

Reflexivity and theorizing: Conceptualizing the police role in migration control

Helene O. I. Gundhusⁱ

ORCID: 0000-0001-5279-7291

Abstract

In this chapter I reflect upon doing practice-based research on migration police in Norway, and look at how this positionality might generate new analytical insights. The methodology of the project was designed to gain proximity to police practices and occupational cultures norms, values and professional ethos. The empirical findings reveal various challenges that the police working with migration control experience. In the chapter I discuss how these tensions affected the theorizing of the data. Analyzing different antagonisms and dynamics as objects to study, rather than objects of assessment, provided sensitizing concepts which helped to orient my interests by guiding the data collection and the writing process. In the last section I discuss how to deal with experiences of discomfort and competing moral and political agendas by looking into the moving and navigating between different research sites and concepts. The chapter concludes that analysing proximity relations between the researcher and researched provides pivotal sensitizing concepts for not only gaining necessary distance, but also to go beyond a top down and thesis driven analysis. Taking the actors' situation seriously by doing practice-based research also strengthens the practice field's reception for criticism.

Reference: Gundhus, H.O.I. (2018). Reflexivity and theorizing: Conceptualizing the police role in migration control. In: Fili, A., Jahnsen, S. and Powell R. (eds.) Criminal Justice Research in an Era of Mass Mobility. London: Routledge.

Introduction

In order to understand how control and security works, participant observation of those with power to define security agendas is an important vantage point. By using participatory observation together with interviews in a project on migration policing in Norway at different organizations and locations I sought to gain proximity to police practices and occupational cultures norms, values and professional ethos. To do so, required access to study the field, and willingness from the actors in the field to be researched. In this chapter I reflect on doing such research, and look at how the positionality of the researcher might open up for new analytical insights about the practices of migration policing.

My research post during the project was at the Norwegian Police University College. This adds a particular layer to the reflection of the power dynamics within this research project, since this educational institution is part of the police. Nevertheless, researchers based there are supposed to have full academic freedom.ⁱⁱ It was precisely because of my research position that I was particularly interested in mapping the policing field as a site where knowledge-power discourses take place, in Foucauldian terms. Specifically, I was interested in understanding how the professionalisation discourse influences the police's role in society within the field of policing migration (Gundhus, 2017).

In discussing proximity relations between researched and researcher I reveal how theoretical approaches and theory provide pivotal sensitizing concepts for research in the practice field.ⁱⁱⁱ How level of access impacts the production of knowledge will, in this light, become secondary to questions about how to use the approach as a productive point of departure for analysis. The question will then be, when you find your research caught up in the cross-fire of competing moral and political agendas, how can you actively make use of these struggles on the production of knowledge, and to what ends?

The chapter follows four paths. I first provide the context of the study by describing the shifts in policing migration in Norway. I then move on to discuss the concept of positionality and how researchers negotiate proximity. In the third section I present empirical findings illustrating the challenges police officers, working with migration control and particularly deportation, experience, and how these tensions affect the positioning of the researcher. In the last section I conclude with discussing how to deal with experiences of discomfort and competing moral and political agendas by moving and navigating between different research sites and concepts.

Multi-sited: researching policing migration in Norway

As a member of a multi-sited research project on the policing of migration in Norway, called ‘Transnational policing, tasks, organization and professionalization’, I experienced certain challenges in getting access, negotiating trust, and in analysing the field’s complexities and tensions. The project constitutes a sub-project within the main project ‘Crime Control in the Borderlands of Europe’^{iv}, headed by Katja Franko, carried out from 2012-2016.^v

The project’s overall objective was to map and examine the changing demands for knowledge within the police raised by international cooperation when it comes to policing diversity in a global society; how does globalization contribute to the changing nature of police professionalism, the development of novel work methods and standards, and professional and organizational cultures? The approach was built on the notion that globalization takes place *inside* the national rather than just over it, and the aim has been to explore the ‘mundane globalization’ – not just police working for international organisations - but the internationalisation of everyday tasks of policing and their dynamical intertwining. Policing in itself is increasingly a global phenomenon, transgressing traditional boundaries of the nation state (Bowling and Scheptycki 2012). To capture what Sassen (2007) has coined as ‘multiscalar

nature of globalization processes' within the policing context, a broad range of sites were studied, from the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, Norwegian Police Directorate, Norwegian Police University College, to units with specialized competence, such as the National Police Immigration Service, National Criminal Investigation Service (KRIPOS). We also interviewed officers with experience in Frontex operations, Frontex personnel in Warsaw, and officers working at a local police station in Oslo which has a special co-operation with Romanian police, as well as the Organised Crime Unit in Oslo Police district.

In total the researchers conducted 70 qualitative in-depth interviews with police staff over a two-year period, from 2012-2014. Staff worked at a variety of levels in the institutions under review, and at different locations. They ranged from guest officers participating at ground level in cross-national police operations in the Mediterranean, to interviews with top managers at national and European headquarters, and communication unit desk workers at Norwegian Criminal Investigation Service. We also observed meetings aimed to share experiences and best practices from the field.

Emerging and contested field of policing

Policing migration has been a priority in Norway over the last five years, particularly since the perceived refugee crisis during the summer of 2015, which put it at the top of the political, public and police agendas. Two of the sites studied, the Norwegian Police Directorate and the Police Immigration Service, have for the last five years sought to normalize the use of immigration law as a crime control tool, and to facilitate more effective identity checks of foreigners within the Norwegian border. Their aim has been both to improve the effectiveness of special agencies and to link their practices to core crime-fighting police activities (Franko and Mohn, 2015). In Norway, as elsewhere in Europe and the USA (see inter alia, Aas, 2014;

Leun, 2003; Stumpf, 2006; Weber and Bowling, 2008; Weber, 2013), immigration law is increasingly used in tandem with criminal law, as a tool for both crime fighting and migration control (POD, 2014a,b). The trend is a result of an increased political focus on mass mobility and security and of changes in European policy, domestic criminal justice systems and, particularly, police leadership (Franko and Mohn, 2015). By deportation, the police prevent crime from reoccurring. This development, that is often referred to as a ‘crimmigration’^{vi} process, is partly related to the intensified criminalization of immigration-related conduct, particularly illegal entry and re-entry, as well as to the progressive convergence and mutual support of criminal law and administrative immigration enforcement.

The National Police Immigration Service (NPIS) is the main domestic immigration law enforcement body tasked with migration policing, and the key agency responsible for registering all asylum applications and verifying the identities of asylum seekers, as well as for coordinating and executing forced returns. There has been a substantial growth in the number of immigration police specialists in the NPIS over the last decade, from 135 in 2004 to 950 in 2016. The growth is closely connected to the political priorities mentioned above, and the related increase in deportation orders based on removal orders/expulsion (from 190 in 2002 to 2500 in 2014) (Franko and Mohn, 2015).^{vii} The NPIS cannot forcibly return a person to his or her country of origin without verifying and documenting their identity. In the many cases where identifying documentation is absent, they rely on various methods developed by what interviewees describe as ‘creative thinking’. By this they mean discretion concerning when to use criminal or immigration law, depending on the citizenship status of the non-citizens (third-world national or EEC citizen), their connection to Norway, and the possibility of deporting them (see also Aas, 2014). NPIS officers, who lack power to prosecute criminal cases, use coercive measures available from immigration law. These include arrest and remand in custody,

seizure and search of a foreign citizen's personal belongings or dwelling, as well as traditional police methods like surveillance and the tracking of a person's network.

Although restrictive immigration policies introduced by the Ministry of Justice have been welcomed by the majority of the Norwegian population, this has been criticized within the public debate in Norway (Gundhus 2017). Detention of children at the Immigration Police closed detention centre at Trandum and deportation of children who have lived for many years in Norway have been controversial, debated and questioned in Parliament (Eriksen 2017; Ugelvik 2016). As a result, police often describe external pressures from the political level, police management, researchers and the public. For instance, interviewees experienced pressure from above to produce removal orders and expulsion to increase the numbers of deportations, and talked about ambivalence regarding performing the job. Moreover, the management of the Police Immigration Service also described being researched as challenging because external criticism has created both internal turmoil and pressure.^{viii} Nonetheless, the police have taken our research results seriously, including critical aspects, and we have been invited to numerous seminars and conferences to talk about the findings.

Positionality as an analytical concept

The research design was developed to give more voice to police officers' experiences of policing in the age of mass mobility, in order to unveil the connections between the police practitioners' worldview and the operation of migration policing in practice. Taking account of their views of everyday life and the mundane within their work can be difficult. Researchers must trace meaning across different sites while grasping the multiplicity of meanings or the multi-vocality of situations. The research was therefore designed to capture nuances in the respondent's everyday world. Like other studies of culture and practice fields, it sought to

explore actors' logic, rationalizations, characterized by ambiguity, contradictions, doubts and conflicts, including ambivalence and doubt in reaction to the policies that they were implementing (Fassin 2011, 245).

Traditionally methodological reflections related to qualitative research of the police have been discussed in terms of the researcher's positionality; that is being an insider or outsider to the institution, and/or academic or practitioner within the police (Brown 1996). This chapter will further add to these methodological reflections on the insider/outsider aspect, by looking deeper into the concept of positionality (Buegner and Mireanu 2015). As mentioned in the introduction, the question is not how to reduce the impact of positionality in the research process, or to analyse how the social position in the field may have impacted the fieldwork processes. Recent discussion on reflexivity and research effects also point to certain limits that difference in social position might have on data production process (Damsa and Ugelvik 2017). The aim of this chapter is rather to discuss what the tensions and dynamics produced between the researcher, the researched and the topic explored might tell about the field, and how negotiations of proximity may open up new analytical insights.

Analysing empirical data requires analytical terms and translation of the field (Callon 1986). Van Maanen's (1979) divide between first-order and second-order terms are useful to illuminate the process. First-order concepts are the terms and descriptions used by the participants. Second-order concepts are the theories or theoretical concepts used or created by the researcher. In the process of making first order concepts into second-order ones, the researcher more or less creates analytical distance from the actors' point of view. Researching the global impact on policing indispensably requires such a break, since global processes are not tangible, but need to be framed in a theoretical context so as to be understood (Sassen 2007).

However, since the analytical approach of this project consisted of analysing migration security and control as processes within mundane policing, such practices are interpreted as speech and performative acts. But involving humans in the research, by studying practices, implicates amplifying the voice and subjectivity to the entities involved. Moreover, getting closer to the practice field, might challenge the researchers experienced latitude for being critical towards the actors being researched. As Buegner and Mireanu (2015, 123) point out: “Methodology is the movement from the world to academic practice (and back) by which, to use a Latourian expression, the world is *mobilized*” [emphasis in the original]. Such translation may also be experienced by the researched as a breach of trust in the relationship between the researcher-researched. This is common in ethnographic research, but appears more prominently when the researched internal logic and rationalities are questioned by the researcher, and as we will see the researcher experiences discomfort with the practices they promoted thereof.

Hence, unlike traditional representations of proximity as an objectivity problem (see also Alvesson and Sköldbberg 2009), the claim of this chapter is that proximity has been fruitful to balance access, trust, discomfort and the critical dimensions of the project. As it will be further explored, issues discussed in the interviews, such as professionalism and human rights, became central objects of the study, which served in navigating between closeness and distance.

Negotiation in the field

The topics under exploration, professionalism and standardization, were helpful in getting access to the field. Access was negotiated formally and informally. Securing formal access to the field was the “easiest” part of the research process. It was considered and approved by the Council of Confidentiality and Research, the Norwegian Police Directorate and Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD) relatively quickly, within 5 months.

The second step towards approaching the field was, in line with the ethical research guidelines for doing police research at the Norwegian Police University College (Bjørge and Myhrer 2015), to send letters to police chiefs in the districts to ask for permission to use their employees' working time to participate in the research. Positive responses were received from all chief managers, giving us the contact details of key informants. Information meetings were arranged, and key contacts were established. However, the process was dependent on researchers calling and pushing forward the formal requests, using informal networks. Finally, contact details and emails of volunteers who would like to participate in the project were sent to us. Formal access was therefore marked by elements of both informal and personal initiatives. Getting inside the field and starting interviewing revealed that the specialists within the police saw themselves as change makers inside the police, framing deportation as a more rational and smarter way to combat crime. As one police officer argued:

I see no reason why we should use a lot of money to put them in prison here, when we can fly them out. Because I can see that this is what is being done now, and I do not understand why. They do 10 or 12 years inside and continue just as before. Then we can send them to Kurdistan instead. (OPD2)

These arguments and justifications were quite different from my own preconceptions about deportation, which I assumed was more about implementing policies and enforcing immigration laws. The interviewees also revealed much more diversity in justifications and legitimations than expected, ranging from accounts claiming it as better ways to punish the perpetrators, as in the quote above, to ambivalence towards joint use of immigration and criminal law. Crimmigration processes within the Norwegian police were also considered as progressive, 'creative', 'using opportunities' and 'doing smart' policing. Yet, this narrative is not in line with notions of appropriate police work among police in general – catching criminals

- and rather seen as morally dubious. Hence, those interviewed saw the possibility of being heard as an opportunity to be understood.

For example, applying criminal and immigration law to enhance deportation were highlighted by the migration police specialist in the field as ‘innovative’ policing, as this interview with a police prosecutor makes clear:

First of all, this is a system where we follow the cases from A to Z. We start the cases, we apprehend, we prepare them for detention - and in our cases most of them they stay in pre-trial detention until they are ready for court. But we are not finished yet until they are sentenced and then deported. These cases are very special because all interviews and all work is done through an interpreter, and there are some special guidelines when one is doing these types of cases./.../ And, as I said, we imprison quite a lot of them. They are not detained only once. Detention is often prolonged again and again. They stay in pre-trial detention until their court hearing, because of the danger of absconding, right. If you let go of them, they disappear out of the country. So there is quite a lot of work for lawyers in this. (MAJ4)

This way of doing policing is portrayed as creative, innovative and successful because it increases the deportation of criminals, and is met with applause from the Police Directorate. In contrast to these positive connotations, researchers have criticized the practice for being disproportionate in selection of cases, random, arbitrary and lacking safeguarding mechanisms as in criminal code cases (Aas 2014; Gundhus 2016). These different approaches to the same phenomena reveal clear gaps between our views of this practice.

An illustration of ambivalence in the field is how to deal with the politics of compassion. As Aas and I (2014) have argued elsewhere, participating in Frontex operations in the Mediterranean can be interpreted as mobilization of the political utility of compassion. Policing

humanitarian borderlands may communicate engagement by actually responding to the perceived refugee crises. It is not unilaterally signaling security politics aimed at fending off the unwanted poor from the Global South. There are obviously humanitarian reasons for governing precarious lives, however, the language of compassion, empathy, and assistance are in a way replacing the language of injustice and rights (Fassin, 2011). By doing policing in humanitarian borderlands, the distinction between help and control is further intertwined (Aas and Gundhus 2014). The ability to create fantasies of goodness and moral community on the part of the helpers, in this context the guest officers, gives humanitarianism a remarkable consensual force, and is affecting the self-presentation of this work. However, this vocabulary of suffering and responsibility to protect both ‘serves to qualify the issues involved and to reason about choices made’ (Fassin 2011: 2). On the other side, the alarming picture of drowned refugees also releases resources to attack the bad guys within this illicit trade, the human smugglers and traffickers, and further militarize the border. There are, therefore, several aspects that contradict the police work as being innovative and progressive, and raise moral issues with the practices.

Partly because of the ambivalence and ambiguities in the practice field, during the first phase of the research I was overwhelmed by a feeling of power inferiority. In such an environment there is a danger of becoming co-opted, with a lack of the necessary distinction between researcher and researched (Zehfuss 2012). Participation may easily become ‘complicity’ towards the political reality under scrutiny. This is especially important when doing empirical research within political battlefields such as mass mobility control, where global disparities are vast, and the police enforce political decisions to achieve targets determined by police and political processes (Gundhus 2017).

Dealing with discomfort/complicity

Looking into the methodology literature, particularly on migration, security and international relations, it is not unusual for researchers to experience ethical and moral discomfort in being co-opted and losing critical distance in a contested field of research (Salter and Mutlu 2013). Researchers might also contribute to and increased securitization, or even produce it, when getting involved in security practices (Aradau, Huysmans, Neal and Voelkner 2015). To deal with co-option, moral obligations and discomfort an analytical break from empirical data is necessary. In the following, drawing on my experiences, I will suggest different ways of dealing with this.

Creating distance and finding common space between the researcher and the world inhabited by the researched may be an important step towards understanding the field, especially when studying the meaning produced in the field. Navigating between different practices and academic 'worlds', are making dissonance between the academic world and the world of fieldwork. More important, by making these tensions into an object of study, do promote distance (Buegner and Mireanu 2015). However, gaining a distant view to make space for critique may be accomplished with or without the recognition and subjectivity of actors in the field. As Fassin (2011) discusses, there are two ways of framing empirical research where human subjects are involved. One is to translate what the actors in the field know better than us, as a means to deal with the world (sensemaking). The other is to unveil what the actors cannot see. In this context, ideology is understood as a layer concealing the 'reality' (the objective world), and research questions aim to portray different types of illusions making them blind. This highlights different understandings of critical research, with long traditions of epistemological and ontological controversies. By starting with the actors' point of view and researching the micro level of interaction and relations, the first perspective aims to translate

the actors' meaningful processes and subjectivity. The other perspective aims to unveil the ideology. Here the analysis point of departure is from the external, and the actors involved become more extras than subjects. In this context an obvious way of following such an approach would be to apply a thesis driven analysis from top down and stop there. An exterior analysis of the police as a proxy for the securitization of migration would illustrate the said position.

However, it is possible to go beyond that duality, as Fassin (2011) claims, and avoid reproducing the traditional dualism between translation and unveiling. This is also his understanding of critique; criticism must be produced on the basis of studies which assume that individuals have agency, groups are formed and opposed to each other, and have conflicting interests. Fassin argues for the advantages of an empirical material based on the actor's point of view for taking actors logic and rationalizations, characterized by ambiguity, contradictions, doubts and conflicts, seriously. As he put it: "By facing the actors and the facts, which resist all attempts at reduction, critique must precisely give an account of this irreducibility" (Fassin, 2011: 247). His term for a research position that is able to reformulate duality, is on edge, because it can: "Reveal what agents cannot see at the same time as translating what they know better than we do" (Fassin, 2011, 245). This way of framing a strategy for gaining distance, is close to the Buegner and Mireanu's (2015) argument about turning tensions between the researcher and the researched into an object of the study. They argue for analysing antagonisms as objects of study rather than objects of assessment.

To sum up so far, gaining distance in this research project has been attempted by making epistemological breaks with the actors' narratives and point of view by framing the data through theoretical conceptions. Moreover, analysing antagonisms in the field, for instance the tensions between the specialists within migration police and the traditional police occupational culture approaches in framing crime and crime control, as study objects rather than objects of assessments, has also been helpful in the process. An analytical break inherent in the research

design is informed by theoretical approaches within criminology and globalization theory, suggesting that, today and in previous historic epochs, mobility is not only *controlled* by the state and policing actors, but also *produced* by them, as a strategy for expanding and reasserting state sovereignty.

Policing is not only becoming a global phenomenon, but is also shaped by, and shaping, globalization (Gundhus and Franko 2016). One way of producing an analytical break is not to take for granted the police story about their mission, by unveiling hidden structures. This was done by challenging the customary approach of examining mobility as a problem to state sovereignty and as a burdensome task for the police and other institutions of governance. However, such a top-down theoretical approach may also be refuted by the researched as suppressing their own life-world. In this project this was attempted to be avoided by balancing what people in the practice field cannot see with recognizing what they know better. Studies of cultures as fields of practice, explores the actors' logic, rationalizations, which are often characterized by ambiguity, contradictions, doubts and conflicts, including ambivalence and doubt in reaction to the policies that they implement (Fassin 2011, 245), in this case the ambivalence in implementing and enforcing the policies.

In this study the discourse about professionalism and political utility of compassion mentioned above might then function as sensitizing concepts bringing forth new reflections among the researched, as well as new research insights. Observed changes in conceptualising professionalism were met with research questions like: Why is it important? How is the professionalism discourse functioning as a means of establishing legitimacy? What is it with empathy and compassion, making it into a political utility? Empathy is an important aspect of police education in Norway and emphasises the process of refining the police students social competence (Bloksgaard and Prieur 2016), but what does it mean in this context?

Moving between different ‘worlds’, in this study the Police University College, the University of Oslo and the police service, makes it possible to actively create space by becoming aware of how the demands of recognition tempt our practices of knowledge production. Acknowledging the subjectivity of the interviewees preventing the researched from feeling inferior and estranged in the scientific analysis are key in this process. Listening, showing interest and being present in the field, were met with positive response, despite the use of discomforting topics and our critical stance towards the police practice, their aims and ways of acting. Likewise, incorporating into the methodological approach a sensitivity to the fact that scholars are as much subject and product of this world as the objects and subjects we study, is an assumption for gaining distance to the world we inhabit but also proximity to the researched.

Conclusion: Recognizing police agency

This discussion of proximity relations between the researched and the researcher has revealed how theoretical approaches and theory provides pivotal sensitizing concepts for research to get the necessary distance to go beyond a top down and thesis driven analysis. Analyzing different antagonism and dynamics as objects to study, provides sensitizing concepts which help to orient the interest by guiding data collection and writing process. The ontological and basic assumptions about how the world is, and methodological choices, on how to study things so that particular ontology materializes, work together, and are impossible to distinguish from each other. This approach raises questions like: Which problems do we want to reconstruct in using which sensitizing concepts? Which links do we want to strengthen towards whom or what? How do we move and translate and thereby produce realities? How do we as researchers avoid producing increased control?

In general, the approach outlined in this chapter stress the need to be close to the problems, to the practices and the actions and objects that constitute them, through for example participatory observation and other methods requiring proximity. It requires us to think through proximity and how it can be negotiated successfully. Tension is expected to arise when actors are involved in reforms and projects, experience themselves as ‘vibrant souls’ dedicated to make things better, being progressive and striving to influence a rather stubborn traditional and conservative police institution. Although the aim of the project under study here is not as Bourdieu (1999) suggests, to reveal the objective conditions behind the interviewees misery, to think about the tension between structural frameworks and ensuring the actors’ point of view have been reflected upon throughout the research project. Since the processes examined in the project are practiced by practitioners striving for recognition of their work and efforts, it becomes crucial how the object of study is analysed and the participants in the project are involved in the study.

In contrast to criminology researchers in Australia (see Powell and Segrave; Cochrane this volume) and Canada (Hannah-Moffatt 2011), Norwegian researchers of the criminal justice apparatus in general do not experience many problems with acquiring access (Finstad 2000; Gundhus 2013; Ugelvik 2014).^{ix} Critical research on the police is in general perceived as beneficial by the research society. The police are also going through different types of reforms, partly because of the new police district structures and reactions to the criticism of the police in the wake of how the police handled the terrorist attack 22 July, 2011^x (Gundhus 2017).

Likewise, as this research supports, it is possible to do critical police research without being banned, excluded and neutralized as an arrogant academic or research activist. In this research project it is my opinion that this is prevented by recognizing the actors’ subjectivity in the field of practice. The experience supports Fassin’s (2011) argument that taking the actors situation seriously by doing practice research based on proximity, and thereby not reducing them to marionettes and objects, strengthen the practice field’s reception of criticism. Numerous

invitations to researchers in the project team Crime Control at the Borders of Europe to present findings, for different audiences in the field of practice, supports this. However, this is not to argue that proximity and treating the researched as subjects are sufficient for such a relation, but it may indicate that it is an important precondition.

Critical research may flourish if the research reformulates the traditional duality between translating or unveiling, by recognizing that it involves both of them: Actors cannot see all, but they carry knowledge that needs to be translated in order to cross the threshold of just an individual experience. Involving actors' reflexivity also renders the logic in the field more understandable and intelligible. Equally important to strengthen the practice field's reception for criticism is a critique that includes us as researchers, and does not leave the social scientist alone outside the world.

References

- Aas, K.F (2014). 'Bordered penalty: precarious membership and abnormal justice',
Punishment and Society, 16(5): 520–541.
- Aas, K. F. and Gundhus, H. O. I. (2014). Policing Humanitarian Borderlands: Frontex,
Human Rights and the Precariousness of Life. *British Journal of Criminology*. 55: 1-
18.
- Alvesson, M. and Sköldberg, K (2009). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative
Research*. London: Sage.
- Aradau, C., Huysmans, J., Neal, A., and Voelkner, N. (2015). *Critical Security Methods. New
frameworks for analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Barker, V. (2012). Nordic Exceptionalism revisited. Explaining the paradox of a Janus-face
penal regime. *Theoretical Criminology*, 17(1), 5-21.
- Bjørger, T. and Myhrer, T-G. (2015). *Forskningsetisk veileder for Politihøgskolen*. Oslo: PHS.
- Bloksgaard, L. and Prieur, A. I. (2016). Den professionelt empatiske politibetjent :
politistuderendes håndtering af følelser i arbejdet. *Dansk Sociologi*. (27) 3-4: 107-127.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999): *The weight of the world: social suffering in contemporary society*. P.
Bourdieu et al. Cambridge: Polity press.
- Bowling, B. and Sheptycki, J. (2012). *Global Policing*. London: Sage.
- Brown, J. (1996). Police research: some critical issues. In: Leishman, F., Loveday, B. &
Savage, S.P. (eds.) *Core Issues in Policing*. Harlow: Longman, 177-190.

- Buegner, C. and Mireanu, M (2015). Proximity. In: C. Aradau, J. Huysmans, A. Neal and N. Voelkner (eds). *Critical Security Methods. New frameworks for analysis*. London: Routledge. 118-141.
- Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of scallops and the fishermen of St Brieuc Bay. In: J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief*. London: Routledge.
- Damsa, D. and Ugelvik, T. (2017). A difference that makes a difference? Reflexivity and researcher effects in an all-foreign prison. *International Journal of Qualitative Research*, 16: 1-10.
- Eriksen, L. (2017). *Målenes tvetydighet -målstyring og kriminalitetsbekjempelse i Politiets Utlendingsenhet*. Oslo: Politihøgskolen.
- Fassin, D. (2011). *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Finstad, L. (2000). *Politiblikket*. Oslo: Pax. Gundhus, H.I. (2013). Experience or knowledge? Perspectives on new knowledge regimes and control of police professionalism. *Policing: Journal of theory and practice*, 7 (2): 178-194.
- Franko, K. and Mohn, S. B. (2015). 'Utvising som straff? Om grensesnittet mellom strafferett og utlendingskontroll.' *Tidsskrift for strafferett*, 2: 153–176.
- Gundhus, H.I.O. and Franko, K. (2016). Global policing and mobility: Identity, territory, sovereignty. In: B. Bradford, B. Jauregui, I. Loader, J. Steinberg (eds). *SAGE Handbook of Global Policing*. London: Sage.

- Gundhus, Helene I. (2013). Experience or knowledge? Perspectives on new knowledge regimes and control of police professionalism. *Policing: Journal of theory and practice*. 7(2) s. 178-194.
- Gundhus, H. O. I (2016). Å målstyre skjønnsutøvelse: profesjonalisering av politiets utlendingskontroll. *Sosiologi i dag*. 46(1): 54-81
- Gundhus, H.I.O. (2017). Discretion as an Obstacle: Police Culture, Change and Governance in a Norwegian Context. *Policing: Journal of theory and practice*. 11(3): 258-272.
- Hannah-Moffatt, K. (2011). Criminological Cliques: Narrowing Dialogues, Institutional Protectionism, and the Next Generation. In: M. Bosworth and C. Hoyle (eds). *What is criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- Leun, J.P. van der (2003). *Looking for Loopholes. Processes of Incorporation of Illegal Immigrants in the Netherlands*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Liebling, A. (2011). Being a Criminologist: Investigation as a Lifestyle and Living. In: M. Bosworth and C. Hoyle (eds). *What is criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University press.
- POD (2014a). *Evaluering av returarbeidet i politiet. Delrapport 1 – ressursbruk i perioden 2009-2013*. Oslo: Politidirektoratet. POD (2014b). *Evaluering av returarbeidet i politiet. Delrapport II – effekten av retur*. Oslo: Politidirektoratet.
- Politihøgskolen (2015). *Forskningen ved Politihøgskolen*. Oslo: Politihøgskolen. Online, Available:
http://www.phs.no/Documents/4_Forskning/Forskningsmeldinger/Forskningsmeldingen%202015.pdf (accessed 28 October 2017).

- Salter, M. B and Mutlu, C. E. (eds) (2013). *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Sassen, S. (2007). *A Sociology of Globalization*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Scharff Smith P (2012). A critical look at Scandinavian exceptionalism: Welfare state theories, penal populism and prison conditions in Denmark and Scandinavia. In: Ugelvik T and Dullum J(eds) *Penal Exceptionalism? Nordic Prison Policy and Practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 38–57.
- Schatzki, T.R, Karin Knorr, C, and von Savigny, E. (2001). *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Stumpf J.P. (2006). *The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, & Sovereign power*. *Bepress Legal Series*. Working Paper 1635. Online, Available: <http://law.bepress.com/expresso/eps/1635> (accessed 28th October 2017).
- Ugelvik, T. and Dullum, J. (2012) (eds). *Penal Exceptionalism? : Nordic prison policy and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Ugelvik, T. (2014). *Power and Resistance in Prison: Doing Time, Doing Freedom*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ugelvik, T. (2016) Low-trust policing in a high-trust society. *Nordisk Politiforskning*, 3(2): 181-198.
- van Maanen, J. (ed) (1979). *Qualitative methodology*. London: Sage Publications.
- Weber, L. (2013). *Policing Non-Citizens*. London: Routledge.
- Weber, L. and Bowling, B. (2008). ‘Valiant beggars and global vagabonds. Select, eject, immobilize’. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(3), 355–375.

Zehfuss, M. (2012). Culturally sensitive war? The Human terrain system and the seduction of ethics. *Security Dialogue*, 43(2): 175-190.

ⁱ I am grateful to the editors, Johanne Yttri Dahl and Katja Franko for their helpful comments and suggestions.

ⁱⁱ The Norwegian Police University College offers a Bachelor's Degree in Police Studies, two Master Degree programs in police science, and post-graduate studies, built on knowledge based teaching. In addition it has a research department with approximately 25 police researchers employed.

ⁱⁱⁱ By sensitizing concepts I mean the role of concepts in social science to sensitise perceptions when applying theory in ways that clarify and develop conceptual understanding (see also Liebling 2011). By applying such concepts it is possible to change the perceptual world, by questioning 'taken for granted' assumptions and meaning mobilized by practitioners. Doing that is affected by the proximity to the field, since the sensitising concepts are depending on obtaining thick knowledge about what is happening at site.

^{iv} <http://www.jus.uio.no/ikrs/english/research/projects/crimmigration/>

^v Researchers who participated in the sub-project team by conducting interviews on migration policing have been Katja Franko (project leader), Helene O. I. Gundhus, Synnøve Jahnsen, Sigmund Book Mohn and Annette Vestby.

^{vi} Stumpf (2006) first coined the term 'crimmigration' to describe the merger of immigration law and criminal law in both substance and procedure. However, Aas (2011: 332), introduced a broader perspective on crimmigration as intertwining of crime control and migration control, which also includes the social context of crimmigration on issues relating to crime and migration, and processes connected to it.

^{vii} Expulsion here means reentry-ban, removal is administrative. Deportation order also includes asylum rejections.

^{viii} This was highlighted by the assistant chief of National Police Immigration Service at the Leverhulme Trust Network, seminar in Oslo, June 2015.

^{ix} There is an interesting discussion on criticizing part of the research on Scandinavian exceptionalism for being too benevolent in the interpretation of the more repressive part of the criminal justice apparatus (see e.g. Barker 2012, Scharff-Smith 2012, Ugelvik and Dullum 2012). How this influences access to research the criminal justice system is an interesting topic to explore, but goes beyond the scope of this chapter.

^x The deadliest attack in Norway since World War II was the 2011 Norway attacks, referred to as 22 July. It consists of two sequential terrorist attacks by Anders Behring Breivik against executive government quarter of Norway, and a Worker's Youth League (AUF)-run summer camp. The attacks claimed a total of 77 lives.