017, 584). My study is an attempt to contribute to

filling this gap. However, further empirical knowledge is necessary if we are to better understand the everyday practices, challenges, decisions, negotiations, and actions performed on a daily basis by actors involved in transnational (border police) collaboration.

Although my study focuses on police and border organizations, increasing demands of transnational collaboration is not unique for law enforcement officials and authorities, and various sectors in society depend on collaboration between international and transnational partners. In this study, I suggest that one of the benefits of the framework of community of practice is that it sheds light on how social groupings without previously shared characteristics (such as for instance gender, class, nationality, common national language or culture), or through simple co-presence (such as a specific workplace) (Brown and Duguid 2001; Wenger and Snyder 2000) can develop a trust-based relationship conducive to deeper collaboration. This perspective might therefore be useful in further studies on transnational collaboration.

References

Aas, K. F. (2011). 'Crimmigrant' bodies and the bona fide traveller: Surveillance, citizenship and global governance. *Theoretical Criminology,* 15(3): 331-346.

Aas, K. F., & Gundhus, H. O. I. (2015). Policing humanitarian Borderlands: Frontex, human rights and the precariousness of life. *British Journal of Criminology*, 55(1): 1-8.

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Alain, M. (2001). *'The trapeze artists and the ground crew'* police cooperation and intelligence exchange mechanisms in Europe and North America: A comparative empirical study, *Policing and Society*, 11(1): 1-27.

Al-Alawi, A., Al-Marzooqi, N., and Mohammed, Y. (2007). Organizational Culture and Knowledge Sharing: Critical Success Factors. *Journal of Knowledge Management,* 11(2): 22-42.

Allen, J., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., and Rogelberg, S. (eds.). (2015). *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alvesson, M. (2013). *Understanding organizational culture*. 2. ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Alvesson, M. & Billing, Y. D. (1997). *Kön och organisation*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Anderson, B. (1993). *Den föreställda gemenskapen. Reflexioner kring nationalismens ursprung och spridning*. Göteborg: Bokförlaget Daidalos.

Atkinson, P. (2014). *For Ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Aull Davies, C. (1999). *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others*. London: Routledge.

Bachmann, R., & Zaheer, A. (2008). Trust in Inter-organizational Relations, in Cropper, S., Ebers, M., Huxham, C., & Smith Ring, P (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Inter-organizational Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Basic, G. (2018a). Observed successful collaboration in social work practice: Coherent triads in Swedish juvenile care. *European Journal of Social Work*, 21(2): 193-206.

Basic, G. (2018b). Construction of norm resolution and moral panics. Ethnographic analysis concerning intelligence and operational police and border guards' work. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Policing*, 4(1): 50-69.

Balibar, E. (2010). 'At the Borders of Citizenship: A Democracy in Translation?'. *European Journal of Social Theory,* 13(3): 315-22.

Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Harris, S. (1997). *Managing Language: The Discourse of Corporate Meetings. Amsterdam*: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Becker, H. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press.

Benyon, J., Turnbull, L., Willis, A.,Woodward, R. & Beck, A. (1993). *Police Cooperation in Europe: An Investigation.* Leicester, Centre for the Study of Public Order, University of Leicester.

Benyon, J. (1996). The Politics of Police Co-operation in the European Union. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law,* 24(4): 370-371.

Bigo. D. (2008) EU Police Cooperation: National Sovereignty Framed by European Security? in Guild. E & Geyer, F (eds.) *Security versus Justice? Police and Judicial Cooperation in the European Union*. Ashgate.

Bigo, D. (2014). The (In)Securitization Practices of the Three Universes of EU Border Control: Military/Navy-Border - Guards/Police. *Database Analysts Security Dialogue*, 45(3): 209-225.

Billig, M. (2005). *Laughter and ridicule: Towards a social critique of humour*. London: SAGE.

Blatter, J. (2004). `From Spaces of Place' to `Spaces of Flows'? Territorial and Functional Governance in Cross-border Regions in Europe and North America. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(3): 530-548.

Block, L. (2008a). 'Cross-Border Liaison and Intelligence: Practicalities and Issues', in C. Harfield, A. MacVean, J. Grieve and D. Phillips (eds) *Handbook of Intelligent Policing* pp. 183-94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Block, L. (2008b). Combating Organized Crime in Europe: Practicalities of Police Cooperation. *Policing,* 2(1): 74-81.

Block, L. (2010). 'Bilateral Police Liaison Officers: Practices and European Policy'. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*. 6(2): 194-210.

Bloksgaard, L. (2011). Masculinities, Femininities and Work - The Horizontal Gender Segregation in the Danish Labour Market. *Nordic journal of working life studies*, 1(2): 5-21.

Blumer, H. (1954). "What is Wrong with Social Theory." *American Sociological Review,* 18: 3-10.

Blumer, H. (1962). *Society as Symbolic Interaction in Human Behaviour and Social Process*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Bourdieu, P. (1972, translated 1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1979, translated 1984*). Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). *The Logic of Practice. Cambridge*: Polity Press.

Bowling, B. (2009). Transnational policing: The globalization thesis, a typology and a research agenda. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 3(2): 149-160.

Bowling, B. & Foster, J. (2002). 'Policing and the police', in Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Bowling, B. & Westenra, S. (2018). 'A really hostile environment': Adiaphorization, global policing and the crimmigration control system. *Theoretical Criminology*: 1-21.

Bradford, B., Quinton, P., Myhill, A., & Porter, G. (2013). Why do 'the law' comply? Procedural justice, group identification and officer motivation in police organizations. *European Journal of Criminology*, 11(1): 110-131.

Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2001). Knowledge and Organization: A Social-Practice Perspective. *Organization Science*, 12(2): 198-213.

Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Cain, M. (1973). *Society and the Policeman's Role.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Campbell, M. (2007). Applying Communities of Practice to the Learning of Police. *Learning and Sociocultural Theory: Exploring Modern Vygotskian Perspectives International Workshop 2007*, 1(1): 133-146.

Castells, M. (1996). *The information age: economy, society and culture. Vol. 1, The rise of the network society.* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.

Chan J. (1996). 'Changing police culture'. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36 (1): 109-134.

Chan, J. (2004). Using Pierre Bourdieu's Framework for Understanding Police Culture. *Droit et société.* 1(56-57): 327-346.

Chan, J. B. L. (1997). *Changing Police Culture: Policing in a Multicultural Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chan, J. B. L., Devery, C., & Doran, S. (2003). *Fair Cop: Learning the Art of Policing*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Charman, S. (2013). Sharing a Laugh: The role of humour in relationships between police officers and ambulance staff. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 33(3/4): 152-166.

Charman, S. (2017). *Police Socialisation, Identity and Culture: Becoming Blue.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Claycomb, B., & Mulberry, G. (2007). Praxis, Language, Dialogue. *Human Affairs*, 17(2): 182-194.

Cogburn, D. L., & Levinson, N. S. (2003). U.S.–Africa Virtual Collaboration in Globalization Studies: Success Factors for Complex, Cross-National Learning Teams. *International Studies Perspectives*, 4: 34-51.

Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of Social Control: Crime, Punishment and Classification*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cook, K. S., Rice, E. R. W., & Gerbasi, A. (2004). The Emergence of Trust Networks under Uncertainty: The Case of Transitional Economies - Insights from Social Psychological Research, in in Kornai, J., Rothstein, B., & Rose-Ackerman, S. (eds.) (2004). *Creating Social Trust in Post-Socialist Transition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Côté-Boucher, K., Infantino, F., & Salter, M.B. (2014). Border Security as Practice: An Agenda for Research. *Security Dialogue*, 45(3): 195-208.

Cotter, R. S. (2015). Police intelligence: connecting-the-dots in a network society. *Policing and Society*, 27(2):173-187.

Crank, J.P. (2004). *Understanding Police Culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Czarniawska, B. (2007). *Shadowing and other techniques for doing fieldwork in modern societies*. Malmö: Liber.

Dastanka, A. A., & Chyprys, V. (2014). Euroregions as a Part of Trans-Border Cooperation of Belarus: Legal and Sociological Aspects. *Regional Formation and Development Studies,* 13(2): 16-24.

Dauvergne, C. (2004). Sovereignty, Migration and the Rule of Law in Global Times. *The Modern Law Review*, 67(4): 588-615.

de Laat, M., & Broer, W. (2004). CoPs for Cops: Managing and Creating Knowledge through Networked Expertise, in Hildreth, P.M. and Kimble, C. (eds.), *Knowledge Networks: Innovation through Communities of Practice*, Idea Group, Hershey.

Denney, D. (2005). *Risk and Society*. London: SAGE Publications.

Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict: constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Duguid, P. (2005). The Art of Knowing: Social and Tacit Dimensions of Knowledge and the Limits of the Community of Practice. *The Information Society. Taylor & Francis Inc,* 21: 109-118.

Dupont, B., Manning, P. K., & Whelan, C. (2017) Introduction for special issue policing across organisational boundaries: developments in theory and practice. *Policing and Society*, 27(6): 583-585.

Eckert, P. (2006). Communities of Practice, in Brown, K. (ed.) (2006). *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. 2. ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Elias, N., & Scotson, J. L. (1994). *The Established and the Outsiders: A Sociological Enquiry into Community Problems*. 2. ed. London: F. Cass.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I. & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing Ethnographic Field Notes.* Second Edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Evans, J. M., & Kebbell, M. R. (2012). The Effective Analyst: A Study of what Makes an Effective Crime and Intelligence Analyst. *Policing & Society,* 22(2): 204-219.

Fassin, D. (2013). *Enforcing Order: An Ethnography of Urban Policing.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fassin, D. (ed.) (2017). *Writing the World of Policing - The Difference Ethnography Makes*. The University of Chicago Press.

Fehérváry, K. (2002). American kitchens, luxury bathrooms, and the search for a "normal" life in post-socialist Hungary. *Ethnos,* 67(3): 369–400.

Fine, G. A. (1993). Ten Lies of Ethnography. Moral Dilemmas of Field Research. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 22 (3): 267-294.

Finstad, L. (2005). "En av gutta? Om kjønn i Politiet", in Egge, M., & Strybe, J. (eds.): *Politirollen gennem 100 år*. Oslo: PHS Forskning, 2.

Finstad, L. (2000). *Politiblikket*. Oslo: Pax.

Fletcher, C. (1996). ""The 250lb man in an alley": Police storytelling". *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 9(5): 36-42.

Fox, S. (2000). Communities of practice: Foucault and actor-network theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(6): 853-867.

Fägersten, B. (2010). *Sharing Secrets - Explaining International Intelligence Cooperation.* (Dissertation). Department of Political Science, Lund University, Lund.

Gadamer, H. G. (1989). *Truth and method*. 2., revised edition London: Sheed and Ward.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Gerard, A., & Pickering, S. (2014) Gender, Securitization and Transit: Refugee Women and the Journey to the EU, *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 27(3): 338–359.

Gerspacher, N., & Dupont, B. (2007). The Nodal Structure of International Police Cooperation: An Exploration of Transnational Security Networks. *Global Governance*, 13: 347-364.

Giordano, C., & and Kostova, D. (2002). The Social Production of Mistrus, in Hann, C. M. (ed.), *Postsocialism. Ideals, Ideologies, and Practices in Eurasia*. New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. London: Free Press of Glencoe.

Goffman, E. (1968). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Goldsmith, A. (1990). Taking Police Culture Seriously: Police Discretion and the Limits of Law. *Policing and Society*, 1(2): 91-114.

Granér, R. (2007). Police work between legitimacy and efficiency. Handling the expectations on the role of the police, in Aili, C., Nilsson, L.E., Svensson, L. & Denicolo, P. (eds.), *In tension between organization and profession: Professionals in Nordic public service* (303-321). Falun: Nordic Academic Press.

Granér, R (2014). Humorns funktion i polisarbetet. *Nordisk politiforskning,* 1: 9-23.

Guiraudon, V., & Lahav, G. (2000). "A Reappraisal of the State Sovereignty Debate: the Case of Migration Control." *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(2): 163-195.

Gundelach, P. (2000). Joking Relationships and National Identity in Scandinavia. *Acta Sociologica*, 43(2): 113-122.

Gundhus, H. O. (2005) ' "Catching" and "Targeting": Risk-based policing, local culture and gendered practices'. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, 6(2): 128-146.

Görtz, D. (2015) *Etnifierade polispraktiker. Hur etnicitet görs i polisers vardag*. Lund Dissertations in Sociology 111.

Haas, P. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination. *International Organization*, 46(1): 1-35.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon.

Hage, G. (2005). A not so multi-sited ethnography of a not so imagined community. *Anthropological Theory,* 5(4): 463-475.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*. Taylor & Francis.

Herbert, S. (2001). 'Hard Charger' or 'Station Queen'? Policing and the Masculinist State. *Gender, Place and Culture,* 8(1): 55–71.

Heyman, J. M. (2002). U.S. Immigration Officers of Mexican Ancestry as Mexican Americans, Citizens, and Immigration Police. *Current Anthropology*, 43(3): 479-507.

Hildreth, P. & Kimble, C. (2004) *Knowledge Networks: Innovation through Communities of Practice*. London/ Hershey: Idea Group Inc.

Hills, A. (2006). The Rationalities of European Border Security. *European Security*, 15(1): 67-88.

Hjortsjö, M. (2006). *With Cooperation in Sight. Concerted Efforts and Co-Located Family Centers.* Lund: Lund University.

Holmberg, L. (2003). *Policing Stereotypes: A Qualitative Study of Police Work in Denmark*. Glienicke/Berlin; Madison/Wis.: Galda und Wilch Vlg.

Holmes, J., & Meyerhoff, M. (1999). The Community of Practice: Theories and Methodologies in Language and Gender Research. *Language in Society*, 28(2): 173-183.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The Active Interview*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Hufnagel, S., Harfield, C., & Bronitt, S. (eds.) (2012). *Cross-Border Law Enforcement: Regional Law Enforcement Cooperation – European, Australian and Asia-Pacific Perspectives.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Hufnagel, S., & McCartney, C. (eds.) (2017). *Trust in international police and justice cooperation*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Huxham, C., & Beech, N. (2008) Inter-Organizational Power, in Cropper, S., Ebers, M., Huxham, C., & Smith Ring, P (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Inter- organizational Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jacobsson, K. & Åkerström, M. (2012). Interviewees with an agenda: learning from a 'failed' interview. *Qualitative Research,* 13(6): 717-734.

Jarzabkowski, P. A., & Lê, J. K. (2017). We Have To Do This and That? You Must be Joking: Constructing and Responding to Paradox Through Humor. *Organization Studies,* 38(3-4): 433-462.

Johnston, L., & Shearing, C. (2003). *Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice*. Routledge, London.

Jordan, B. (1989). Cosmopolitan obstetrics: some insight from the training of traditional midwives. *Social Science and Medicine,* 28: 925-944.

Juska, A., Johnstone, P., & Pozzuto, R. (2004). The changing character of criminality and policing in post-socialist Lithuania: from fighting organized crime to policing marginal populations? *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 41(2): 161-177.

Kello, J. (2015). The Science and Practice of workplace meetings, in Allen, J. et al (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Meeting Science*, 709–734. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Khosravi, S. (2007). The 'Illegal' Traveller: an Auto-Ethnography of Borders. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale,* 15(3): 321-334.

Kietzmann, J., Plangger, K., Eaton, B., Heilgenberg, K., Pitt, L., & Berthon, P. (2013). Mobility at work: A tyopology of mobile communities of practice and contextual ambidexterity. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 22(4): 282-297.

Kusenbach, B. (2003). Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool. *Ethnography,* 4(3): 455-485.

Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through Interviews and Dialogues. *Qualitative Inquiry,* 12: 480-500.

Latour, B. (1986). Visualization and cognition: thinking with eyes and hands. *Knowledge and Society*, 6: 1-40.

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. P. (2007). Boundary Negotiating Artifacts: Unbinding the Routine of Boundary Objects and Embracing Chaos in Collaborative Work. *Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, 16: 307-339.

Li, L., Grimshaw. C., Nielsen. J. M., C., Judd, M., Coyte, P. C., & Graham, I. D. (2009). Use of communities of practice in business and health care sectors: A systematic review. *Implementation Science*, 4(27): 1-9.

Lindberg, K. (2009). *Collaboration*. Malmö: Liber.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-Level Bureaucracy. Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Loader, I., & Walker, N. (2007). *Civilizing Security*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Loftus, B. (2010). Police occupational culture: classic themes, altered times. *Policing and Society,* 20(1): 1-20.

Lofus, B. (2015) Border regimes and the sociology of policing. *Policing and Society*, 25(1): 115-125.

Loftus, B. (2016). Revisiting the Classics: S. Holdaway (1983) Inside the British Police: a Force at Work. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. *Policing and Society*, 26(6): 713-720.

Lowenthal, M. M. (2016). *Intelligence: From Secrets to Policy*. CQ Press.

Lundin, J., & Nuldén, U. (2007)."Talking about tools - investigating learning at work in police practice". *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 19(4): 222-239.

Maguire, M., & John, T. (2006). Intelligence Led Policing, Managerialism and Community Engagement: Competing Priorities and the Role of the National Intelligence Model in the UK. *Policing & Society*, 16(1): 67-85.

Malinowski, B. (2014[1922]). *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. Routledge Classics, Routledge.

Manning, P. K. (1977). *Police Work: The Social Organization of Policing*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Manning, P. K. (2007). A Dialectic of Organisational and Occupational Culture. Police Occupational Culture, in in O'Neill, M., Marks, M., & Singh, A-M. (eds.) *Police Occupational Culture (Sociology of Crime, Law and Deviance, Volume 8*). Emerald Group Publishing Limited: 47-83.

Martin S. E. (1999). Police Force or Police Service? Gender and Emotional Labor. *The Annals of the American Academy,* 561: 111-126.

Marková, I. (2004). *Trust and Democratic Transition in Post-Communist Europe*. Oxford: published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. (2010). "Fighting Piracy with Private Security Measures: When Contract Law Should Tell Parties to Walk the Plank". *American University Law Review,* 59: 1363-1398.

McDermott, R. (1999). "Learning Across Teams: The Role of Communities of Practice in Team Organizations". *Knowledge Management Review,* 7(3).

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*. University of Chicago Press.

Mitra, D. L. (2008). Balancing power in communities of practice: an examination of increasing student voice through school-based youth-adult partnerships*, Journal of Educational Change,* 9: 221-242.

Myers, F. R., & Brenneis, D. L. (1984). Introduction: Language and Politics in the Pacific, in Brenneis, D. L., & Myers, F. R., (eds.). *Dangerous Words: Language and Politics in the Pacific*. New York: New York University Press.

Nadelman, E. A. (1993). *Cops Across Borders. The Internationalization of U.S. Criminal Law Enforcement.* Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State University Press.

Nader, L. (2011). Ethnography as Theory. *Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 1(1): 211-219.

Narayan, K. (2012). *Alive in the Writing: Crafting Ethnography in the Company of Chekhov*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.

Nowak, A. (2017). Date rape drugs: a new kind of rape and a new kind of violence. *Public Security and Public Order*, 19: 59-68.

Omidvar, O., & Kislov, R. (2014). The Evolution of the Communities of Practice Approach: Toward Knowledgeability in a Landscape of Practice – an Interview with Etienne Wenger- Trayner. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(3): 266-275.

O'Reilly, C.A., Chatman. J., & Caldwell, D. F. (1991). People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization fit. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3): 487-516.

Pacanowsky, M. E., & O'Donnell-Trujillo, N. (1982). Communication and organizational cultures. *Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46(2): 115-130.

Paoline, E. A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 3(3): 199-214.

Parmar A. (2018). Policing Belonging. Race and Nation in the UK, in Bosworth, M., Parmar, A. & Vazquez, Y. (eds.) *Race, Criminal Justice and Migration Control.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, A., & Uhnoo, S. (2013). The Problem of Loyalty in Greedy Institutions, in Miller, L. B., & Moore, W. C. (eds.) (2013). *Psychology of Loyalty*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Peterson, A., & Åkerström, M. (2014). (eds.). Introduction to the Special Issue "Policing Ethnicity: Between the Rhetoric of Inclusion and the Policies and Practices of Exclusion". *Social Inclusion*, 2(3): 1-4.

Phillips, S. W. (2016). Police Discretion and Boredom: What Officers Do When There Is Nothing to Do. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 45(5): 580-601.

Prokos, A., & Padavic, I. (2002). 'There Oughtta Be a Law Against Bitches': Masculinity Lessons in Police Academy Training. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9(4): 439-459.

Radaev, V. (2004) How Trust is Established in Economic Relationships when Institutions and Individuals Are Not Trustworthy: The Case of Russia, in Kornai, J., Rothstein, B., & Rose-Ackerman, S. (eds.) *Creating Social Trust in Post-Socialist Transition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ratcliffe, J. (ed.) (2009). *Strategic Thinking in Criminal Intelligence*. Sydney: Federation Press.

Reiner, R. (2010). *The Politics of the Police*. 4. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reiner, R. (2015). Revisiting the Classics: Three Seminal Founders of the Study of Policing: Michael Banton, Jerome Skolnick and Egon Bittner. *Policing and Society*, 25(3): 308-327.

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983). *Two Cultures of Policing: Street Cops and Management Cops*. New Brunnswick, N.J.: Transaction publishers.

Robinson C. D., & Scaglion, R. (1987). The Origin and Evolution of the Police Function in Society: Notes toward a Theory. *Law & Society Review*, 21(1): 109-154.

Roschelle, J., & Teasley S.D. (1995). The construction of shared knowledge in collaborative problem solving, in C.E. O'Malley (ed.), *Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag: 69-197.

Rouse, J. (2007). Practice Theory, in Turner, S. P. & Risjord, M. W. (eds) *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology*. Amsterdam: Elsevier/North-Holland.

Rumford, C. (2006) Theorizing Borders. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(2): 155-169.

Sausdal, D. (2018). *The last policeman: on the globalisation of local policing*. Diss. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.

Schott, T. (1994). Collaboration in the Invention of Technology: Globalization, Regions, and Centers. *Social Science Research*, 23(1): 23-56.

Schwartzman, H. B. (1987). The Significance of Meetings in an American Mental Health Center. *American Ethnologist*, 14(2): 271-294.

Shearing, C. D., & Ericson, R. V. (1991). Culture as figurative action. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 42(4):481-506.

Sheptycki, J. W. E. (1995). Reviews*. British journal of criminology,* 35(2): 302-3017.

Sheptycki, J. (1998a). Police co-operation in the English Channel tunnel 1968-1996. *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*, 6(3): 216-235.

Sheptycki, J. (1998b). "Policing, Post-modernism and Transnationalisation." *British Journal of Criminology,* 38(3): 485-503.

Shore, C. (2000). (2000). *Building Europe: the cultural politics of European integration*. London: Routledge.

Shove, E., Pantzar, M., & Watson, M. (2012). *The Dynamics of Social Practice: Everyday Life and How It Changes*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Silverman, D. (2013). *A Very Short, Fairly Interesting and Reasonably Cheap Book about Qualitative Research*. 2. ed. London: SAGE.

Simmel, G. (1908/70). *Kamp!.* Uppsala: Argos.

Skolnick, J. (1966). *Justice Without Trial*. New York; Wiley.

Spapens, T. (2017). Building Trust and More: The Importance of Police Cooperation Networks in the European Union, in Hufnagel, S. & McCartney, C. (eds.) *Trust in international police and justice cooperation*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Spearin, C. (2010). "A Private Security Solution to Somali Piracy? The U.S. Call for Private Security Engagement and its Implications for Canada". *Naval War College Review,* 63(4): 56-71.

Strauss, A. (1988). The Articulation of Project Work: An Organizational Process. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 29(2): 163-178.

Stenning, P.C, & Shearing, C. D. (2012). The Shifting Boundaries of Policing: Globalisation and its possibilities, in Newburn, T., and Peay, J. (eds.) *Policing: Politics, Culture and Control*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.

Storck, J., & Hill, P. A. (2000). Knowledge Diffusion Through 'Strategic Communities'. *Sloan Management Review,* 41(2): 63-74.

Sztompka, P. (1999). *Trust: a sociological theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Terpstra, J., & Schaap, D. (2013). Police Culture, Stress Conditions and Working Styles. *European Journal of Criminology*, 10(1): 59-73.

Thedvall, R. (2006). *Eurocrats at Work. Negotiating Transparency in Postnational Employment Policy*. Dissertation. Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology, 58, Stockholm University

Tsing, A. (2000). The Global Situation. *Cultural Anthropology,* 15(3): 327–60.

van der Woude, M. A. H., van der Leun, J. P., & Nijland, J-A. A. (2014). Crimmigration in the Netherlands. *Law and Social Inquiry*, 39(3): 560-579.

van Duyne, P. (1993). Implications of cross-border crime risks in an open Europe. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 20(2): 99-111.

Van House, N. A., Butler, M. H., & Schiff, L. R. (1998). Cooperative knowledge work and practices of trust: sharing environmental planning data sets. *Proceedings of the 1998 ACM conference on computer supported cooperative work*: 335-343.

van Hulst, M. (2013). Storytelling at the police station: the canteen culture revisited. *British Journal of Criminology, Delinquency and Deviant Social Behaviour*, 53(4): 624-642.

Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observations on the Making of Policemen. *Human Organization*, 32(4): 407-418.

Van Maanen, J. (1978). Kinsmen in Repose: Occupational Perspectives of Patrolmen, in Manning, P. K., and Van Maanen, J. (eds.), *Policing: A View from the Street.* Goodyear Pub. Co., Santa Monica, Calif.

Wacquant, L. (2002). Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(6): 1468-1532.

Waddington, P.A.J. (1999). Police (Canteen) Sub-Culture: an Appreciation. *British Journal of Criminology*, 39(2): 287-309.

Weber, L., & Bowling, B. (2004). Policing Migration: A Framework for Investigating the Regulation of Global Mobility. *Policing & Society,* 14(3): 195-212.

Weick, K., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). 'Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking'. *Organization Science*, 16(4): 409–421.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. M. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice*. Harvard Business Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity.* Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. C., & Snyder, W. S. (2000). Communities of Practice: The Organizational Frontier. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(1): 139-145.

Wenger, E. & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). *Introduction to communities of practice: A brief overview of the concept and its uses*. Retrieved from http://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/07-Brief-introduction-to-communities-of-practice.pdf (2018-05-12).

Wettergren, Å. (2013). *Emotionssociologi*. 1. uppl. Malmö: Gleerups utbildning.

Whelan, C. (2016) Organisational culture and cultural change: a network perspective. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 49(4): 583-599.

Wicks, D., & Bradshaw, P. (2002). Investigating gender and organizational culture: Gendered value foundations that reproduce discrimination and inhibit organizational change, in Alvesson, M., Aaltio-Marjosola, I., & Mills, A. J. (2002) *Gender, Identity and the Culture of Organizations*. London: Routledge.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wonders, N. A. (2006). Global Flows, Semi-Permeable Borders and the New Channels of Inequality, in Pickering, S. & Weber, L. (eds.) (2006) *Borders, Mobility, and Technologies of Control*. Dordrecht: b Springer.

Wood, J. (2004). Cultural Change in the Governance of Security. *Policing and Society*, 14(1), 31-48.

Wood, J., & Dupont, B. (eds.). (2006). *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Woodruff, C. (2004). Establishing Confidence in Business Partners: Courts, Networks, and Relationships as Pillars of Support, in Kornai, J., Rothstein, B., & Rose-Ackerman, S. (eds.) (2004) *Creating Social Trust in Post-Socialist Transition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wästerfors, D. (2004) *Berättelser om mutor: det korruptas betydelse bland svenska affärsmän i Öst- och Centraleuropa*. Brutus Östlings bokförlag Symposion.

Yakhlef, S., Basic, G., & Åkerström, M. (2015a). *Project Turnstone: Successful Collaboration and Collaboration Obstacles in Police, Border, and Coast Guard Cooperation*. (Network for Research in Criminology and Deviant Behavior). Lund University (Media-Tryck).

Yakhlef, S., Basic, G., & Åkerström, M. (2015b). *Freedom of Movement: Passengers´ Experiences of Safety and Border Control in the Baltic Sea Area*. (Network for Research in Criminology and Deviant Behavior), Lund University (Media- Tryck).

Yakhlef, S, Basic, G., & Åkerström, M (2016). Risk, Safety and Freedom of Movement. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Security*, 1(2): 175-193.

Yakhlef, S, Basic, G., & Åkerström, M (2017). Policing Migration: Described and Observed Cooperation Experiences of Police and Border Guards in the Baltic Sea Area. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 12(1): 117-140.

Åkerström, M., Yakhlef, S., & Wästerfors, D. (2018) "Are meetings really police work? Boundary work in controlling boundaries". *Qualitative Sociology Review*.

Documents provided by the project participants

Project Turnstone (2014) Memorandum of Understanding.

Project Turnstone 1 (2014) Turnstone Weekly Report 10.03.2014-14.03.2014. Compiled by the Helsinki Police, Finland.

Project Turnstone 2 (2014) Turnstone Weekly Report. 07.04.2014-11-04-2014. Compiled by the State Border Guard of the Republic of Latvia.

Project Turnstone 3 (2014) Turnstone Power Week in Klaipeda. 19.05.2014-23.05.2014. Compiled by the State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania.

Project Turnstone 4 (2014) Turnstone Weekly Report. 23.10.2014. Compiled by the Gulf of Finland Coast Guard District.

Project Turnstone 5 (2014) Turnstone Weekly Report. 23.11.2014-26.11.2014. Compiled by the Police and Border Guard Board, Estonia.

Project Turnstone 1 (2015) Turnstone Weekly Report. 23.03.2015-27.03.2015. Compiled by the Police and Border Guard Board, Estonia.

Project Turnstone 2 (2015) Turnstone Power Week in Klaipeda. 01.06.2015- 05.06.2015. Compiled by the State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania.

Online resources

English Style Guide: A handbook for authors and translators in the European Commission Accessed: 20 March 2018 https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/styleguide_english_dgt_en.pdf

Hunt, A., & Wheeler, B. (2018). ”Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU”, BBC News, 19 March 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887

Johansson, B. (2015). “Grovt kriminella på Östersjöns färjor”, Sveriges Radio, 4 April 2015. http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=6133601

Nygårds, O. (2015). “Överraskande avancerad brottslighet runt Östersjön”, Svenska Dagbladet, 21 October 2015. https://www.svd.se/ovantat-avancerad-brottslighet-runt-ostersjon

TT, “Svensk polis skuggade juveltjuv”, Göteborgsposten, 13 May 2015. http://www.gp.se/nyheter/sverige/svensk-polis-skuggade-juveltjuvar-1.90435

Organization websites

Europol (2018, 10 March) About Europol. Accessed from https://www.europol.europa.eu/about-europol

European Union: The History of the European Union (2017, 22 April) Accessed from http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm

Centrala etikprövningsnämnden: Personuppgifter i forskningen- vilka regler gäller? (2017, 10 December) Accessed from: http://www.epn.se/media/1102/personuppgifter_i_forskningen.pdf

Interpol: Estonia: Estonia Police and Border Guard Board (2018, 9 March) Accessed from: http://www.interpol.int/Member-countries/Europe/Estonia

Police of Finland: Helsinki Police Department (2018, 9 March) Accessed from: https://www.poliisi.fi/en/helsinki

The Finnish Border Guard (2018, 9 March) Accessed from: http://www.raja.fi/functions/border_surveillance

State Border Guard Latvia: History (2018, 14 March) Accessed from: http://www.rs.gov.lv/index.php?id=924&top=0

State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania (2018, 9 March) Accessed from: http://www.pasienis.lt/index.php?3601861271

Swedish Coast Guard: Retrospect (2018, 9 March) Accessed from: https://www.kustbevakningen.se/en/about-us/historic/

Polisen: Gränspolisen- Polisens arbete (2018, 24 March) Accessed from: https://polisen.se/om-polisen/polisens-arbete/granspolisen/

European Commission: Proposal for a council implementing decision: setting out a recommendation for temporary internal border control in exceptional circumstances putting the overall functioning of the Schengen area at risk (2016, 4 May) Accessed from: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160504/schengen_proposal_en.pdf

European Commission: Migration and Home Affairs (2016, 4 May) (No longer accessible) Accessed from: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/implementation package/docs/20160504/schengen_proposal_en.pdf

European Council: Council of the European Union: Strengthening the EU's External Borders (2018, 10 March) Accessed from: http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/migratory-pressures/strengthening-external-borders/

European Commission: Migration and Home Affairs: Temporary Reintroduction of Border Control (2018, 10 March) Accessed from:

https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/reintroduction-border-control_en

Appendix

1. Information about the Participating Organizations

Estonia. The Estonian Police and border guard board was founded in 2010 when several police and border organizations were merged into one organization. It is currently the largest state agent in Estonia. The main tasks of the organization are crime prevention, security and public order, detection, investigation, and that of securing the European Union border[66].

Finland. The Helsinki Police was established in 1826 and is one of 11 police departments in Finland serving under the National Police Board. The role of the Finnish police is to maintain social and public order and prevent and investigate crime. The Helsinki police have close collaboration with Customs and the Border Guard Board[67]. The Finnish Border Guard (founded in 1919) is responsible for maintaining security and order at the Finnish borders with a particular focus on the external border of the Schengen area. The Finnish Border Guard operates at border crossing points and is also responsible for maritime safety and part of the National Defence[68].

Latvia. The State Border Guard of the Republic of Latvia focus on preventing illegal immigration and the security of the state border. The organization is responsible for surveilling EU external borders between Latvia, Russian Federation, and Belarus. Latvian border guard units were formed in 1919 and maintained until 1940 when the organization was discharged. The Latvian border guard was reintroduced in 1991 when Latvia reinstated its independence from the Soviet Union[69].

Lithuania. The State Border Guard Service at the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Lithuania (SBSG) has been safeguarding the borders of Lithuania since 1920. When the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania in 1940 the Lithuanian border guard was disbanded and not reinforced until Lithuania had restored its independence in 1990. The main tasks of the SBGS is to exert control over land borders, sea borders, persons

[66] http://www.interpol.int/Member-countries/Europe/Estonia
[67] https://www.poliisi.fi/en/helsinki
[68] http://www.raja.fi/functions/border_surveillance
[69] http://www.rs.gov.lv/index.php?id=924&top=0

and transports crossing the state border, to enforce regulations of environmental protection, to implement control of migration, and to defend the state in time of war[70].

Sweden. Although the Swedish coast guard goes back as far as 1638, the organization became a civilian organization in 1988 placed under the Ministry of Defence. The main tasks of the Swedish coast guard are maritime safety, environmental control, environmental rescue at sea, and maritime surveillance[71]. The Border Police division is part of the Swedish police and its main task area is border control and border surveillance. The division is also responsible for security checks, intelligence analysis, and the distribution of information regarding crime related activities in the Stockholm county airports[72].

2. Border Regulations in the EU 2007-2018

In 2007, freedom of movement was implemented in the Schengen area entailing the abolishing of passport controls. Border checking was still in practice at three levels: 1) mobile police controls, 2) joint patrols and border police collaboration, and 3) administrative requirements (such as handling visa requirements) enforced on European citizens and third country nationals. Identity checks were permitted in border zones connected to the borders. National legislative frameworks regulated the sizes of the border areas where identity checks could be performed. These legislations varied across countries; in some cases, checks could only be carried out within the border areas and in others within the entire territory. Temporary border controls may be imposed in the Schengen area or at its borders with other member states during certain types of events: planned events (such as major sporting events), unpredictable events (such as terrorist attacks) or if a lack of control over external borders is anticipated (Yakhlef, Basic and Åkerström 2016).

Due to the increase in mixed migratory flows, the EU Commission proposed the need for strengthening controls at the EU borders in 2015. Based on the grounds of serious threats to international security and public policy (because of the uncontrolled influx of persons undocumented or properly registered upon arrival) several member states reintroduced temporary border controls at the internal borders in autumn 2015. The member states carrying out internal controls were Germany (the German-Austrian land border), Austria (the Austrian-Slovenian and Austrian-Hungarian land borders), Sweden (all internal land borders), Norway (all internal land borders), and Denmark (all internal land borders). In December 2015, the commission also highlighted the

[70] http://www.pasienis.lt/index.php?3601861271
[71] https://www.kustbevakningen.se/en/about-us/historic/
[72] https://polisen.se/om-polisen/polisens-arbete/granspolisen/

need to intensify and strengthen security checks and border control at the EU external borders with relevant databases and information systems[73].

For various reasons (one arguably being the European immigration crisis)[74] UK citizens voted to leave the European Union in June 2016. Earlier that same year, the European Commission proposed to allow some EU member states to continue carrying out internal border controls (that is, identity checks at borders within the EU) for an extended period of six months. The purpose for this proposal was the concern that a secondary movement of irregular migrants (arriving via Greece) was a persistent risk. The commission also recommended that five additional member states (Austria, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway) to continue carrying out internal border controls for a further six months[75].

In September 2016, the European Council announced that there were on-going discussions on the future management of EU external borders. There was also a proposal to implement an EU border guard system comprising of a European border and coast guard agency and national authorities that would replace Frontex. The objective of the EU border guard system would be to implement and ensure a European integrated border management at the external borders as a shared responsibility The European border and coast guard would consist of a European border and coast guard agency (which would replace Frontex) and national authorities responsible for border management. The objective would be to ensure and implement, as a shared responsibility, the European integrated border management at the external borders[76].

As for 2018, several countries (such as France, Austria, Germany, Denmark, Sweden and Norway) have temporary reintroduced border controls in the context of foreseeable events until October or November 2018. This decision is based on "the security situation in Europe and threats resulting from the continues significant secondary movements", and as in the case of France, because of "persistent terrorist threat"[77].

[73] http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160504/schengen_proposal_en.pdf
[74] http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887
[75] https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/implementation package/docs/20160504/schengen_proposal_en.pdf
[76] http://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/migratory-pressures/strengthening-external-borders/
[77] https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/borders-and-visas/schengen/reintroduction-border-control_en

3. List of (Named) Officers

Alberts: Border officer, Latvia.
Alexander: Border officer, Lithuania.
Andris: intelligence border officer, Latvia.
Ania: Intelligence officer, Lithuania.
Anna: Border police officer, Estonia.
Dennis: Intelligence officer, Finland.
Dima: Intelligence border officer, Lithuania.
Edwin: Intelligence officers (former international liaison officer and street level police officer).
Filip: Intelligence border officer (early advocate of the project), Sweden.
Henrik: Border intelligence officer, Sweden.
Jakob: Border intelligence officers (participated in surveillance during the Power Weeks).
Jan: Intelligence police officer, early advocate of the project, Finland.
John: Senior border officer.
Juha: Police officer, Finland.
Jüri: intelligence police officer, Finland.
Lars: one of the initiators and coordinators of the project, Sweden
Lukas: middle level manager, intelligence officer, Latvia.
Magnus: intelligence border police officer, Sweden.
Marcus: border intelligence police officer, Sweden.
Marta: border intelligence officer (participated in surveillance during the Power Weeks).
Matti: coordinator of intelligence information, Finland.
Mina: border intelligence officer, Finland.
Mona: one of the initiators and coordinators of the project, Sweden.
Niklas: one of the initiators and coordinators of the project, Sweden
Oskar: one of the initiators and coordinators of the project, Sweden
Petra: intelligence border officer, Sweden.
Pontus: intelligence border police officer.
Stefan: senior coast guard officers (former EU observer), Sweden.
Victor: border officer, Lithuania.

4. Interview Guide- Project Turnstone Participants

Introduction Questions:

- What is your work experience (education and work tasks within the organization)?
- What motivated you to become a police/border/coast guard/intelligence officer?

Previous Experiences of Collaboration:

- What are your experiences of national collaboration?
- What are your experiences of international collaboration?
- Which organization do you collaborate on a daily (frequent) basis?
- What are your experiences of working with the participating organizations/countries?

General questions regarding collaboration:

- How would you describe success?
- What is important for national collaboration?
- What is important for international collaboration?
- What collaboration obstacles have you encountered?
- Can you give an example of successful/unsuccessful collaboration?
- The importance of collaboration in your work?

The Project

- What are your general opinions regarding the project?
- What do you think of the project so far?
- What is positive/negative regarding the project?
- Do you have any fears regarding collaboration during Project Turnstone?
- What are your hopes/expectations regarding the project?
- What would you have done differently? How? Why?
- What are your experiences regarding the Power Weeks?

Publikationer från Sociologiska institutionen
Lunds universitet

Beställning och aktuella priser på:
bokshop.lu.se
Böckerna levereras mot faktura eller kortbetalning.

Lund Dissertations in Sociology (ISSN 1102–4712)

13. Neergaard, Anders *Grasping the Peripheral State: A Historical Sociology of Nicaraguan State Formation* 401 sidor ISBN 91-89078-00-4 (1997)
14. Jannisa, Gudmund *The Crocodile's Tears: East Timor in the Making 328* sidor ISBN 91-89078-02-0 (1997)
15. Naranjo, Eduardo *Den auktoritära staten och ekonomisk utveckling i Chile: Jordbruket under militärregimen 1973-1981* 429 sidor ISBN 91-89078-03-9 (1997)
16. Wangel, Arne *Safety Politics and Risk Perceptions in Malaysian Industry* 404 sidor ISBN 91-89078-06-3 (1997)
17. Jönhill, Jan Inge *Samhället som system och dess ekologiska omvärld: En studie i Niklas Luhmanns sociologiska systemteori* 521 sidor ISBN 91-89078-09-8 (1997)
18. Lindquist, Per *Det klyvbara ämnet: Diskursiva ordningar i svensk kärnkraftspolitik 1972-1980* 445 sidor ISBN 91-89078-11-X (1997)
19. Richard, Elvi *I första linjen: Arbetsledares mellanställning, kluvenhet och handlingsstrategier i tre organisationer* 346 sidor ISBN 91-89078-17-9 (1997)
20. Einarsdotter-Wahlgren, Mia *Jag är konstnär! En studie av erkännandeprocessen kring konstnärskapet i ett mindre samhälle* 410 sidor ISBN 91-89078-20-9 (1997)
21. Nilsson-Lindström, Margareta *Tradition och överskridande: En studie av flickors perspektiv på utbildning* 165 sidor ISBN 98-89078-27-6 (1998)
22. Popoola, Margareta *Det sociala spelet om Romano Platso* 294 sidor ISBN 91-89078-33-0 (1998)
23. Eriksson, Annika *En gangster kunde kanske älska sin mor… Produktionen av moraliska klichéer i amerikanska polis- och deckarserier* 194 sidor ISBN 91-89078-36-5 (1998)
24. Abebe Kebede, Teketel *'Tenants of the State': The Limitations of Revolutionary Agrarian Transformation in Ethiopia, 1974-1991* 364 sidor ISBN 91-89078-38-1 (1998)
25. Leppänen, Vesa *Structures of District Nurse – Patient Interaction* 256 sidor ISBN 91-89078-44-6 (1998)
26. Idof Ståhl, Zeth *Den goda viljans paradoxer: Reformers teori och praktik speglade i lärares erfarenheter av möten i skolan* 259 sidor ISBN 91-89078-45-4 (1998)
27. Gustafsson, Bengt-Åke *Symbolisk organisering: En studie av organisatorisk förändring och meningsproduktion i fyra industriföretag* 343 sidor ISBN 91-89078-48-9 (1998)
28. Munk, Martin Livsbaner *gennem et felt: En analyse af eliteidrætsudøveres sociale mobilitet og rekonversioner of kapital i det sociale* rum 412 sidor ISBN 91-89078-72-1 (1999)

29. Wahlin, Lottie Den *rationella inbrottstjuven? En studie om rationalitet och rationellt handlande i brott* 172 sidor ISBN 91-89078-85-3 (1999)
30. Mathieu, Chris *The Moral Life of the Party: Moral Argumentation and the Creation of meaning in the Europe Policy Debates of the Christian and Left-Socialist Parties in Denmark and Sweden 1960-1996* 404 sidor ISBN 91-89078-96-9 (1999)
31. Ahlstrand, Roland *Förändring av deltagandet i produktionen: Exempel från slutmonteringsfabriker i Volvo* 165 sidor ISBN 91-7267-008-8 (2000)
32. Klintman, Mikael *Nature and the Social Sciences: Examples from the Electricity and Waste Sectors* 209 sidor ISBN 91-7267-009-6 (2000)
33. Hultén, Kerstin *Datorn på köksbordet: En studie av kvinnor som distansarbetar i hemmet* 181 sidor ISBN 91-89078-77-2 (2000)
34. Nilsén, Åke *"en empirisk vetenskap om duet": Om Alfred Schutz bidrag till sociologin* 164 sidor ISBN 91-7267-020-7 (2000)
35. Karlsson, Magnus *Från Jernverk till Hjärnverk: Ungdomstidens omvandling i Ronneby under tre generationer* 233 sidor ISBN 91-7267-022-3 (2000)
36. Stojanovic, Verica *Unga arbetslösas ansikten: Identitet och subjektivitet i det svenska och danska samhället* 237 sidor ISBN 91-7267-042-8 (2001)
37. Knopff, Bradley D. *Reservation Preservation: Powwow Dance, Radio, and the Inherent Dilemma of the Preservation Process* 218 sidor ISBN 91-7267-065-7 (2001)
38. Cuadra, Sergio *Mapuchefolket – i gränsernas land: En studie av autonomi, identitet, etniska gränser och social mobilisering* 247 sidor ISBN 91-7267-096-7 (2001)
39. Ljungberg, Charlotta *Bra mat och dåliga vanor: Om förtroendefulla relationer och oroliga reaktioner på livsmedelsmarknaden* 177 sidor ISBN 91-7267-097-5 (2001)
40. Spännar, Christina *Med främmande bagage: Tankar och erfarenheter hos unga människor med ursprung i annan kultur, eller Det postmoderna främlingskapet* 232 sidor ISBN 91-7267-100-9 (2001)
41. Larsson, Rolf *Between Crisis and Opportunity: Livelihoods, diversification, and ineuality among the Meru of Tanzania* 519 sidor Ill. ISBN 91-7267-101-7 (2001)
42. Kamara, Fouday *Economic and Social Crises in Sierra Leone: The Role of Small-scale Entrepreneurs in Petty Trading as a Strategy for Survival 1960-1996* 239 sidor ISBN 91-7267-102-5 (2001)
43. Höglund, Birgitta *Ute & Inne: Kritisk dialog mellan personalkollektiv inom psykiatrin* 206 sidor ISBN 91-7267-103-3 (2001)
44. Kindblad, Christopher *Gift and Exchange in the Reciprocal Regime of the Miskito on the Atlantic Coast of Nicaragua, 20th Century* 279 sidor ISBN 91-7267-113-0 (2001)
45. Wesser, Erik *"Har du varit ute och shoppat, Jacob?" En studie av Finansinspektionens utredning av insiderbrott under 1990-talet* 217 sidor ISBN 91-7267-114-9 (2001)
46. Stenberg, Henrik *Att bli konstnär: Om identitet, subjektivitet och konstnärskap i det senmoderna samhället* 219 sidor ISBN 91-7267-121-1 (2002)
47. Copes, Adriana *Entering Modernity: The Marginalisation of the Poor in the Developing Countries. An Account of Theoretical Perspectives from the 1940's to the 1980's* 184 sidor ISBN 91-7267-124-6 (2002)
48. Cassegård, Carl *Shock and Naturalization: An inquiry into the perception of modernity* 249 sidor ISBN 91-7267-126-2 (2002)
49. Waldo, Åsa *Staden och resandet: Mötet mellan planering och vardagsliv* 235 sidor ISBN 91-7267-123-8 (2002)
50. Stierna, Johan *Lokal översättning av svenskhet och symboliskt kapital: Det svenska rummet i Madrid 1915-1998 300* sidor ISBN 91-7267-136-X (2003)

51. Arvidson, Malin *Demanding Values: Participation, empowerment and NGOs in Bangladesh* 214 sidor ISBN 91-7267-138-6 (2003)
52. Zetino Duartes, Mario *Vi kanske kommer igen, om det låser sig: Kvinnors och mäns möte med familjerådgivning* 246 sidor ISBN 91-7267-141-6 (2003)
53. Lindell, Lisbeth *Mellan ´frisk och sjuk: En studie av psykiatrisk öppenvård* 310 sidor ISBN 91-7267-143-2 (2003)
54. Gregersen, Peter *Making the Most of It? Understanding the social and productive dynamics of small farmers in semi-arid Iringa,* Tanzania 263 sidor ISBN 91-7267-147-5 (2003)
55. Oddner, Frans *Kafékultur, kommunikation och gränser* 296 sidor ISBN 91-7267-157-2 (2003)
56. Elsrud, Torun *Taking Time and Making Journeys: Narratives on Self and the Other among Backpackers* 225 sidor ISBN 91-7267-164-5 (2004)
57. Jörgensen, Erika *Hållbar utveckling, samhällsstruktur och kommunal identitet: En jämförelse mellan Västervik och Varberg* 242 sidor ISBN 91-7267-163-3 (2004)
58. Hedlund, *Marianne Shaping Justice: Defining the disability benefit category in Swedish social policy* 223 sidor ISBN 91-7267-167-X (2004)
59. Hägerström, Jeanette *Vi och dom och alla dom andra andra på Komvux: Etnicitet, genus och klass i samspel* 234 sidor ISBN 91-7267-169-6 (2004)
60. Säwe, Filippa A*tt tala med, mot och förbi varandra: Samtal mellan föräldrar och skolledning på en dövskola* 215 sidor ISBN 91-7267-173-4 (2004)
61. Alkvist, Lars-Erik *Max Weber och kroppens sociologi* 271 sidor ISBN 91-7267-178-5 (2004)
62. Winsvold, Aina *Når arbeidende barn mobiliserer seg: En studie av tre unioner i Karnataka,* India 300 sidor ISBN 91-7267-183-1 (2004)
63. Thorsted, Stine IT-*retorik og hverdagsliv: Et studie af fødevarehandel over Internet* 219 sidor ISBN 91-7267-186-6 (2005)
64. Svensson, Ove *Ungdomars spel om pengar: Spelmarknaden, situationen och karriären* 308 sidor ISBN 91-7267-192-0 (2005)
65. Lundberg, Anders P. *Om Gemenskap: En sociologisk betraktelse* 248 sidor ISBN 91-7267-193-9 (2005)
66. Mallén, Agneta *Trygghet i skärgårdsmiljö: En studie om rädsla för brott i Åland* 218 sidor ISBN 91-7267-1955 (2005)
67. Ryding, Anna *Välviljans variationer: Moraliska gränsdragningar inom brottsofferjourer* 222 sidor ISBN 91-7267-188-2 (2005)
68. Burcar, Veronika *Gestaltningar av offere rf a renheter: Samtal med unga män som utsats för brott* 206 sidor ISBN 91-7267-207-2 (2005)
69. Ramsay, Anders *Upplysningens självreflexion: Aspekter av Theodor W. Adornos kritiska teori* 146 sidor ISBN 91-7267-208-0 (2005)
70. Thelander, Joakim *Mutor i det godas tjänst: Biståndsarbetare i samtal om vardaglig korruption* 194 sidor ISBN 91-7267211-0 (2005)
71. Henecke, Birgitta *Plan & Protest: En sociologisk studie av kontroveser, demokrati och makt i den fysiska planerimgen* 272 sidor ISBN 91-7267-213-7 (2006)
72. Ingestad, Gunilla *Dokumenterat utanförskap: Om skolbarn som inte når målen* 180 sidor ISBN 91-7267-219-6 (2006)
73. Andreasson, Jesper *Idrottens kön: Genus, kropp och sexualitet i lagidrottens vardag* 267 sidor ISBN 91-628-7009-2 (2007)

74. Holmström, Ola *Skolpolitik, skolutvecklingsarena och sociala processer: Studie av en gymnasieskola i kris* 249 sidor ISBN 91-7267-229-3 (2007)
75. Ring, Magnus *Social Rörelse: Begreppsbildning av ett mångtydigt fenomen* 200 sidor ISBN 91-7267-231-5 (2007)
76. Persson, Marcus *Mellan människor och ting. En interaktionistisk analys av samlandet* 241 sidor ISBN 91-7267-238-2 (2007)
77. Schmitz, Eva *Systerskap som politisk handling: Kvinnors organisering i Sverige 1968 1982* 362 sidor ISBN 91-7267-244-7 (2007)
78. Lundberg, Henrik *Filosofisociologi: Ett sociologiskt perspektiv på filosofiskt tänknde* 225 sidor ISBN 91-7267-245-5 (2007)
79. Melén, Daniel *Sjukskrivningssystemet: Sjuka som blir arbetslösa och arbetslös som blir sjukskrivn* 276 sidor ISBN 91-7267-254-4 (2007)
80. Kondrup Jakobsen, Klaus The *Logic of the Exception: A Sociological Investigation into Theological Foundation of Political with specific regard to Kirekegaardian on Carl Schmitt* 465 sidor ISBN 91-7267-265-X (2008)
81. Berg, Martin *Självets gardirobiär: Självreflexiva genuslekar och queer socialpsykologi* 230 sidor ISBN 91-7267-257-9 (2008)
82. Fredholm, Axel *Beyond the Catchwords: Adjustment and Community Response in Participatory Development in Post-Suharto Indonesia* 180 sidor ISBN 91-7267-269-2 (2008)
83. Linné, Tobias *Digitala pengar: Nya villkor i det sociala livet* 229 sidor ISBN 91-7267-282-X (2008)
84. Nyberg, Maria *Mycket mat, lite måltider: En studie av arbetsplatsen som måltidsarena* 300 sidor ISBN 91-7267-285-4 (2009)
85. Eldén, Sara *Konsten att lyckas som par: Populärterapeutiska berättelser, individualisering och kön* 245 sidor ISBN 91-7267-286-2 (2009)
86. Bjerstedt, Daniel *Tryggheten inför rätta: Om rätten till förtidspension enligt förvaltningsdomstolarna under tre decenier* 240 sidor ISBN 91-7267-287-0 (2009)
87. Kåhre, Peter På *AI-teknikens axlar: Om kunskapssociologin och stark artificiel intelligens* 200 sidor ISBN 91-7267-289-7 (2009)
88. Loodin, Henrik *Biografier från gränslandet: En sociologisk studie om psykiatrins förändrade kontrollmekanismer* 118 sidor ISBN 91-7267-303-6 (2009)
89. Eriksson, Helena *Befolkning, samhälle och förändring: Dynamik i Halmstad under fyra decenier* 212 sidor ISBN 91-7267-313-3 (2010)
90. Espersson, Malin M*er eller mindre byråkratisk: en studie av organisationsförändringar inom Kronofogdemyndigheten* 182 sidor ISBN 91-7267-315-X (2010)
91. Yang, Chia-Ling *Othering Processes in Feminist Teaching – A case study of an adult educational institution* 184 sidor ISBN 91-7267-318-4 (2010)
92. Anna Isaksson *Att utmana förändringens gränser – En studie om förändringsarbete, partnerskap och kön med Equal-programmet som exempel* 206 sidor ISBN 91-7267-321-4 (2010)
93. Lars-Olof Hilding ”ÄR DET SÅ HÄR VI ÄR” – Om utbildning som normalitet och om produktionen av studenter 200 sidor ISBN 91-7267-326-5 (2011)
94. Pernille Berg *The Reluctant Change Agent – Change, Chance and Choice among Teachers Educational Change in The City* 196 sidor ISBN 91-7267-331-1 (2011)
95. Mashiur Rahman *Struggling Against Exlusion – Adibasi in Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh* 202 sidor ISBN 91-7267-334-6 (2011)

96. Lisa Eklund *Rethinking Son Preference – Gender, Population Dynamics and Social Change in the People's Republic of China* 218 sidor ISBN 978-91-7473-108-8 (2011)
97. Klas Gutavsson *Det vardagliga och det vetenskapliga – Om sociologins begrepp* 260 sidor ISBN 91-7267-336-2 (2011)
98. Daniel Sjödin *Tryggare kan ingen vara – Migration, religion och integration i en segregerad omgivning* 268 sidor ISBN 91-7267-337-0 (2011)
99. Jonas Ringström *Mellan sanning och konsekvens – En studie av den tredje generationens kognitiva beteendeterapier* 268 sidor ISBN 921-7267-338-9 (2011)
100. Maria Norstedt Berättelser om stroke och arbetsliv – Att upptäcka styranderelationer 204 sidor ISBN 978-91-7473-182-8 (2011)
101. Terese Anving Måltidens *Paradoxer – Om klass och kön i vardagens familjepraktiker* 228 sidor ISBN 91-7267-339-2 (2012)
102. Goran Basic *Samverkan blir kamp – En sociologisk analys av ett projekt i ungdomsvården 287* sidor ISBN 91-7267-346-X (2012)
103. Zettervall, Charlotta *Reluctant Victims into Challengers – Narratives of a Kurdish Political Generation in Diaspora in Sweden* 315 sidor ISBN 978-91-7473-412-6 (2013)
104. Apelmo, Elisabet *Som vem som helst – Kön, funktionalitet och idrottande kroppar 272 sidor ISBN 978-91-7473-408-9 (2012) Utgivare: Bokförlaget Daidalos, Bergsjödalen* 54b, 415 23, Göteborg, www.daidalos.se
105. Sandgren, Mikael *Europa som nation – En ny stil i nationalismens genre* 242 sidor ISBN 91-7267-356-7 (2013)
106. Sandberg, Johan *Social Policy of Our Time? – An Inquiry into Evidence, Assumptions, and Diffusion of Conditional Cash Transfers in Latin America* 182 sidor ISBN 91-7267-365-6 (2014) Kan ej beställas av Media-Tryck. Beställs av författaren.
107. Frees Esholdt, Henriette *Når humor, leg og lyst er på spil – Social interaktion på en multietnisk arbejdsplads* 260 sidor ISBN 978-91-7623-215-6 (2015).
108. Vaide, Johan, *Contact Space: Shanghai, The Chinese Dream and the Production of a New Society* 215 sidor ISBN 978-91-7623-231-6 (2015)
109. Kolankiewicz, Marta *Anti-Muslim Violence and the Possibility of Justice* 226 sidor ISBN 978-91-7623-257-6 (2015)
110. Boethius, Susanne *Män, våld och moralarbete -Rapporter från män som sökt behandling för våld i nära relationer*. 262 sidor ISBN 978-91-7623-450-1 (2015)
111. Görtz, Daniel *Etnifierade polispraktiker Hur etnicitet görs i polisens vardag* 337 sidor ISBN 978-91-7267-380-9 (2015)
112. Stjärnhagen, Ola *Ekonomisk tillväxt i välfärdskapitalismen -En jämförande studie av BNP per capita-tillväxten i rika OECD-länder 1970-2000.* 168 sidor ISBN 978-91-7623-490-7 (2015)
113. Hedman, Karl *Managing Medical Emergency Calls.* 281 sidor ISBN 978-91-7623-690-1 (2016)
114. Solano, Priscilla *Assisting in the Shadows - Humanitarianism, Shelters and Transit Migration Politics. 250 sidor* ISBN 978-91-7753-102-9 (2017)
115. Ennerberg, Elin *Destination employment? Contradictions and ambiguities in Swedish labour market policy for newly arrived migrants* 232 sidor ISBN 978-91-7753-204-0 (2017)
116. Sunnercrantz, Liv *Hegemony and the Intellectual Function Medialised Public Discourse on Privatisation in Sweden 1988-1993.* 338 sidor ISBN 978-91-7753-471-6 (2017)

117. Kaya, Gökhan *Aspirations, Capital and Identity: Four studies on the determinants of life chances for young Swedes with an immigrant background*. 163 sidor ISBN 978-91-7753-771-7 (2018)
118. Hylmö, Anders *Disciplined reasoning: Styles of reasoning and the mainstream-heterodoxy divide in Swedish economics*
119. Yakhlef, Sophia *United Agents: Community of Practice within Border Policing in the Baltic Sea Area*. 220 sid ISBN: 978-91-7753-806-6 (2018)

Licentiate's Dissertations in Sociology (ISSN-1403-6061)

1996:1 Forsberg, Pia *Välfärd, arbetsmarknad och korporativa institutioner: En studie av Trygghetsrådet SAF/PTK* 147 sidor ISBN 91-89078-07-1
1996:2 Klintman, Mikael *Från "trivialt" till globalt: Att härleda miljöpåverkan från motiv och handlingar i urbana sfärer* 171 sidor ISBN 91-89078-46-2
1996:3 Höglund, Birgitta *Att vårda och vakta: Retorik och praktik i en rättspsykiatrisk vårdkontext* 215 sidor ISBN 91-89078-68-3
1997:1 Jacobsson, Katarina *Social kontroll i dövvärlden*
148 sidor ISBN 91-89078-18-7
1997:2 Arvidsson, Adam *Den sociala konstruktionen av "en vanlig Människa": Tre betraktelser kring reklam och offentlighet* 122 sidor ISBN 91-89078-26-8
1998:1 Lundberg, Magnus *Kvinnomisshandel som polisärende: Att definiera och utdefiniera* 136 sidor ISBN 91-89078-40-3
1998:2 Stojanovic, Verica *Att leva sitt liv som arbetslös... Svenska och danska ungdomars relationer, ekonomi, bostadssituation och värdesättning av arbete*
148 sidor ISBN 91-89078-54-3
1998:3 Wesser, Erik *Arbetsmarknad och socialförsäkring i förändring: En studie av långtidssjukskrivning och förtidspensionering på 90-talet*
150 sidor 91-89078-57-8
1999:1 Radmann, Aage *Fotbollslandskapet: Fotboll som socialt fenomen*
167 sidor ISBN 91-89078-81-0
1999:2 Waldo, Åsa *Vardagslivets resor i den stora staden*
288 sidor ISBN 91-89078-88-8
1999:3 Säwe, Filippa *Om samförstånd och konflikt: Samtal mellan föräldrar och skolledning på en specialskola* 159 sidor ISBN 91-89078-93-4
1999:4 Schmitz, Eva *Arbetarkvinnors mobiliseringar i arbetarrörelsens barndom: En studie av arbetarkvinnors strejkaktiviteter och dess inflytande på den svenska arbetarrörelsen* 138 sidor ISBN 91-89078-99-3
2000:1 Copes, Adriana *Time and Space: An Attempt to Transform Relegated Aspects in Central Issues of the Sociological Inquiry* 177 sidor ISBN 91-7267-003-7
2000:2 Gottskalksdottir, Bergthora *Arbetet som en port till samhället: Invandrarakademikers integration och identitet*
89 sidor ISBN 91-7267-012-6
2000:3 Alkvist, Lars-Erik *Max Weber och rationalitetsformerna*
176 sidor ISBN 91-7267-019-3
2001:1 Bergholtz, Zinnia *Att arbeta förebyggande: Tankar kring ett hälsoprojekt*
50 sidor ISBN 91-7267-043-6

2005:1 Bing Jackson, Hannah *Det fragmenterede fællesskab: Opfattelser af sociale fællesskabers funktion og deres udvikling i det senmoderne samfund*
162 sidor ISBN 91-7267-190-4

2005:2 Lundberg, Henrik *Durkheim och Mannheim som filosofisociologer*
88 sidor ISBN 91-7267-200-5

Lund Studies in Sociology (ISSN 0460-0045)

1 Goodman, Sara & Mulinari, Diana (red) *Feminist Interventions in Discourses on Gender and Development: Some Swedish Contributions*
250 sidor ISBN 91-89078-51-9 (1999)

2 Ahlstrand, Roland *Norrköpingsmodellen – ett projekt för ny sysselsättning åt personalen vid Ericsson Telecom AB i Norrköping*
114 sidor ISBN 91-7267-026-6 (2001)

3 Djurfeldt, Göran & Gooch, Pernille *Bondkäringar – kvinnoliv i en manlig värld* 60 sidor ISBN 91-7267-095-9 (2001)

4 Davies, Karen *Disturbing Gender: On the doctor – nurse relationship*
115 sidor ISBN 91-7267-108-4 (2001)

5 Nilsson, Jan Olof & Nilsson, Kjell *Old Universities in New Environments: New Technology and Internationalisation Processes in Higher Education*
116 sidor ISBN 91-7267-174-2 (2004)

1996:1 Ahlstrand, Roland *En tid av förändring: Om involvering och exkludering vid Volvos monteringsfabrik i Torslanda 1991-1993*
116 sidor ISBN 91-89078-15-2

1997:1 Lindbladh, Eva, et al *Unga vuxna: Berättelser om arbete, kärlek och moral*
192 sidor ISBN 91-89078-14-4

1997:2 Lindén, Anna-Lisa (red) *Thinking, Saying, Doing: Sociological Perspectives on Environmental Behaviour* 103 sidor ISBN 91-89078-13-6

1997:3 Leppänen, Vesa *Inledning till den etnometodologiska samtalsanalysen*
76 sidor ISBN 91-89078-16-0

1997:4 Dahlgren, Anita & Ingrid Claezon *Nya föräldrar: Om kompisföräldraskap, auktoritet och ambivalens* 117 sidor ISBN 91-89078-08-X

1997:5 Persson, Anders (red) *Alternativ till ekonomismen*
71 sidor ISBN 91-89078-22-5

1997:6 Persson, Anders (red) *Kvalitet och kritiskt tänkande*
67 sidor ISBN 91-89078-25-X

1998:1 Isenberg, Bo (red) *Sociology and Social Transformation: Essays by Michael Mann, Chantal Mouffe, Göran Therborn, Bryan S. Turner*
79 sidor ISBN 91-89078-28-4

1998:2 Björklund Hall, Åsa *Sociologidoktorer: Forskarutbildning och karriär*
84 sidor ISBN 91-89078-31-4

1998:3 Klintman, Mikael *Between the Private and the Public: Formal Carsharing as Part of a Sustainable Traffic System – an Exploratory Study*
96 sidor ISBN 91-89078-32-2

1998:4 Lindén, Anna-Lisa & Annika Carlsson-Kanyama *Dagens livsstilar i framtidens perspektiv* 74 sidor ISBN 91-89078-37-7

1998:5 Ahlstrand, Roland *En tid av förändring: Dominerande koalitioner och organisationsstrukturer vid Volvo Lastvagnars monteringsfabriker i Tuve 1982-1994* 94 sidor ISBN 91-89078-37-3

1998:6 Sahlin, Ingrid *The Staircase of Transition: European Observatory on Homelessness. National Report from Sweden* 66 sidor ISBN 91-89078-39-X

1998:7 Naranjo, Eduardo *En kortfattad jämförelse mellan den asiatiska och chilenska socioekonomiska erf a renheten* 42 sidor ISBN 91-89078-42-X

1998:8 Bosseldal, Ingrid & Johanna Esseveld *Bland forskande kvinnor och teoretiserande män: Jämställdhet och genus vid Sociologiska institutionen i Lund* 103 sidor ISBN 91-89078-59-4

1998:9 Bosseldal, Ingrid & Carl Hansson *Kvinnor i mansrum: Jämställdhet och genus vid Sociologiska institutionen i Umeå* 82 sidor ISBN 91-89078-60-8

1998:10 Bosseldal, Ingrid & Merete Hellum *Ett kvinnligt genombrott utan feminism? Jämställdhet och genus vid Sociologiska institutionen i Göteborg*
83 sidor ISBN 91-89078-61-6

1998:11 Morhed, Anne-Marie *Det motstridiga könet: Jämställdhet och genus vid Sociologiska institutionen i Uppsala* 103 sidor ISBN 91-89078-62-4

1998:12 Bosseldal, Ingrid & Sanja Magdalenic *Det osynliga könet: Jämställdhet och genus vid Sociologiska institutionen i Stockholm*
71 sidor ISBN 91-89078-63-2

1998:13 Bosseldal, Ingrid & Stina Johansson *Den frånvarande genusteorin: Jämställdhet och genus vid Sociologiska institutionen i Linköping*
62 sidor ISBN 91-89078-64-0

1998:14 Hydén, Håkan & Anna-Lisa Lindén (red) *Lagen, rätten och den sociala tryggheten: Tunnelbygget genom Hallandsåsen*
154 sidor ISBN 91-89078-67-5

1998:15 Sellerberg, Ann-Mari (red) *Sjukdom, liv och död – om samband, gränser och format* 165 sidor ISBN 91-89078-66-7

1999:1 Pacheco, José F. (ed.) *Cultural Studies and the Politics of Everyday Life: Essays by Peter Dahlgren, Lars Nilsson, Bo Reimer, Monica Rudberg, Kenneth Thompson, Paul Willis. Introductory comments by Ron Eyerman and Mats Trondman* 105 sidor ISBN 91-89078-84-5

1999:2 Lindén, Anna-Lisa & Leonardas Rinkevicius (eds.) *Social Processes and the Environment – Lithuania and Sweden* 171 sidor ISBN 91-7267-002-9

2000:1 Khalaf, Abdulhadi *Unfinished Business – Contentious Politics and State-Building in Bahrain* 120 sidor ISBN 91-7267-004-5

2000:2 Pacheco, José F. (red.) *Kultur, teori, praxis: Kultursociologi i Lund*
238 sidor ISBN 91-7267-015-0

2000:3 Nilsson, Jan Olof *Berättelser om Den Nya Världen*
92 sidor ISBN 91-7267-024-X

2001:1 Alkvist, Lars-Erik *Max Webers verklighetsvetenskap*
147 sidor ISBN 91-7267-099-1

2001:2 Pacheco, José F. (red) *Stadskultur: Bidrag av Eric Clark, Richard Ek, Mats Franzén, Camilla Haugaard, Magnus Carlsson, Charlotte Kira-Kimby, José F. Pacheco, Margareta Popoola, Ingrid Sahlin, Catharina Thörn, Magnus Wennerhag, Niklas Westberg* 125 sidor ISBN 91-7267-115-7

2002:1 Wendel, Monica *Kontroversen om arbetstidsförkortning: En sociologisk studie av tre försök med arbetstidsförkortning inom Malmö kommun*
209 sidor ISBN 91-7267-166-5

2002:2 Thelander, Joakim *"Säker är man ju aldrig": Om riskbedömningar, skepsis och förtroende för handel och bankärenden via Internet*
58 sidor ISBN 91-7267-117-3

2002:3 Dahlgren, Anita *Idrott, motion och andra fritidsintressen: En enkätundersökning bland 17-åriga flickor och pojkar i Landskrona, Kävlinge och Svalöv* 39 sidor ISBN 91 7267-123-8 (2002)

2002:4 Wendel, Monica *Mot en* ny *arbetsorganisering: En sociologisk studie av några försöksprojekt med flexibla arbetstider och distansarbete inom Malmö kommun*
144 sidor ISBN 91-7267-129-7

2002:5 Sörensen, Jill *Utvärderingsmodell för flexibla arbetstider inom Malmö kommun* 76 sidor ISBN 91-7267-132-7

2003:1 Klintman, Mikael & Mårtensson, Kjell med Johansson, Magnus *Bioenergi för uppvärmning – hushållens perspektiv* 98 sidor ISBN 91-7267-148-3

2004:1 Johnsdotter, Sara *FGM in Sweden: Swedish legislation regarding "female genital mutilation" and implementation of the law*
68 sidor ISBN 91-7267-162-9

2004:2 Carlsson-Kanyama, Annika, Lindén, Anna-Lisa & Eriksson, Björn *Hushållskunder på elmarknaden: Värderingar och beteenden*
133 sidor ISBN 91-7267-166-9

2005:1 Lindén, Anna-Lisa et al *Mat, hälsa och oregelbundna arbetstider* 216 sidor ISBN 91-7267-187-4

2006:1 Lindén, Anna-Lisa et al *Miljöpolitik och styrmedel – Två fallstudier: Kött och kläder* 90 sidor ISBN 91-7267-220-X

2006:2 Heidegren, Carl-Göran *FOSS-galaxen – En empirisk undersökning kring fri och öppen programvarurörelsen* 93 sidor ISBN 91-7267-218-8

2006:3 Apelmo, Elisabet & Sellerberg, Ann-Mari *"Shit, jag kan också lyckas" – Om genus, funktionshinder och idrottande kroppar* 43 sidor ISBN 91-7267-225-0

2007:1 Sellerberg, Ann-Mari *Världsbäst och i periferin – Om att vara funktionshindrad kvinna i idrotten* 40 sidor ISBN 91-7267-248-X

2007:2 Thorsted, Stine *Måltidet i tidsfällan – Måltidspraksis og brug af färdigmat i vardagen* 56 sidor ISBN 91-7267-250-1

2008:1 Klintman, Mikael, Boström, Magnus, Ekelund, Lena & Anna-Lisa Lindén *Maten märks – Förutsättningar för konsumentmakt* 134 sidor ISBN 91-7267-266-8

2008:2 Anving, Terese *"Man måste ligga steget före" – Måltidsarbetets planering och organisering i barnfamiljen* 56 sidor ISBN 91-7267-267-6

2008:3 Sellerberg, Ann-Mari *En het potatis – Om mat och måltider i barn- och tonårsfamiljer* 96 sidor ISBN 91-7267-268-4

2008:4 Nyberg, Maria, Lindén, Anna-Lisa, Lagnevik, Magnus *Mat på arbetet dygnet runt? Arbete – Tid – Måltid Inventering av kunskap genom svensk forskning* 49 sidor ISBN 91-7267-275-7

2008:5 Lindén, Anna-Lisa *Hushållsel – Efektivisering i vardagen* 84 sidor ISBN 91-7267-280-3

2009:1 Lindén, Anna-Lisa *Klimat och konsumtion – Tre fallstudier kring styrmedel och konsumtionsbeteende* 72 sidor ISBN 91-7267-294-3

2009:2 Lindén, Anna-Lisa, Jörgensen, Erika, Thelander, Åsa *Energianvändning – Konsumenters beslut och agerande* 264 sidor ISBN 91-7267-298-6

Working Papers in Sociology (1404-6741)

1997:1 Sjöberg, Katarina (red) *Vetenskapsteori* 92 sidor ISBN 91-89078-10-1

1997:2 Lindholm, Jonas & Vinderskov, Kirstine *Generationen der blev kulturpendlere: Et kvalitativt studie af unge muslimers hverdag* 171 sidor ISBN 91-89078-19-5

1999:1 Jörgensen, Erika *Perspektiv på social hållbarhet i Varberg och Västervik* 65 sidor ISBN 91-89078-75-6

1999:2 Holmström, Ola *En utvärdering av en utvärdering eller Berättelsen om hur jag förlorade min sociologiska oskuld* 93 sidor ISBN 91-89078-91-8

2000:1 Kimby, Charlotte Kira & Camilla Haugaard *Kroppen i den computermedierede kommunikation* 93 sidor ISBN 91-7267-007-X

2000:2 Bing Jackson, Hannah *Forandringer i arbejdslivet og i familjelivet: Om kvinders livsformer ved årtusindeskiftet* 43 sidor ISBN 91-7267-017-7

2000:3 Bing Jackson, Hannah *Family and Fertility Patterns in Denmark – a "Postmodern" Phenomenon: On the relationship between women's education and employment situation and the changes in family forms and fertility*
52 sidor ISBN 91-7267-018-5

2002:1 Henecke, Birgitta & Jamil Khan *Medborgardeltagande i den fysiska planeringen: En demokratiteoretisk analys av lagstiftning, retorik och praktik*
38 sidor ISBN 91-7267-134-3

2003:1 Persson, Marcus & Thelander, Joakim *Mellan relativism och realism: Forskarstudenter om vetenskapsteori* 89 sidor ISBN 91-7267-146-7

2003:2 Barmark, Mimmi *Sjuka hus eller sjuka människor? Om boenderelaterad ohälsa bland malmöbor* 46 sidor ISBN 91-7267-151-3

2004:1 Persson, Marcus & Sjöberg, Katarina (red) *Om begrepp och förståelse: Att problematisera det enkla och förenkla det svåra*
61 sidor ISBN 91-7267-171-8

2007:1 Lindén, Anna-Lisa *Sociala dimensioner i hållbar samhällsplanering*
30 sidor ISBN 91-7267-236-6

Evaluation Studies

1997:1 Persson, Anders *Räddningstjänstutbildning för brandingenjörer – en utvärdering* 37 sidor ISBN 91-89078-12-8

1997:2 Björklund Hall, Åsa *På spaning efter tillvaron som doktorand – med hjälp av forskarstuderandes röster* 72 sidor ISBN 91-89078-21-7

1998:1 Bierlein, Katja, Leila Misirli & Kjell Nilsson *Arbetslivsrehabilitering i samverkan: Utvärdering av Projekt Malmö Rehab 2000*
63 sidor ISBN 91-89078-30-6

1998:2 Mulinari, Diana *Reflektioner kring projektet KvinnoKrami/MOA*
84 sidor ISBN 91-89078-55-1

1998:3 Mulinari, Diana & Anders Neergard *Utvärdering av projektet "Steg till arbete"* 72 sidor ISBN 91-89078-56-X

1998:4 Misirli, Leila & Monica Wendel *Lokal samverkan – till allas fördel?: En utvärdering av Trelleborgsmodellen – ett arbetsmarknadspolitiskt försök med "friår", inom Trelleborgs kommun* 45 sidor ISBN 91-89078-58-6

1998:5 Bierlein, Katja & Leila Misirli *Samverkan mot ungdomsarbetslöshet: Utvärdering av projekt Kompassen i Helsingborg*
80 sidor ISBN 91-89078-69-1

1999:1 Bierlein, Katja & Ellinor Platzer *Myndighetssamverkan i projekt Malmö Rehab 2000: Utvärdering 1997-98* 75 sidor ISBN 91-89078-74-8

1999:2 Ahlstrand, Roland & Monica Wendel *Frågor kring samverkan: En utvärdering av Visionsbygge Burlöv – ett myndighetsövergripande projekt för arbetslösa invandrare* 51 sidor ISBN 91-89078-82-9

1999:3 Nilsson Lindström, Margareta *En processutvärdering av projektet Trampolinen: Ett vägledningsprojekt riktat till långtidsarbetslösa vid Arbetsförmedlingen i Lomma* 104 sidor ISBN 91-89078-94-2

1999:4 Nilsson Lindström, Margareta *En processutvärdering av projektet New Deal: Ett vägledningsprojekt för långtidsarbetslösa kvinnor inom kontor och administration* 107 sidor ISBN 91-89078-95-0

1999:5 Wendel, Monica *Utvärdering av projekt arbetsLÖSningar: En arbetsmarknadsåtgärd i samverkan för långtidssjukskrivna och långtidsarbetslösa* 63 sidor ISBN 91-7267-000-2

2005:1 Nilsson Lindström, Margareta *Att bryta traditionella könsmönster i arbetslivet: En grupp långtidsarbetslösa kvinnors erfarenheter av kursen "Teknik för kvinnor med begränsat utbud"* 50 sidor ISBN 91-7267-209-9

Afrint Working Paper (ISSN 1651-5897)

1 Larsson, Rolf, Holmén, Hans & Hammarskjöld, Mikael *Agricultural Development in Sub – Saharan Africa* 48 sidor ISBN 91-7267-133-5

2 Djurfeldt, Göran & Jirström, Magnus *Asian Models of Agricultural Development and their Relevance to Africa* 47 sidor ISBN 91-7267-137-8

Studies in Bodies, Gender and Society (ISSN 1652-1102)

1 Hansson, Adam *Det manliga klimakteriet: Om försöker att lansera ett medicinsk begrepp* 50 sidor ISBN 91-7267-158-0 (2003)

2 Norstedt, Maria *Att skapa dikotomier och bibehålla genusordningar: An analys av tidningen* Taras *berättelser om kropp. kön och medelålder* 52 sidor ISBN 91-7267-159-9 (2003)

Lund Monographs in Social Anthropology (ISSN 1101-9948)

3 Pérez-Arias, Enrique *Mellan det förflutna och framtiden: Den sandinistiska revolutionen i Nicaragua* 322 sidor ISBN 91-89078-01-2 (ak. avh. 1997)

4 Karlsson, B. G. *Contested Belonging: An Indigenous People's Struggle for Forest and Identity in Sub-Himalayan Bengal* 318 sidor ISBN 91-89078-04-7 (ak. avh. 1997)

5 Lindberg, Christer (red) *Antropologiska porträtt 2* 342 sidor ISBN 91-89078-05-5 (1997)

6 Gooch, Pernille *At the Tail of the Buffalo: Van Gujjar pastoralists between the forest and the world arena* 391 sidor ISBN 91-89078-53-5 (ak. avh. 1998)

7 Persson, Johnny *Sagali and the Kula: A regional systems analysis of the Massim* 245 sidor ISBN 91-89078-87-X (ak. avh. 1999)

8 Malm, Thomas *Shell Age Economics: Marine Gathering in the Kingdom of Tonga, Polynesia* 430 sidor ISBN 91-89078-97-7 (ak. avh. 1999)

9 Johansson Dahre, Ulf *Det förgångna är framtiden: Ursprungsfolk och politiskt självbestämmande i Hawai'i* 228 sidor Ill. ISBN 91-7267-107-6 (ak. avh. 2001)

10 Johnsdotter, Sara *Created by God: How Somalis in Swedish Exile Reassess the Practice of Female Circumcision* 301 sidor ISBN 91-7267-127-0 (ak. avh. 2002)

11 Andersson, Oscar Chicagoskolan: *Institutionaliseringen, idétraditionen & vetenskapen* 336 sidor ISBN 91-7267-153-X (ak. avh. 2003)
12 Carlbom, Aje *The Imagined versus the Real Other: Multiculturalism and the Representation of Muslims in Sweden*
234 sidor ISBN 91-7267-154-8 (ak. avh. 2003)
13 Antoniusson, Eva-Malin *Överdosens antropologi: En kontextuell studie*
232 sidor ISBN 91-7267-161-0 (ak. avh. 2003)
14 Parker, Peter *How Personal Networks Shape Business: An Anthropological Study of Social Embeddedness, Knowledge Development and Growth of Firms*
156 sidor ISBN 91-7267-182-3 (ak. avh. 2004)
15 Lindberg, Crister (red) *Nya antropologiska porträtt*
355 sidor ISBN 91-7267-182-3 (2005)
16 Sliavaite, Kristina *From Pioneers to Target Group: Social change, ethnicity and memory in a Lithuanian power plant community*
206 sidor ISBN 91-7267-202-1 (ak. avh. 2005)
17 Göransson, Kristina *Conflicts and Contracts – Chinese Intergenerational Relations in Modern Singapore* 187 sidor ISBN 91-7167-202-1 (ak. avh. 2006)
18 Bourgouin, France *TheYoung, the Wealthy, and the Restless: Trans-national Capitalist Elite Formation in Post-Apartheid Johannesburg*
342 sidor ISBN 91-7267-249-8 (ak. avh. 2007)
19 Matsson, Anna *The Power to do Good: Post-Revolution, NGO Society, and the Emergence of NGO-Elites in Contemporary Nicaragua*
208 sidor ISBN 91-7267-251-X (ak. avh. 2007)
20 Holm, Hilma *Knowledge as Action – An Anthropological Study of Attac Sweden*
144 sidor ISBN 91-7267-317-6 (ak. avh. 2010)
21 Wittrock, Hanna *Säg inte mötesplats! – Teater och integration i ord och handling*
268 sidor ISBN 91-7267-332-X (ak. avh. 2011)
22 Hedlund, Anna *Exile Warriors: Violence and Community among Hutu Rebels in the Eastern Congo* 244 sidor ISBN 978-91-7473-983-1 (ak. avh. 2014)
23 Capelán Köhler, Annika *Fibre Formations: Wool as an anthropological site* 260 sidor ISBN 978-91-7753-202-6 (ak. avh. 2017)
24 Granbom Lotta, *The Second Wave: The Urak Lawoi After the Tsunami in Thailand.*
356 sidor ISBN 978-91-7753-397-9 (ak. avh. 2017)

Licentiate's Dissertation in Social Anthropology (ISSN 1404-7683)

1999:1 Parker, Peter *Cognition and Social Organisation: A Framework*
125 sidor ISBN 91-89078-76-4
1999:2 Johansson Dahre, Ulf *Politik med andra medel: En antropologisk betraktelse av rättens politiska och ideologiska förhållanden*
137 sidor ISBN 91-7267-006-1

Research Reports in Social Anthropology

2006:1 Johansson Dahre, Ulf (ed.) *The Reconstruction of Good Governance in the Horn of Africa – Proceedings of the 4th SIRC Conference on the Horn of Africa, October 1416, 2005* 232 sidor ISBN 91-7267-216-1

2007:1 Johansson Dahre, Ulf (ed.) *The Role of Diasporas in Peace, Democracy and Development in the Horn of Africa* 226 sidor ISBN 91-7267-237-4

2008:1 Johansson Dahre, Ulf (ed.) *Post-Conflict Peace-Building in the Horn of Africa: A Report of the 6th Annual Conference on the Horn of Africa, Lund, August 24-26, 2007* 288 sidor ISBN 91-7267-256-0

2009:1 Svensson, Nicklas (ed.) *Initiative Report Horn of Africa: Co-operation Instead of Wars and Destruction, 11-12 May, 2002 Lund, Sweden*
106 sidor ISBN 91-7267-290-0

2009:2 Svensson, Nicklas (ed.) *Final Report Conference Horn of Africa: II No Development without Peace, 23-25 May, 2003 Lund, Sweden*
136 sidor ISBN 91-7267-291-9

2009:3 Svensson, Nicklas (ed.) *Horn of Africa: Transforming Itself from a Culture of War into a Culture of Peace, 27-29 August 2004 Lund, Sweden*
312 sidor ISBN 91-7267-292-7

2009:4 Sthlm Policy Group (ed.) *Faith, Citizenship, Democracy and Peace in the Horn of Africa: A Report of the 7th Annual Conference on the Horn of Africa, Lund, October 17-19, 2008* 216 sidor ISBN 91-7267-293-5

Working Papers in Social Anthropology (ISSN 1652-442X)

2004:1 Göransson, Kristina *Filial Children and Ageing Parents: Intergenerational Family Ties as Politics and Practice among Chinese Singaporeans*
26 sidor ISBN 91-7267-175-0

2005:1 Granbom, Ann-Charlotte *Urak Lawoi: A Field Study of an Indigenous People in Thailand and treir Problems with Rapid Tourist Development*
98 sidor ISBN 91-7267-206-4

Övrigt

Från seminarium till storinstitution: Sociologi i Lund 1947-1997 (Sociologiska institutionens Årsbok 1996) 105 sidor

Institution i rörelse: Utbildning och forskning inför år 2000 (Sociologiska institutionens Årsbok 1997) 153 sidor ISBN 91-89078-29-2

Printed by Media-Tryck, Lund 2018 NORDIC SWAN ECOLABEL 3041 0903

United Agents

This study focuses on a border police collaboration project called *Turnstone*. The purpose of the project was to prevent and fight transnational crime in the Baltic Sea area and increase collaboration between border intelligence officers. Participants in the project included police, coast guard, and border police officers from Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Sweden.

Based on observations and interviews, and taking a community of practice perspective, the study illustrates the significance of informal processes and practices for creating a trust-based context conducive to the exchange of sensitive information and the generation of new practices. Face-to-face interactions (involving among other things joking and sharing stories), negotiations, and engaging in everyday activities have proved to be instrumental in creating a collaborative climate.

LUND UNIVERSITY

Lund University
Faculty of Social Sciences
Department of Sociology
ISBN 978-91-7753-806-6
ISSN 1102-4712