
Article:
Rice, L. (2024) From acculturation to transculturation?: Police culture change in the pluralised crime investigation department. The British Journal of Criminology: An International Review of Crime and Society, 64 (1). pp. 70-87. ISSN 0007-0955

https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azad014

Introduction

Research has drawn attention to the ways pluralisation processes have changed the organisation of policing (Bayley and Shearing 1996; Jones and Newburn, 2008). These debates have been propelled by the post-financial crisis politics of austerity (HMIC 2013), resulting in workforce reorganisations, new collaborations and more efficient means of working. Pluralisation has also been a key instigator in the devolution of police work to non-warranted police staff operating *within* the state. Known as *civilianisation*, this under-researched dimension of pluralisation has happened in a range of contexts – including mobile patrols (O'Neill 2019), custody (Skinns 2011), and control rooms (Lumsden and Black 2018) – and reflects the need for improved cost-effectiveness and demand for knowledge/skill-sets that are 'non-traditional' to the police. However, one underexplored part of this picture is crime investigation. Since 2002, police staff known as Civilian Investigators (CIs) have been recruited to help warranted detectives carry out investigative enquiries. Intended to fulfil a supportive role, over time, CIs have adopted an almost identical remit to Detective Constables (DCs): undertaking suspect interviews, working as family liaison officers and leading serious and complex crime investigations (Rice 2020). Much of the CI demographic comprises individuals with little/no experience of police work; People who have spent much of their professional lives working in other fields of practice (Rice 2020: 971). The recruitment of 'non-ex-officer CIs' is a sea-change in the tradition of crime investigator recruitment and, as I will argue, has implications for understandings about police occupational culture and its reproduction within the context of 'detective work'.

In this paper, I examine police culture through a lens of postcolonialism in an attempt to better understand the socio-cultural dynamics of the pluralised CID and the role played by CIs in cultural production and change within this setting. Research on police staff operating in other 'core' areas (such as custody and patrol) points to their limited agency and cultural impact (Cosgrove 2016; Atkinson 2017). However, much of this research approaches the study of culture through a Western lens, relying on a static and monologic interpretation of acculturation. Acculturation is a widely used yet contested concept whose application varies over time and between disciplines. In the context of policing, overwhelmingly its application has sought to audit the occupational dispositions of new entrants to the police organisation with reference to the varying characteristics of 'cop-culture' (Reiner 2010). Not only does this 'attribute model' approach obscure the complexity of the social-cultural dynamics that shape contemporary pluralised policing spaces, it also underplays the resiliency of the non-traditional identities and values that civilian police staff transpose into the police organisation.

Reporting on empirical findings from a study of CIs in two police forces in England, this paper seeks to push the debate about police cultural continuity and change away from one guided by *acculturation* and focused on cultural 'artefacts' (Schien 1990), towards one rooted in *transculturation* (Ortiz 1944) and the study of (trans)cultural encounters. Presently, it remains unclear how actors negotiate and reconcile changes in the contemporary field of police work (i.e. pluralisation), the cultural and/or professional differences that arise within pluralised settings, and the implications of this for practice. By drawing upon the concept of 'transculturation' (Ortiz 1947) this paper aims to gain a better understanding of this *process*.

The first part of this paper provides an overview of the conceptual framework employed. It explains how transculturation can be used to better understand the pluralisation experiences of CIs and DCs as they attempted to navigate their respective roles, identities and cultural outlooks through a period of considerable organisational change. The second section provides a brief explication of the research methods used to collect and analyse the data. In the third section, Ortiz's transculturation thesis is used both, as a tool for mapping the dimensions of coexistence (between CIs and DCs) that structure the CID, and as a theoretical device to challenge the dominance of bounded conceptualisations of police culture. The fourth section discusses the implications of the findings for understanding police culture and the role of police staff as facilitators of cultural change.

Re-examining cultural change and continuity: A postcolonial perspective?

It remains a matter of tension whether police culture has changed since early policing scholars' seminal works (Banton 1964; Cain 1973). Some point to the resiliency of many of the descriptors that define cop-culture, including mission-action, isolation, solidarity, pragmatism, machismo, and conservatism. These features of the police 'working personality' (Skolnick 1966) seem to stand the test of time (Loftus 2009; Van Hulst 2013) despite changes in the social, political and cultural contexts of the police/policing, for example, workforce demographic changes including the number of women and ethnic minority officers (Loftus, 2009) and the introduction of direct entry superintendents (Smith, 2016). However, there are a handful of authors whose work questions this account of 'cultural inertia'. White and Gill (2013: 74-75) speak of the 'complex blurring of relations and rationalities' that result from collaborations between the police and private security, with 'both private security and police actors drawing upon a mix of public and private scripts to inform their actions'. Research on police partnership working has similarly emphasised the capacity of the police's close working relationship with partner agencies to 'foster changes in attitudes and behaviours' (Crawford and L'Hoiry, 2017: 648), as introspective cultures and outlooks are subject to 'reconfiguration' (O'Neill and McCarthy, 2014: 155) through sustained contact with 'others'. Whether a similar pattern exists in the case of detective culture remains less explored. While few studies have directly addressed whether there is a distinctive detective (sub)culture within police culture, there is evidence that the cultural values of detectives are shaped by their insulated position within the police organisation (Manning 2007: 393). However, alterations in the field of crime investigation work – such as the shift from traditional enforcement interventions towards a greater focus on harm reduction (Bacon, 2021) and professionalisation of crime investigation (Tong and O'Neill 2020)-, may have initiated undercurrents of change. Bacon (2021:15) for example, has shown how new directions in drugs policing have encouraged officers (including detectives) to 'put alternative cultural resources to work, tell (and listen to) alternative stories and use alternative schemas, frames and scripts to make sense of drug problems, their role and (in)effectiveness'. However, generally speaking, the sub-culture of crime investigation continues to be conceived as a 'radicalised and concentrated version of traditional cop culture' (Innes 2003: 14), with a more individualistic and entrepreneurial approach to work and fragmented professional loyalties (Maguire and Norris, 1992).

In a recent article, Campeau (2019: 75) seeks to transcend the parameters of the culture change/inertia debate, by drawing attention to the propensity for change even *within* apparent cultural stasis. Informed by literature from the sociology of culture and organisations, her work helps to breathe new life into the police acculturation debate, by highlighting the non-linear trajectory of police culture change and the capacity of new/less-powerful actors to assert their preferences over the contours of the dominant narrative.

Having an anthropological pedigree, acculturation was originally used to describe the cultural flow from a dominant to a subordinate culture, mostly in colonial situations (Gowricharn and Çankaya 2017: 1103). Over time, the concept has found a particular niche in sociology and cross-cultural and intercultural psychology, featuring most commonly in studies of individuals living in locations other than where they were born – such as among immigrants, refugees and sojourners (e.g. international students, seasonal farms workers) (Schwartz et al. 2010: 237). Acculturation has also been employed by policing scholars as a broad lens for understanding how new officer recruits become socialised into the police (Chan 1997: 66). The story goes that, new recruits enter the organisation with a variety of different outlooks, but soon become assimilated into a powerful occupational culture which they eventually adopt as their own (Skalnsky 2007: 20). Despite longstanding recognition of the ability of policing actors to *resist* acculturation (Fielding 1988; Chan 1997), and of the existence of police sub-cultures (Reuss-Ianni 1983), few have considered to what extent this one-dimensional model of acculturation has been overtaken by the increasing complexity of contemporary policing patterns, in particular, pluralisation. We know little about how micro-level interactions between policing actors, and the contexts in which these occur, act to shape and determine the direction of the acculturation process (and ultimately, the *texture* of police

culture). The tendency of acculturation theory to gloss over power differentials alongside its failure to capture the larger context, have been common critiques in other fields of study (Gowricharn and Çankaya 2017: 1104). Campeau's analysis inspires the search for a framework of cultural analysis that is better able to account for 'the dynamic qualities and contextually contingent nature of police culture' (Campeau 2015: 674), and which is capable of revealing *how* policing actors 'perpetually and actively' (re)negotiate stasis 'on the ground' (Campeau 2016: 14). Campeau helps to progress this line of enquiry by (re)focusing attention onto the 'structuring conditions' of change (in her case, intensified police oversight) and the contextual nuances *behind* the cultural *resources* police actors deploy as they engage with an unsettled occupational landscape. Culture is 'socially embedded' within the police department (Campeau 2015: 672), being formed and re-formed through social interactions and *encounters*. Thus, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of contemporary police culture and its propensity to change, it is essential to situate it within its structural and discursive conditions.

This, I argue, gives pause to think again about the 'structuring conditions' of *pluralisation* and its implications for how we understand and investigate police culture. The aforementioned studies suggest that, like the intensification of oversight, pluralisation has altered the structural, social and economic context of police work, affecting how actors located within the police organisation approach their work (i.e. how they understand and *use* culture). One underexplored dimension of the pluralisation debate concerns the growing significance (and cultural impact) of non-warranted police staff. Like the new generation police officers in Campeau's study, police staff bring with them non-traditional values/schemas of perception that have the potential to disrupt the cultural status quo. However, whether the non-traditional mind-sets of police staff are contributing to the reconfiguration of cop-culture, remains poorly understood. Research (O'Neill 2019) has tended to associate the marginalised status of police staff to an absence of agency when it comes to their (in)ability to modify the dominant cultural script of the police. The non-warranted status of police staff (and the mythology surrounding their lack of professionalism relative to their warranted counterparts (Rice 2020)) certainly restricts their capacity to move into 'positions of power' within the organisational hierarchy, making generational turnover a less significant 'disruptive' force than may be the case with police officers (Campeau 2019; Sklansky 2006). However, that does *not* mean police staff have no impact.

Cultural studies in other fields have acknowledged the dynamism of acculturation, which includes the capacity of disempowered groups to affect the dominant cultural script in subtle yet significant ways. This work assumes a level cultural playing field; that all actors, regardless of their position within the social-structural (or organisational) hierarchy, influence the style and trajectory of the dominant cultural narrative (Ashcroft 2001). Individuals (and their respective cultures/outlooks) are mutually affected by their interaction, though the nature of these effects may take time to reveal themselves owing (often) to the structural conditions in which cultural encounters happen (as within postcolonial contexts). Thus, it also envisages cultural change as a product of *ongoing social contact*. Considered alongside Campeau's work on cultural inertia (2019), this lens evidences the need for a more nuanced interrogation of *how* actors of differing structural and/or cultural positioning negotiate their co-presence - and their diverse outlooks - within 'unsettled moments' (such as pluralisation). Understanding *how* police officer-police staff actors navigate their encounters is thus likely to reveal a great deal about not only how/when/where police staff *use* culture, but also, the active role they can (and do) play in shaping its (re)production over time.

This is where I argue that further insights can be gained by drawing on the postcolonial studies literature, which contains a wealth of understanding about how culture develops within settings where group interactions are structured (historically) by social instability and an obvious imbalance of power (i.e. in the case of (de)colonised nations). For postcolonial scholars, culture is 'not a system of meanings or a container of attributed traditions' (as typically perpetuated within the field of police studies), but a manifestation of 'contradictory layers of different, conflict-causing claims articulations, self-conceptions and marginalized areas of discourse' (Bachmann-Medik 2016: 147). Culture is what happens when individuals of differing backgrounds, values, and outlooks encounter one another within a given locale and attempt to reconcile their differences. These spaces have been variously conceptualised (e.g. as

'zones of contention' (Eagleton 2016: 128) or 'contact zones' (Pratt 1991)) and are sites of discord and struggle (as opposed to consensus and 'shared values'), wherein power is negotiated and culture, reimagined. Whilst it is far from the author's intention to compare the plight(s) of groups affected by imperial conquest (which includes such evils as slavery) with policing actors' experiences of cultural change, I believe that when applied in the abstract sense – as 'a methodology for examining what happens when two cultures clash based upon one of the culture's assumptions of his authority' (Kambysellis 1997: 1) - a postcolonial perspective has the potential to help policing scholars better understand the complex power imbalances that underlie and direct culture (ex)change under conditions of pluralisation.

It is also important to recognise the well-established influence of postcolonial literature/theory outside of settings structured by a racially/ethnically driven power imbalance, or on geographies/communities not typically considered part of the 'colonial ideology' (cf Ellenberger (2019) application to the Republic of Iceland). Pratt (1991), for example, introduces 'contact zones' – spaces where transculturation happens (p34) – as a way to better understand the relationship between knowledge-production and power dynamics in the 'literacy space' of the classroom. Postcolonial literature/theory has also been used within the field of policing studies to analyse the effects of contemporary globalisation on local policing practices. Drawing upon Pratt's (1991) work, Blaustein (2014: 58) is able to shed light upon 'the ways that seemingly disempowered actors and institutions capitalise on their unique positioning in networks of governance to assert their preferences upon the contours of emergent contact zones like Safer Communities' in Bosnia-Herzegovina. These works demonstrate the versatility of the postcolonial lens beyond contexts structured by colonial violence and/or by cultural relations based upon race/ethnicity. Nonetheless, the author recognises that her attempt to recontexualise/disembed postcolonial theory from these conventional contexts may, for some, be contentious. However, by applying postcolonial theory in an abstract way - to help illuminate the cultural complexity and economic/social/cultural power asymmetries inherent to the contemporary police organisational context - this paper contributes to the already vague disciplinary bounds of this body of literature, and to the interdisciplinary/interdiscursive tradition of postcolonial studies.

Unlike in policing studies which has focused predominantly on the ability of new entrants to *resist* acculturation (i.e. the tool-kit model), postcolonial scholars have instead chosen to foreground the capacity of actors with less power to offer 'a creative reply' to it (Rama 1981: 33). One such scholar was Cuban anthropologist, lawyer, historian and occasional criminologist, Fernando Ortiz (1947). His concept of transculturation sought to improve upon acculturation - as a unidirectional mode of adaption by migrants to the host society - by instead recognising the multiple and *reciprocal* influences that develop through cohabitation and which are easily overlooked by scholars when looking for continuity and change from a 'colonist' perspective. Unlike acculturation, transculturation is not a linear transition from one culture to another, but embodies both 'deculturation' (a period of cultural loss due to colonisation) and 'neoculturation' (the formation of new and blended cultural creations) (Ortiz 2003). Crucially, it emphasises how cultural influences are shaped by imbalances of power, but also by the agency different social actors demonstrate through their everyday practices and relationships (i.e. how the socio-economic power of one culture impacts on, without altogether determining, another). By privileging cultural *exchange* (process) over cultural *extraction* (outcome), transculturation is able to accentuate the active role played by subordinate cultural players in reinterpreting, rather than suffering, the cultural (and structural) status quo in situations shaped by asymmetric power relations (such as those present within pluralised police settings). It is most distinct from acculturation in its recognition of the *impurity* of culture - something Campeau's work alludes to, but does not unpack. Under the auspices of transculturation, the culture that emerges from the interaction of two or more participating cultures is 'not simply a mechanical conglomeration of characteristics, nor a mosaic', but rather, is a 'new reality, compound and complex … original and independent' (Malinowski 1991: 658).

At the most basic level, transculturation is a neologism introduced by Ortiz to 'better express the different phases of the process of transition from one culture to another' (Ortiz 1947: 102). However, its

explanatory power lies in its ability to operate as a loose framework to understand the complexity of local cultural (re)production and discourse. Ortiz (1944) describes his transcultural model as a series of phases. The first of these phases - **capture** - is 'marked by hostility' (p22) alongside a notable power imbalance between dominant and subordinate groups. The dominant group's suppression of the subordinate group is justified on grounds of their self-perceived superiority over the 'accursed' (p22). While the subordinate group may appear 'conquered', they remain, however, far from resigned to their fate. The second phase of transculturation, **compromise**, is typified by the 'exploitation' of the subordinate group by their dominant counterparts who, powerless to resist oppression, learn to modify their behaviours and own sense of self in accordance with the dominant cultural narrative. Over time, the dominant group begins to relent to the presence of the subordinate, while the subordinate begins to readjust to 'the new life and the new land', even developing an affection for their new home. According to Ortiz, 'the former wishes this system to go on indefinitely, while the latter awaits his own day' (p22). Occurring during the third phase of transculturation, the **adjustment** period is characterised by 'imitation' (p23), as both groups begin to embrace the new situation by adopting traits (both good and bad) learned from one another. Words of an oppressive inflection begin to take on a distasteful hue and ultimately 'give way to others of a more pleasant sound in ordinary speech' (p23). The dominant group accepts the cooperation of the subordinate when it is advantageous to him and providing they 'keep their place'. Whilst qualitatively changed, life continues to proceed 'in the tempo of the past'. The fourth phase of Ortiz's model – **self-assertion** - is marked by developing 'mutual-respect' and increased cooperation between the dominant and subordinate cultural groups. In this phase, the subdominant group has begun to acquire control over their life and has attained a degree of self-respect. No longer ashamed of their own 'traditions' and 'ancestral culture', extent cultural identity is both retained and displayed. While pockets of resistance to the new social order continue to exist (especially economically), the degree of relational interaction continues to increase.

The four stages of transculturation outlined by Ortiz (1944: 23) are not mutually exclusive, nor are they 'inevitable phases which all persons … are forced to undergo'. Factors such as 'environmental phenomena' alongside 'the personality of the individual may hasten or skip one phase or another'. Others have also noted the problem with framing transculturation as a teleology of cultural production, and consider it 'a fantasy of class, gender and racial reconciliation' (Beverly 1999: 47). Despite its critics, transculturation provides an alternative ontology to Western, metaphorically-driven conceptualisations of culture - as an organism with distinct/carefully maintained boundaries that can be 'blurred' and/or 'fragmented' and which separate it from 'others'. This is helpful for thinking about contemporary police occupational culture, which, like all culture, is comprised of an amalgam of diverse influences. However, under the conditions of pluralisation and changing recruitment practices, these influences derive from a more diverse range of socialisation experiences than has traditionally been the case (Charman 2017; Pichonnaz 2021). The impact of this, however, remains poorly understood. The impurity of cop-culture means it cannot (if it ever could) be reduced to a single and all-embracing 'grand narrative' or comprehensively investigated as a static object. This is, in part, what Sklansky (2007) is referring to when he speaks of 'cognitive burn-in', that is, the tendency of policing scholars to conceptualise culture as a series of predetermined traits or 'shared values', which are difficult to change (p20-21). This epistemic lens, according to Sklansky, has 'made it harder to see the dramatic though still incomplete ways in which the internal dynamics of police forces have been transformed, and how much rides on continuing that progress' (p37). The reality of police culture is that it is *naturally unstable*, comprised of an assemblage of discourses and imaginings which are constantly changing, evolving and in dispute, as they encounter new cultures/logics/outlooks at both the group and individual levels. It is *transcultural* and should be studied as such. Understanding police culture with reference to the durability of predetermined traits will only ever provide a partial account of change. Viewing police culture through a transcultural lens is more likely to reveal subtle transformations happening in/to the *texture* (rather than the shape) of police culture, as plural actors negotiate their competing interests through their encounters with one another 'on the ground'.

Methods

This paper reports on qualitative findings gleaned from a mixed-methods study of CIs operating in two police forces of comparable size in England, hitherto referred to under the pseudonyms *Newbank* and *Shorewick* (Rice 2020). These findings derive from 61.5 hours of observation and 36 semi-structured interviews (plus 18 unstructured 'interviews as conversations') undertaken between June 2013 and March 2015 with CIs, DCs, police constables, civilian unit managers and senior police officers (including Detective Sergeants, Detective Inspectors and Detective Chief Inspectors) working within five distinct investigative units across two police forces. CIs were interviewed and/or observed wherever they were located and varied in their length of employment (ranging from 2 months to 9 years). The variable length of participants' service is reflected in the data presented below which provide both chronological *and* contemporaneous accounts of CIs' experiences of their employment. At Shorewick, CIs were located in the Reactive Generalist Unit (GRU), Major Incident Team (MIT), Economic Crime Unit (Financial Investigation Team) (ECU), Public Protection Unit (Domestic Abuse and Child Protection Teams) (PPU), and Crime Management Unit (Diary Team) (CMU). At Newbank CIs were located in the Reactive Generalist Unit (GRU), Economic Crime Unit (financial investigation team) (ECU), Public Protection Unit (PPU), and Crime Management Unit (Prisoner Handling Team) (CMU). Observations were carried out in each force using a schedule and varied in context, scope and duration: CIs and DCs were observed operating within district-level police stations, headquarters or co-located police buildings (e.g. premises shared with social care, housing etc.), within the police custody suite, on home visits with members of the public and during other routine, out of station enquiries. CIs were observed when working individually and alongside DCs as part of a team within the CID suite. As the study was principally concerned with investigating the occupational 'fit' of CIs relative to DCs, data collection was concentrated on gaining a better understanding of CIs' occupational remit, environment, authority and interactions with their warranted colleagues. Qualitative field notes and interview transcripts were analysed using the method of thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006) which involved systematic coding driven by a mixture of theory and data-led approaches.

Gatekeepers facilitated access to key participants and others were recruited through snowball sampling. Interviews had an average duration of one-hour and seven minutes, were conducted face-to-face, and concerned CIs' roles and responsibilities; training; perceptions of CIs; detective skills; occupational status. When possible, the interviews were audio-recorded, to be transcribed verbatim at a later point. Where interviews were undertaken ad-hoc while accompanying participants outside of the police station (e.g. taking a witness statement), extensive notes were taken. 19 (semi-structured) interviewees in this research were female. The remaining 17 were male. An additional 18 unstructured interviews were undertaken with CIs and officers during observation (9 in each force). None of the participants encountered at either Shorewick or Newbank were from BAME backgrounds and all worked in mixed teams, though some teams were more 'mature' in terms of how long CIs had worked there (PPU and MIT being the two units in which non-ex-officer CIs were found to have been located the longest). Participants were aged between 25–65 years old and most had more than 5 years' experience in the field of crime investigation. Participants varied in terms of their educational levels ranging from school-level attainment (e.g. O-Levels/GCSEs) and/or having been trained in the police organisation itself, to University degrees; at least three CI participants were identified as being educated to degree-level. 13 warranted officer participants were DCs (including 5 of Sergeant rank or above) and 5 were Police Constables (trainee DCs). Within the group of CIs encountered (36 directly involved as participants), 28 were *ex-officers* (i.e. individuals who had retired or left the police organisation having served as warranted constables) and 27 were *non-ex-officers* (i.e. individuals whom have never been police constables). 53 CIs were employed by the police organisation and two were employed by private security agencies.

This paper focuses principally on the experiences, contributions, and perceptions (by DCs) of non-ex-officer participants encountered at both police forces. This group of participants came from a range of occupational backgrounds, including other police staff roles (e.g. police indexers). However, a

sizeable number came from 'outside' the police, such as fraud investigation/intelligence work (for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs), drugs work, social work, locomotive risk analysis, borders agency, early years' education, and the probation service. In most cases, these CIs had been recruited into the CID for their particular skills-set, accentuating the necessity for a broader range of professional skills and specialist expertise in contemporary investigative policing.

All data gathered are treated with upmost confidentiality and have been anonymised, using subject codes/names in place of participant names and pseudonyms in place of force names. No parts of this research were covert and informed consent was sought for all interviews.

Findings

In what follows, I use Ortiz's concept of transculturation to dissect the pluralisation experiences of non-ex-officer CIs operating within the organisational context of the police. The data are organised around the varying phases of the transculturation process, as articulated by Ortiz (1944). These are *capture, compromise, adjustment, and self-assertion.* This model provides a helpful interpretive framework for understanding how power asymmetries within pluralised settings structure the use of culture by police staff (CIs) but also, the capacity of CIs, despite their inferior structural status, to affect the cultural gradient of the CID in subtle but meaningful ways.

Capture

In line with Ortiz's envisaging of *capture*, and existing research on the cultural challenge posed by 'civvies' (Banton 1964; Young 1993: 73), initial encounters between CIs and DCs were characterised by hostility from the dominant cultural group – detectives. While ex-officer CIs, with their lengthy experiential knowledge of the field, fitted neatly within the normative construction of 'detective work', they were nonetheless lamented by DCs for the perceived theft of coveted over-time. Non-ex-officer CIs, however, were reviled at a much deeper level, for the perceived theft of detectives' professionalism and identity:

> This job is all about experience, that's what makes me a professional at it. I can go to any job and know what to do. Knowing what to look for and how to handle it...it's supposed to be the crème de la crème of police work, isn't it? Then you have Joe Bloggs from Sainsbury's coming in and doing it. Of course, you feel a bit put out. (DC-Shorewick-MIT)

Warranted participants regularly drew upon 'old school' cultural scripts (Campeau 2019) as justification for their 'self-perceived superiority' over the 'accursed' non-ex-officer CI (Ortiz 1944: 22). Most disempowering and pervasive of all these cultural scripts was the institutional myth of 'omnicompetence', the idea that only a police detective possesses the 'artistic flair' and 'craft knowledge' required for *every* policing eventuality (Tong and Bowling 2006). The myth of omnicompetence permitted the infantilising of CIs who were shamed for their perceived 'naivety' and/or lack of credibility when it came to 'real police work' (such as interviewing suspects and defusing volatile situations), and for their illegitimate past lives as 'civilians' - much in the same way as happens to new officer recruits (Conti 2009) and, since 2014, to direct entry superintendents (Smith 2016). The 'asymmetrical relations of power' that typified the CID were also reflected in the structural subjugation of CIs at both forces. A lack of role-appropriate training, professional accreditation/recognition (e.g. into the PIP process) and absence of documented role profiles (Rice 2020) left many CIs feeling "like the poor relatives of the office" (ex-officer CI-Shorewick-CMU). The paucity of opportunities to progress within the role in particular left CIs feeling "trapped" by their civilian designation, compounding their sense of alienation:

> There's nowhere for me to go in this job…Civilians will never be police officers and will never be treated the same as police officers either…I've worked Christmas days, I've worked

> Christmas Eves alongside police officers who have been getting 3, 4 times the amount of money I've been getting…So, they expect you to come in on that Christmas Day but they don't want to give you the same privileges (non-ex-officer CI-Shorewick-PPU)

CIs' initial sense of alienation was underscored at the time of the research by an austere fiscal climate (HM Treasury 2010) which placed all police staff under threat of redundancy. The 'employee' status of CIs (relative to warranted personnel who occupy the 'office of constable') meant that this "sword of Damocles" (ex-officer CI-Shorewick-MIT) rendered them vulnerable to fluctuating economic circumstances and/or prevailing ideological will. It also left them powerless to resist the damaging pull of 'mission creep'. As with PCSOs assisting with drugs raids (Cosgrove 2016) and civilian Detention Officers 'booking-in' suspects to the custody suite (Skinns 2011), CIs had taken on roles beyond their paraprofessional/supportive remit, such as interviewing suspects and complex (vulnerable) witnesses (e.g. children), undertaking disclosure on major enquiries and performing family liaison on murder investigations (Rice 2020). This mission creep was widespread across both forces and was symptomatic of the 'precariat status' (Standing 2011) of CIs at this time:

> Ultimately, I'm dispensable, you know? So, you don't have any grounds to argue cos it's like, "well there's the door if you don't like it". I'm not going to be the person that says 'That's beyond my pay grade' because when it comes to it, who do you reckons gonna get the chop? It's not likely to be Mr 'Yes Sir no Sir' is it? It'll be me! (ex-officer CI-Shorewick-MIT)

The economic insecurity of CIs relative to DCs meant that some felt little option but to exit the role. One instance of this was encountered at Shorewick FFIT where an ex-officer CI was in the process of leaving Shorewick for a similar position with Newbank police which they believed to be more "future-proof" due to Newbank's more established CI career progression/structure. However, in most cases, CIs' experiences of economic insecurity seemed to inspire solidarity as they struggled, collectively, to maintain their investigative performance in spite of their inferior practice knowledge and in the absence of adequate training (Rice 2020). At both forces, CIs worked hard to maintain a unified definition of the situation (of being competent and useful members of the CID) by helping other CIs to conceal operational mistakes. For example: forgetting to caution suspects during interviews, falsely arresting participants while undertaking enquiries outside of the police station, and mistakes relating to the retrieval and packaging of exhibits. In each instance, participants confessed to only seeking advice from trusted CI colleagues who could help to resolve matters 'discretely' and, crucially, without notifying their warranted counterparts:

> It can be overwhelming when you first start here. The workload is intense and there's a rigid hierarchy and it can be quite isolating. In my old job, we'd all help each other out when we had a lot of work on and it's something I found quite odd when I first started here…It's important to know who you can go to for advice and who to avoid. There are a few of us [CIs] who tend to work together and we're a good team. We look out for each other. (non-ex-officer CI-Shorewick-CMU)

This evidence points to a CI 'code of self-protection' comparable to the well-documented 'code of silence' noted amongst officers (Skolnick 2002). However, it also supports the suggestion that the sense of 'espirit de corps' could be even stronger amongst police staff than officers (Wright 2006; Rothwell and Baldwin 2007). CIs' sense of solidarity marks an obvious departure from research on detective culture which documents the 'jealous guarding' of case-relevant material by those engaged in detective work (Collison 1995: 41). It also reflects CIs cultural experiences of teamwork as they were formed *outside* of the police

organisation. In line with the transculturation phase of capture, the tendency of CIs to self-protect reveals the omnipresence of their vulnerability, as they grappled to negotiate their professional and cultural status within the CID.

Compromise

Non-ex-officer CIs who had arrived more recently to the CID developed 'strategies of compromise' as a means to negotiating their new organisational territory and identity as 'support staff'. 'Sensemaking' (Weick 1995) was one such strategy, and helped CIs overcome inner tensions resulting from the ambiguity of their role/status relative to DCs:

> Yes, we are support in the sense that we all support one another. But not support in the sense of being less than detectives, because we do the same jobs. The only real difference is that we [CIs] can't arrest people, but that's not something that happens in here anyway. Uniform do that. So, I'd say we're all just investigators. (non-ex-officer CI-Shorewick-MIT)

Sensemaking was also a common practice amongst non-ex-officer CIs whose outlooks/values were the product of a different occupational field, and whose transition into the CID had left them feeling like cultural outsiders, or, as one participant put it, "like a square peg in a round hole" (non-ex-officer CI, Newbank-PPU). Non-ex-officer CIs' attempts at sensemaking were often tied-up with feeling 'betwixt and between' diverse socially constructed identities and the need to accept their new *liminal status*:

> I'm a social worker by trade. This is my second life if you like [laughs]...Crime investigation work is something I've always been interested in, but I didn't want to be rolling around on the floor with baddies on Friday nights. So, this role was a natural progression for me...It can be hard to explain to the public who you are and what your job is because it's not a recognised role like, say, being a social worker. We're not really one thing or the other. (non-ex-officer CI-Newbank-PPU)

Less experienced CIs' and/or those lacking up-to-date knowledge of detective work were mindful of their professional deficiencies and, in line with the transcultural phase of adjustment, demonstrated a tendency to 'defend themselves with shrewdness' (Ortiz 1944: 22). Self-censorship was a common strategy of compromise cited by non-ex-officer CIs. When necessary, this required CIs' modify 'natural' behaviours in accordance with the host culture of the police as they attempted to 'fly under the radar' - much like policewomen's attempts to 'fit in' in a male-dominated working environment (Martin and Jurik 2007). The best illustration of this was the propensity of CIs to yield to the 'a-theoretical' tradition of the CID:

> I do think there's this assumption that experience interviewing child victims/witnesses is enough. I worked for a long time before this with young children and before that, I did two degrees in child development which included child trauma. That's a big reason I got this job. But when it comes down to it, the Bobbies don't always react well to being told how to do things from a 'civvie', you know? So, I'm selective with who I talk to about that part of my life. (non-ex-officer CI-Shorewick-PPU)

However, as implied above, the willingness of CIs to compromise to their new organisational terrain represented little more than the 'peace of Zanjon' (Ortiz 1944: 23), with almost all of those interviewed maintaining a literal and emotional connection to their 'past lives'. The CID was, at this stage in CIs' pluralisation journeys, less a space of cultural transition as it was a space of self-preservation.

Adjustment

At both forces, CIs' experiences of adjustment were characterised by their endorsement of cop-culture (as this was filtered through the lens of detective work) and by their desire for acceptance. In line with the traditional cop cultural trait of *pragmatism*, CIs tended to rely on methods of working that 'made sense' or which showed immediate practical value (Innes 2003). This trait was apparent in the orientations of CIs and DCs alike as a pervasive desire to 'get things done' in the face of bureaucratic barriers (e.g. paperwork), public dissatisfaction and uncooperative victims, witnesses or suspects. Like new officer recruits to the police (Fielding 1988), CIs displayed a clear *sense-of-mission* and reported being driven in their role by an overriding 'service-ethos', articulated as a desire to 'protect the public' and to ensure 'justice is done'. Many non-ex-officer CIs had left established careers in pursuance of the CI role, often choosing pay cuts and shift-work over more consistent and sociable working hours. In line with traditional accounts of police officer culture (Skolnick 1966), CIs were also noticeably *oriented towards crime control.* Some spoke in punitive terms about their role, for example, referring to suspects/offenders as 'baddies' or 'wrongens'. These CIs were also seemingly *drawn to action*, as evidenced by their inclination to take on cases of particular complexity, or of a violent nature which fell beyond their supportive remit.

The tendency of CIs to perpetuate core elements of cop (detective) culture is telling of CIs'/DCs' shared experience of 'detective work' and the challenges this involved (e.g. complex case preparation, high workload/demand, time constraints and the prosecution of offenders). However, it is also reflective of the inherent power imbalance of the pluralised setting in which they were situated. CIs were acutely aware of their outsider status, meaning their experiences of adjustment were shaped by their efforts to (re)present themselves (and their diverse interpretive frameworks) as legitimate players in the field of detective work:

> At the end of the day, I am a civilian. I've never been in uniform, and I don't have that experience. But it's *because* of that that I have other relevant skills that make me efficient at this job, and the Bobbies I work with know that. That's my USP if you like [laughs]. Like, I get a lot of these types of cases [involving young people] because I worked with chaotic young people every day before I came to this job and that's not something the average DC has much knowledge of. (non-ex-officer CI-Newbank-PPU)

> You have to show you're capable and that you can get stuck into whatever...I did security before this job. So, I know all about encountering an angry man or woman and that's been a real advantage of mine over some of the other CIs in here. (non-ex-officer CI-Shorewick-MIT)

As illustrated above, CIs often referred to their jobs/roles prior to joining the CID in ways that resonated with the cultural values of the dominant group/terms. By collaborating with certain aspects of cop-culture (namely, cynicism, pragmatism and sense-of-mission), CIs were able to (re)present their value in ways that made sense to the dominant group (DCs). This process - by which subordinated peoples strive to describe themselves to the dominant group in ways that engage with dominant terms – is known as 'autoethnography' and is typical of transcultural spaces (Pratt 1991). The ability of individual CIs to transition from 'naïve civvie' to 'competent investigator' was thus rooted in their autoethnographic abilities. It was also dependent on their sustained proximity to DCs, which provided opportunities for 'transcultural interactions' – i.e. the range of discursive and material interactions that occur when cultural groups in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination encounter one another (Pratt 1992: 4). Thus, CIs engagement with cop-culture was far from passive, despite their perceived tendency to reproduce the dominant culture when observed through the lens of acculturation. CIs did not simply 'abandon their individual values … and adopt the cultural values held by police officers' (Cosgrove 2011:

201). Rather, they used cop-culture as a medium through which to build trust and cultural capital within the units in which they operated.

For DCs, the transcultural phase of adjustment involved finding value/worth in the divergent knowledge-base of non-ex-officer CIs where it was perceived to be complementary to the 'practical professionalism' (Greenhill 1981) of the CID. Generally, this centred on the ability of CIs to improve the speed, direction and quality of the investigative outcome (e.g. by refining the investigatory 'intelligence-base' (thus furthering crime control) or by lightening the CID workload by reallocating tasks to other appropriate agencies (e.g. NHS, housing, social care etc.)):

> I think they can offer a fresh pair of eyes…I went out on a job with her to take a statement from a young female on a suspected Child Sexual Exploitation job…She just wouldn't engage with me at all…She [CI] got her talking and this young lass gave us the lot, and I do think a lot of that was down to [CIs name] because that's what she's skilled at before she came to us. So, I *was* impressed with that. (DC-Newbank-PPU)

> Daniel [CI] is a young lad who came to us from outside and he's fab with all the digital stuff. I'm sure his age is a factor but he has a forensic accounting degree, so he does a lot of the evidence integrity and preservation side of things because he's really skilled at that. He's been instrumental in a lot of the cases we've had through and I know the courts have been impressed too which makes us all look good. (DC-Shorewick-ECU)

Such accounts speak to the importance of ongoing intergroup *contact* for improving both the performance of investigative work and the social standing of CIs within the CID. They also evidence the pragmatic value officers placed on CIs with skills/expertise in fields of work akin to their partners (e.g. social care, probation, housing etc.). These CIs were felt better able to 'speak the same language' (both literally and culturally) as partner agencies, and thus, were valued for their relationship-building skills with external agencies/stakeholders and role as police 'knowledge-brokers':

> Those that have come in from outside have that extra level of understanding when it comes to engaging with social care and the other externals which is valuable because they've seen it from the other side haven't they? They can 'talk the talk' which can be really helpful. I think those ones are a real asset to be honest. (DCI-Newbank-PPU)

The role of transcultural actors as 'cultural translators' is well-documented in the transculturation literature (Pereira-Ares 2015: 478). The value attached to CIs' 'politicking' abilities accords with traditional conceptualisations of detective culture wherein investigative prestige is envisaged to rest, in large part, upon the boundary spanning and networking that is essential to carrying out the detective mandate well (Hobbs 1988). However, in the case of partnership working, successful detective work was dependent upon DCs' ability/willingness to recognise the value of CIs' non-traditional knowledge/expertise and thus, on CIs' abilities when it came to practising the transcultural 'art' of autoethnography.

Self-Assertion

Relations between CIs and DCs were at their most collegiate within areas of investigation work where the CI role (either at the group level or individual level) had become 'institutionalised' over time; that is, where their use was generally considered to be both necessary and appropriate for the overall efficiency and legitimacy of the unit. It was also in these units that the characteristics of 'self-assertion' were displayed most clearly. At Newbank PPU, for example (where some of the longest-serving CIs were located), DCs were more likely to advocate the constructive benefits of inter-designatory working

arrangements and generally spoke more favourably of CI colleagues' investigative competency and non-traditional skills/expertise.

CIs working in these more established inter-designatory settings were also more self-assured of the value they provided to the CID and felt more able to speak about their past lives in the presence of warranted colleagues.

> I have been surprised by the openness of CIs working in the PPU arena compared with others. Today, and on my previous visit to these units, CIs have been happy (even eager) to share their stories with me, but also with their warranted colleagues, with some making it comically clear that they had 'heard it all before'. This is a contrast to other settings (e.g. GRU) where the unit atmosphere meant that these discussions happened in 'private' spaces', and where DCs showed little/no awareness of their CI colleagues in general. The question, 'What did you do before you became a CI?', is an uncomfortable one, though not in every instance it seems.
>
> (Field-notes-Shorewick-PPU)

In most cases, non-ex-officer CIs retained a strong sense-of-self and considered their non-traditional pathways into detective work as integral to their new ('transcultural') identities as professional/successful investigators:

> I'm good at what I do, and I think a big part of why that is is because I had this other life that I did for many years and the transferable skills you bring from that which have been invaluable in this role. (non-ex-officer CI-Shorewick-PPU)

> I might not be as experienced as a lot of the detectives in here but I'm a damn site better than some of them, I'll tell you that much [laughs]… I do feel sorry for the ones [DCs] who have come straight through because they don't know anything else. It sounds strange to say but they're actually at a disadvantage because this job is so complex now. (non-ex-officer CI-Newbank-PPU)

The DCs in these units also acknowledged how working closely with CIs had influenced their own cultural outlooks, especially when it came to the role of suspects and changing conceptions about the 'deservingness' of those with 'complex needs' (in particular, drug takers and those suffering from mental ill health):

> I'm an old-school cop so I'm very victim-focused. One of the things I've personally taken away from working with Kay [CI] is that you don't have a victim without an offender, and we don't take advantage of that point of contact with suspects enough. (DC-Newbank-PPU)

> This job has evolved over the years. In most cases, there's a lot of stuff going on; drugs and alcohol, family issues, health issues - mental health is a biggy for us now. So, it really helps to have people who are used to dealing with those things, who are experienced in engaging with them in different capacities. Like Gemma, for example. I've learnt a lot from her about addiction and different service providers to signpost people too that I didn't know about before. (DC-Shorewick-GRU)

Whilst punitive dispositions continued to drive DCs' overall sense-of-mission, in many cases, their outlooks were notably more appreciative of the nuances that influence trajectories of offending and/or victimisation, and the longer-term preventative benefits of early intervention, education and relationship building between agencies (in the case of safeguarding). This was evidenced through the notable efforts

of DCs to initiate/encourage offender contact with custody 'Diversion' teams which was observed on more than one occasion in the PPU arena at both forces.

Together, findings presented above demonstrate the preventative ethos of the contemporary CID and influence CIs had on shaping outlooks and values in this setting. They also speak to the *transcultural* character of cop-culture in 'mature' pluralised settings and give pause to think more deeply about the role of ongoing social contact in facilitating the culture change process within pluralised police settings.

Conclusion

This paper provides insight into the current configuration of police detective work and culture in England. Using conceptual instruments gleaned from the field of postcolonial studies to analyse the pluralisation experiences of CIs, it has sought to further theoretical insight on the nature and extent of cultural change happening in pluralised police settings, in this case, the police CID. Findings presented indicate that a careful analysis of how the various members of the 'extended policing family' build an occupational culture and interact with each other is crucial for understanding how pluralised policing operates, and the effect of this on practice.

The devolution of detective work to non-ex-officer CIs has changed the nature of contact between officers and police staff operating within the context of contemporary crime investigation. Whereas DCs and police staff (such as crime indexers and intelligence analysts) have historically been separated in terms of their roles (support versus frontline), pluralising processes (namely civilianisation) have increasingly forced them together, creating new types of contact in which both groups must establish ongoing relations. Tracing how CIs and DCs negotiate their co-presence within this new organisational terrain - while grappling to reconcile their cultural and professional differences within the hierarchical context of the CID - sheds light on the interpretive and active role (Chan 1997: 66) police staff (as the cultural subordinates) contribute to (re)producing detective culture, over time. Through the lens of transculturation, we see that CIs were active in resisting their cultural subordination and in negotiating their place within the social-cultural hierarchy of the CID. Through the transcultural art of autoethnography, CIs were able to circumvent their experiential shortcomings by convincing DCs of the congruity of their non-traditional skills-set with that of the dominant cultural narrative. These narrative accounts were transcultural in that they represented a blending together of outlooks, professional experiences and cultural features to create a new interpretation of the 'police (detective) predicament' (Reiner 2010). CIs played an important role in *(re)interpreting* the police predicament and in disseminating that to DCs. In spite of their non-warranted designation, CIs were able to reshape the stories that warranted officers told *about* them, informing dominant interpretations of the role. CIs retained their non-traditional outlooks/values and wherever possible, used these to influence the field. The findings presented give credence to Campeau's notion of 'change within stasis' (2019) as well as supporting the hypothesis of endurance of dispositions from different spheres of life to the police professional space.

While little evidence of 'full transculturation' was evident at either police force, participants' experiences of the pluralisation process nonetheless demonstrate a striking similarity to those of other marginalised cultural groups engaged in traversing unsettled environments. This suggests that, like them, the CIs and DCs in this study were entangled in a process of mutual cultural development. Each of the stages of Ortiz's transculturation model were observed in the accounts provided by CIs of their pluralisation journeys. They experienced *capture* as infantilisation and through their lack of mobility as non-warranted staff within the investigatory context (and the police organisation more broadly); they *compromised* to their new cultural field by developing strategies of self-reflection that were intended to reconcile the liminality they experienced as a consequence of their need to adjust to their new occupational home and/or lack of clearly defined role; they *adjusted* to their new organisational/cultural environment by collaborating with cop-culture which, over time, allowed them to *self-assert* their authority and cultural preferences over the arena of crime investigation. The trajectory of socialisation presented in this paper helps to reveal *how* disruption to the cultural status quo plays-out within the organisational

context of police. However, most crucially, it provides an account of cultural (re)production, and renders visible the effects of changing workforce dynamics on police occupational culture.

Like police culture generally, detective culture has developed new formations and currents of transcultural expression in the light of structural and economic transformations taking place within the wider field of policing, in this case, the increased significance of the 'civilian' designation. Findings presented suggest that CIs brought with them alternative scripts and 'cognitive lenses' (Skolnick, 1966) which they used to make sense of their work and their role. While diverse in origin, generally, CIs' outlooks comprised a more preventative working ethos and reflexive capacity when it came to the 'victim-offender' dyad than typically found in the 'tool kit' of the detective. There is much to be learnt about current formations of police culture by considering the diversity of cultural resources present in pluralised settings but also, from the way criminal justice actors *experience* modernisation processes like civilianisation. Through the lens of transculturation we can see that contemporary detective culture within the context of pluralisation is as much a product of the creative grappling between CIs and DCs as it is a consequence of the intersections between the organisational conditions, policing environment, and the investigator role itself. In other words, contemporary detective culture is 'constituted *in* and *by*' CI/DC relations with one another (Pratt 1992: 7). Culture as a 'relational phenomenon' (which occurs when power relations/arrangements are negotiated through contact) highlights how the organisational setting and conditions of contact between policing actors within (and across) plural networks, as well as the wider political and social contexts, shape the outcomes of the pluralisation agenda. This requires us to think more deeply about *how* encounters between policing actors take place within pluralised settings and how they might be harnessed to facilitate cultural change. One way this could be achieved is through embedding 'meaningful contact' into training which promotes transcultural interactions (between officers and staff) and the co-production of 'legitimate' knowledge concerning the performance of effective detective work. Meaningful contact refers to 'contact that actually changes values' and engenders 'a more general positive respect for – rather than merely tolerance of – others' (Valentine 2008: 325). It was through such contact that CIs in this study were provided with opportunities to 'intervene in metropolitan modes of understanding' (Pratt, 1994: 28) (through autoethnography) about the nature of detective work and culture. However, as research on organisational culture and engineered social change has demonstrated, meaningful encounters often have limited impact unless they are embedded into longer-term interventions to address the fundamental issue of socio-economic and cultural inequalities. Through CI-led training workshops, for example, non-ex-officers CIs could be integrated as 'authentic voices' in the discourse of detective work. Such integration would represent what Ortiz refers to as 'tomorrow's phase' (Ortiz 1944: 24) and would likely require significant resourcing and an element of mediation. However, if curated properly, it could help transform the pluralisation experiences of police staff from one characterised by tension and alienation to one based on challenge, professionalism, and cultural innovation.

Finally, this article showcases the adaptive nature of transculturation for explaining cultural encounters beyond colonial/postcolonial circumstances (including within organisations). Ortiz himself makes this point explicitly when he says that transculturation may occur 'in all epochs and locales – in short, wherever there is an impact of dissimilar cultures due to economic conflicts' (1944: 23). Thus, the asymmetrical power conditions Ortiz directly references – the existence of a colonial aggressor and loss of sovereignty on the part of an 'inferior' cultural group - are not prerequisites to transculturation's analytical traction. By replacing the dichotomy of 'colonist' and 'colonised' with that of 'dominant' and 'subordinate', transculturation can be effectively mobilised by social researchers to better understand the cultural impact of changing working patterns and economic arrangements in other areas of criminal justice both in the UK and internationally. One obvious example is the migration of public sector employees (forced displacement and voluntary) to the private sector, such as in the case of probation in

the UK (Burke et al. 2017), prisons (Ludlow 2014), and the police (White 2014). A transcultural lens may be beneficial to criminologists in re-examining these situations.

Funding

This work was supported by an Economic and Social Research Council White Rose doctoral scholarship. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

References

Ashcroft, B. (2001), *Writing Past Colonialism: Transformations of a Colonial Culture*. London: Routledge.

Atkinson, C. (2017), 'Patriarchy, Gender, Infantilisation: A Cultural Account of Police Intelligence Work in Scotland', *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 50/2:234–251.

Bacon, M. (2022), 'Desistance from Criminalisation: Police Culture and New Directions in Drugs Policing', *Policing and Society*, 32/4:522-539

Bachmann-Medik, D. (2016), *Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Banton, M. (1964), *The Policeman in the Community*. London: Tavistock.

Bayley, D., and Shearing, C. (1996), 'The Future of Policing', *Law and Society Review*, 30/3:585–606.

Blaustein, J. (2014), 'The Space Between: Negotiating the Contours of Nodal Security Governance through 'Safer Communities' in Bosnia–Herzegovina', *Policing and Society*, 24/1: 44-62

Burke, L., Millings, M., and Robinson, G. (2017), 'Probation Migration(s): Examining Occupational Culture in a Turbulent Field', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 17/2:192–208.

Cain, M (1973), *Society and the Policeman's Role*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Campeau, H. (2015), 'Police Culture at Work: Making Sense of Police Oversight', *The British Journal of Criminology*, *55*/4: 669–687.

Campeau, H. (2016), 'Policing in Unsettled Times: An Analysis of Culture in the Police Organization', *PhD thesis*. University of Toronto. Available at: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/92666/1/Campeau_Holly_201611_PhD_thesis.pdf. (Last accessed 25th July 2022)

Campeau, H. (2019), 'Institutional Myths and Generational Boundaries: Cultural Inertia in the Police Organisation', *Policing and Society*, 29/1:69-84.

Chan, J. (1997), *Changing Police Culture*. Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press.

Charman, S. (2017), *Police Socialisation, Identity and Culture*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Collison, M. (1995), *Police, Drugs and Community*. London: Free Association Books.

Conti, N. (2009), 'A Visigoth System: Shame, Honor and Police Training', Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 38/3:409–432.

Cosgrove, F. (2011), 'An Appreciative Ethnography of PCSOs in a Northern City', *PhD thesis*. Northumbria University.

Cosgrove, F. (2016), ‘‘I Wannabe be a Copper’: The Engagement of Police Community Support Officers with the Dominant Police Occupational Culture’, *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 16/1:119-138.

Crawford, A. and L’Hoiry, X. (2017), ‘Boundary Crossing: Networked Policing and Emergent ‘Communities of Practice’ in Safeguarding Children’, *Policing and Society*, 27/6:636-654.

Eagleton, T. (2016), *Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fielding, N. (1988), *Joining Forces: Police Training, Socialization, and Occupational Competence*. London: Routledge.

Gowricharn, R., and Çankaya, S. (2017), ‘Policing the Nation: Acculturation and Street-Level Bureaucrats in Professional Life’, *Sociology*, 51/5:1101–1117.

Greenhill, N. (1981), ‘Professionalism in the Police Service’, In D. Pope, and N. Weiner, eds., *Modern Policing*, 53-68. London: Taylor and Francis.

HM Treasury. (2010), *Spending Review 2010*, Cm 7942. London: TSO.

HMIC. (2013), *Policing in Austerity: Rising to the Challenge*. London: HMIC

Hobbs, D. (1988), *Doing the Business: Entrepreneurship, the Working Class and Detectives in the East End of London*. Oxford: University Press.

Innes, M. (2003), *Investigating Murder: Detective Work and the Police Response to Criminal Homicide*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Ellenberger, Í. (2019) ‘Transculturation, contact zones and gender on the periphery. An example from Iceland 1890–1920’, *Women's History Review*, 28/7:1078-1095.

Jones, T., and Newburn, T. (2008), ‘The Transformation of Policing? Understanding Current Trends in Policing Systems’, *British Journal of Criminology*, 42/1:129-146.

Kambysellis, Z. (1997), ‘Post-Colonialism: The Unconscious Changing of a Culture’. *Political Discourse – Theories of Colonialism and Postcolonialism*. Available at http://www.postcolonialweb.org/poldiscourse/kz1.html (Last accessed 1st August 2022)

Loftus, B. (2009), *Police Culture in a Changing World*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Ludlow, A (2014), *Privatising Public Prisons: Labour Law and the Public Procurement Process.* Oxford: Hart

Malinowski, B. (1991), 'Fernando Ortiz', In C. Goic, eds., *Historia y Critica de la Literatura Hispanoamericana*, 656-659. Barcelona: Crítica.

Manning, P. (2007), ‘Detective work/culture’. In: J. Greene, eds., *Encyclopedia of Police Science*, pp390–397.

Martin, S. and Jurik, N. (2007), *Doing Justice, Doing Gender: Women in Legal and Criminal Justice Occupations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

O'Neill, M. (2019), *Police Community Support Officers: Cultures and Identities within Pluralised Policing*. Oxford: University Press.

O'Neill, M., and McCarthy, J. (2014), '(Re)negotiating Police Culture Through Partnership Working: Trust, Compromise and the 'New' Pragmatism', *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 14/2:143–159.
Ortiz, F. (1944), 'The Relations between Blacks and Whites in Cuba', *Phylon*, 5/1:15–29.

Ortiz, F. (1947), *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc: New York.

Pichonnaz, P. (2021), 'Connecting Work to Workers' Social Past: A Dispositional Analysis of Police Work'. *British Journal of Criminology*, 61/1:123-142

Pratt, M. (1991), 'Arts of the Contact Zone', *Profession*, pp33–40.

Pratt, M. (1992), *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. Taylor Francis

Rama, A. (1981), *Transculturacion Narrativa en America Latina*. Siglo Veintiuno Editores: Cerro Del Agua, Mexico.

Reiner, R. (2010), *Politics of the Police*. London: Wheatsheaf.

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983), *Two Cultures of Policing: Street Cops and Management Cops*. Transaction Books: New Brunswick.

Rice, L. (2020), 'Junior Partners or Equal Partners? Civilian Investigators and the Blurred Boundaries of Police Detective Work', *Policing and Society*, 30/8:966-981.

Rothwell, G., and Baldwin, J. (2007), 'Whistle-Blowing and the Code of Silence in Police Agencies: Policy and Structural Predictors', *Crime and Delinquency*, 53/4:605–632.

Schein, E. (1990), 'Organizational Culture'. *American Psychologist*, 45/2:109-119.

Skinns, L. (2011), *Police Custody: Governance, Legitimacy and Reform in the Criminal Justice Process*. Cullompton: Willan.

Sklansky, D. (2006), 'Not your Father's Police Department: Making Sense of the New Demographics of Law Enforcement', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 96/3:1209–1243.

Sklansky, D. (2007), 'Seeing Blue: Police Reform, Occupational Culture, and Cognitive Burn-In', in M. O'Neill, M. Marks, A. Singh, eds., *Police Occupational Culture: New Debates and Directions*, 19–45. Elsevier.

Skolnick, J. (1966), *Justice Without Trial*. John Wiley and Sons: New York.

Skolnick J. (2002), 'Corruption and the Blue Code of Silence', *Police Practice and Research* 3/1:7–19.

Smith, R. (2016), 'Don't call me Ma'am: Direct entry into leadership roles in British policing', *The Police Journal*, 89/4:311–326.

Standing, G. (2011), *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.

Tong, S., and Bowling, B. (2006), 'Art, Craft and Science of Detective Work', *The Police Journal*, 79/4:323–329.

Tong, S. and O'Neill, M. (2020), 'Professionalizing Criminal Investigation—An Examination of an Early Attempt to Support Specialization in Criminal Investigation', *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 14/2:337–348

Valentine, G. (2008), 'Living with Difference: Reflections of Geographies of Encounter', In R. Paddison, and E. McCann, eds., *Cities and Social Change: Encounters with Contemporary Urbanism,* 75-91. London: Sage.

Van Hulst, M. (2013), 'Storytelling at the Police Station: The Canteen Culture Revisited', *The British Journal of Criminology*, *53*/4:624-642.

Weick, K. (1995), *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

White, A. (2014), 'Post-crisis Policing and Public–Private Partnerships: The Case of Lincolnshire Police and G4S', *British Journal of Criminology*, 54/6:1002-1022.

White, A., and Gill, M. (2013), 'The Transformation of Policing: From Ratios to Rationalities', *British Journal of Criminology*, 53/1:74-93.

Wright, B. (2010), 'Civilianising the 'Blue Code'? An Examination of Attitudes to Misconduct in the Police Extended Family', *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 12/3:339–356.

Young, M. (1993), *In the Sticks: Cultural Identity in a Rural Police Force.* Oxford: University Press.