& PROFESSIONS PROFESSIONALISM

ISSN: 1893-1049 Volume 10, No 1 (2020), e3493 https://doi.org/10.7577/pp.3493

A Cross-Professional Analysis of Collegiality Among Teachers and Police Officers

Håkan Löfgren & Malin Wieslander

Linköping University, Sweden

Contact: Håkan Löfgren, Linköping University, Sweden, hakan.lofgren@liu.se

Abstract

This article compares collegiality between two professional groups—teachers and police officers. The purpose is to add an open, "cross-professional dimension" to the discussion about collegiality in the teaching and police professions. By investigating collegial relations within the two professions, we provide a unique comparison. Using positioning theory, we analysed variations in stories about colleagues and found that the functions of collegiality share similar norms of trust, loyalty and professionalism. Moreover, what seems to be a case of collegial resource can paradoxically be a challenge to clients when different practices of and responses to professional behaviour are outlined. We suggest that the reason for this paradox might be found in the exposure of individualised responsibility and accountability within the two professions, which drives a perceived need for collegial community-building processes.

Keywords

Collegiality, profession, teacher, police, narrative

Introduction

In this article we suggest that a "cross-professional dimension" on collegiality in professional relations can provide a new way to discuss social and relational aspects of the teaching and policing professions. Collegiality is often described as an important component in successful collaborative professional work (Brante, 2005; Evetts, 2010; Hargreaves, 1994; Paoline,

2003). For instance, it has been claimed that teacher collegiality counteracts attrition (Heider, 2005), encourages professional development, and has a positive impact on job satisfaction and student performance (Shah, 2012). Put simply, successful collaboration based on trustful collegial relations appears to be an antidote to the teacher isolation and weak claims of teacher professionalism described by Lortie (1975). However, some research also takes a more critical stance and describes teacher collegiality as a two-sided coin, stressing on the one hand processes of joint meaning-making and consensus regarding values and norms, and on the other hand a micro-political side with conflicts of interests and different agendas between teachers or groups of teachers (Hargreaves, 1994; Kelchtermans, 2006). Research on teacher collegiality has described how different forms of collegiality evolve in schools and influence teachers' professional work (Hargreaves, 1994; Jurasaite-Harbison & Rex, 2010) and how emotions are involved in processes of trust or distrust in collegial relations (Clement & Vandenberghe, 2000; Cowie, 2011; Hargreaves, 2001; Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016). In a previous article (Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016), we have questioned the singularity in the concept's use through an analysis of how different teachers at one school talk about their collegial relations in completely different terms. Typically, we argue, most research on collegiality among teachers is characterised by an idea that the conditions for the *teaching profession* are unique and that *teacher* collegiality develops as a result of the conditions in certain schools (Craig, 2013; Kelchtermans, 2006). Such research is rooted in the idea that school working conditions are so specific that they shape the teaching profession (Lortie, 1975) based on unique forms of collaboration and collegiality (Hargreaves, 1994). From this viewpoint, it is logical to direct attention towards teachers' collegial work as a matter of the specific conditions for teachers in a school or as a professional group in a certain context. In this article, however, we question the idea that teacher collegiality differs significantly from collegiality in other professions and discuss the importance of contextual aspects of collegiality in contrast to more general norms of inclusion and exclusion in professional groups. Therefore, we direct our attention not only to the joint work of teachers but also to another group of professionals that is also often described as having a unique collegiality and being highly dependent on certain working conditions and with an urgent need for trustful collegial relations: police officers. Research on collegiality among police officers often stresses the importance of sticking together due to the risks of the profession, for example dangerous situations and violent confrontations. It has been suggested that an autonomous perspective dominates when police officers talk about their work (Granér, 2004). This includes, for example, ideas that "real police work" includes collective abilities to identify danger and repressive powers to maintain respect.

Teaching and policing are two publicly funded welfare professions that share similarities. For instance, the work of the professionals is a social mission, they have close, frequent contact with the public, their knowledge has a scientific basis, they have certain qualification requirements, and in Sweden they both require certification. Further, they follow a specific professional ethical code, and share considerable autonomy and discretion

in interpreting and executing informal and formal decisions (e.g. Evetts, 2010; Lipsky, 1980). Another feature they share is the relationship to what is often described as "critical others", that is, a sense among the professionals that their actions are often criticised in public debate by, for example, clients or policymakers. However, teachers and police officers work with very different and specific work tasks and in different sections of society. Both professions are conditioned by legislation and regulations, but they differ in terms of organisational structure and hierarchy. In many regards, specific police characteristics relate to vulnerability to danger and threats, being perceived as an authority, and demands for speed and efficiency (e.g. Skolnick, 1994). The police profession is surrounded by a discourse of sharing a strong (intra-)national *esprit de corps*, or "blue" identity (e.g. Charman, 2017; Paoline, 2003; Skolnick, 1994). In relation to critical others, their reactions are described in terms of a code of silence, isolationism and cynicism (e.g. Chen, 2016; Granér, 2004). On the other hand, and in sharp contrast, the professional identity among Swedish teachers has been described as under pressure, and the professional and collegial discourse has mainly concerned the local school context (Stenslås, 2009). We can, therefore, assume that collegiality differs between teachers and police officers, but also that social interaction among colleagues in both professions shares similar mechanisms.

By drawing on data from two different projects, one about teachers' collegiality and joint work and one about police officers' perceptions of their conversational climate, we conduct a narrative analysis of how professionals position their colleagues and themselves as colleagues in stories about their everyday work with colleagues. We thereby hope to add a "cross-professional dimension" to the discussion on how collegiality might influence teachers' and police officers' professional work. We argue that this dimension is needed in order to discuss collegiality not only as a matter of moral codes within a profession but also as a matter of more general norms about how individuals "ought" to act or react in professional groups. The purpose of this article is to show how collegiality is expressed in teachers' and police officers' stories about their colleagues in order to add a more open, "cross-professional dimension" to the discussion about collegiality in the work of teachers and police officers. We address the following question: How can collegiality in two different professions be understood as a resource and a challenge to their professional work?

Collegiality in welfare professions—a matter of trust and accountability

In research on welfare professionals, such as teachers, police officers and social workers, collegiality is described as one of the basic principles for professionalism based on trust in the professionals' knowledge and authority (Brante, 2005; Evetts, 2010). It has also been shown, however, that a strong sense of collegiality can be a challenge in terms of professional authority when contrasted with critical others (Chen, 2016; Hargreaves, 2001; Kelchtermans, 2006). These professional groups interact with clients, such as pupils, parents, crime victims or families in need of assistance, and their actions are often

scrutinised in public debate. Public trust in an entire corps is therefore likely to be involved in professional identification, and the ability to ensure compliance with ethical guidelines is essential (Colnerud, 2015). Thus, collegiality is closely linked to individual professionals' competence and ability to make discretionary decisions as well as the ability of colleagues, or their organisations, to control the professional work. This kind of occupational professionalism (Evetts, 2010) is often contrasted with discourse-based New Public Management, which instead emphasises external target-setting, accountability and performance reviews (Liljegren & Parding, 2010; Löfgren, 2014). This overview shows that collegiality is a concept with normative as well as relational dimensions, stressing for example personal experiences. In this article collegiality is referred to as "the quality of the relationships among staff members" (Kelchtermans, 2006:221) in terms of personal meaningful experiences in the narratives of police officers and teachers.

In this article we analyse how teachers and police officers relate to collegiality and position themselves as professionals in their stories about their colleagues. An interesting but also potentially problematic feature is that many descriptions in both public debate and research connect collegiality with identity and belonging to an entire corps (e.g. Evetts, 2010; Stenslås, 2009). We argue that such descriptions of collegiality rarely acknowledge that most individual welfare professionals rarely or never interact with the corps, in terms of formal institutions or ethical committees, or other collegial inquiries. On the other hand, we argue, the kind of collegiality when colleagues meet and tackle everyday dilemmas is more common (Colnerud, 2015). Such situations involve questions about professionalism and what professional conduct is. We suggest that norms and values influencing the action of welfare professionals are formed in the close interactions between colleagues. Collegiality, in this sense, takes the form of negotiations concerning which professional values are at stake in certain contexts, rather than being the decision from formal institutions. Our interest in collegiality as a situated action acknowledges the significance of the local context (cf. Kelchtermans, 2006; Löfgren, 2014; Paoline, 2003) and the emotions at stake in professional work (cf. Craig, 2013; Hargreaves 2002; Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016). Still, we argue that the norms and values negotiated in different contexts have a more general character and that this also needs to be acknowledged when investigating how collegiality is shaped.

Collegiality in teaching and police professions

Traditionally, teaching is described as a profession with weak prospects to develop professional authority based on a sense of community and collegial relations (Lortie, 1975). Later, however, most research has focused on the link between teacher collegiality and collegial relations related to daily work and professionalism (see Kelchtermans, 2006). More or less static descriptions of how different school cultures influence teachers' professional work (Hargreaves, 1994), or typologies of how collegial relations and collaborative work are characterised by more or less trust (Little, 1990), may represent early examples of an

ambition to scrutinise this link. We have previously criticised descriptions of collegial relations for being polarised, stressing the pros and cons of collegiality (Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016). In such research, collegiality is sometimes causally linked to positive effects on professional development and work satisfaction (Shah, 2012) and preventing dropouts from the profession (Heider, 2005). In this article, however, we align with research that takes a more critical stance on the possible effects of collegial relations on teachers' and police officers' work, and adhere to research with a more multifaceted view on the concept of collegiality as a vehicle for both possibilities and challenges (or even problems) for professional communities and professional authority (Hargreaves, 2001; Kelchtermans, 2006). A few studies have addressed the meaning that professionals ascribe to collegiality in narratives about professional experiences. In a previous study (Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016), we illustrated how teachers positioned themselves as professionals by referring to different discourses in their stories about a collegial community at one school, and how this evoked feelings of both trust and anger. A study by Craig (2013) shows how a beginning teacher has to deal with different narratives about a teacher community at the beginning of her career. Another narrative study (Murray, 2020) stresses the profession's cultural susceptibility to individualism and how this shapes tensions within teacher collegiality in an Irish setting. Other studies have shown how anger and aggression are consequences of collegial relations (Ben Sasson & Somech, 2015) and make teachers feel questioned or vulnerable in front of their colleagues (Hargreaves, 2001).

In the police, research emphasises the *esprit de corps* as being especially strong compared to other professions. The danger surrounding daily work, with potential violence, threats and trauma, has a unifying effect among officers and generates solidarity and collegiality among peers (e.g. Granér, 2004; Loftus, 2009; Paoline, 2003). As with other professionals, new officers are shaped by the realities of the work, and through interaction with senior colleagues, new officers learn not only the work, but also attitudes, norms and values. Officers' humoristic interaction has been described as a specific way of strengthening in-group autonomy and various norms and values (Wieslander, 2019). Central values include loyalty and a (blue) code of silence among peers (Charman, 2017; Skolnick, 1994; Westmarland, 2005). Theories on loyalty within the police have attracted particular attention (Paoline, 2003; Peterson & Uhnoo, 2012), and have been explained as significant for codes of silence (concerning non-reporting of peers), corruption, and derogatory jargon within police culture (e.g. Loftus, 2009; Waddington, 1999; Westmarland 2005; Wieslander, 2019). A cynical attitude among police officers includes a lack of hope towards citizens and distrust towards the criminal justice system (Chen, 2016). A strongly differentiated sense of "us and them" is reported, both between the police and criminals and between the police and the rest of the society; no one can possibly understand what police work is all about (Paoline, 2003). Police collegiality stands out as exclusive and specific. By investigating the function of everyday collegial relations within the police, we provide a basis for a unique comparison regarding collegial relations in the teaching profession.

In sum, we consider collegiality as a coin with at least two sides (Kelchtermans, 2006). The outcome—in terms of pros and cons—is often unclear and dependent on the micro-politics in local contexts. In this article, the attention is mainly directed to the link between collegiality and professionalism, not to the organisations (schools and the police). However, the conditions within the organisations in terms of management and performance reviews, and their local representations, frame what it is possible for professionals to say. This matter is further addressed in the conclusion.

Despite an extensive research field on what characterises teachers' and police officers' occupational cultures, teachers' and officers' own stories about collegiality have not received the same attention. With this article we hope to contribute to a broader understanding of situated everyday constructions of collegiality among teachers and police officers. As professions they share similar features, but can also be expected to offer distinct perspectives on collegiality considering the profession-specific discourses (on loyalty and trust) surrounding both professions.

Design and data

The present study was based on interview data from two different projects. In the first project, 12 grammar school teachers were interviewed about their experiences of collegial work relating to teaching and their assessment work. In the other project, 33 patrol officers in a district were interviewed about their perceptions of the conversational workplace climate, including questions about collegiality and how to act when colleagues overstep the line of appropriate behaviour (see Wieslander, 2016). Both projects used topical, semi-structured in-depth interviews (Goodson & Sikes, 2001). Both projects follow the ethical regulations of research on humans, which implies informed consent, confidentiality, and secure data storage (Swedish Research Council, 2011).

The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim in Swedish. They were translated into English in close collaboration with a professional translator. The stories chosen for more detailed analysis and presentation explicitly centre on collegial relations and perceptions of collegiality. In the analysis of all transcripts, many stories emerged where both teachers and officers described their closest colleagues in positive terms and where collegiality was cited as a significant resource, or prerequisite, for conducting their work.

Based on this initial analysis, we have chosen two stories (one from each profession) that illustrate the breadth and depth of how participants talk about collegiality as a resource. Another category that emerged was stories concerning how trust and loyalty between colleagues could sometimes cause problems or challenge collegial relations. We have selected one additional story from each profession that illustrates how collegiality sometimes challenges professional relations.

The stories have been selected because they deal with specific challenging situations within each profession. Although our intention was to illustrate a variation in how teachers and police officers talk about collegiality as a resource and a challenge, and to highlight qualitative differences, we do not claim to illustrate the full variation in terms of generalisation (Larsson, 2009). We argue, however, that the stories will probably be recognised by most practitioners in the two professions and that our analysis can contribute to an understanding of collegiality as a socially situated phenomenon.

Theory and methodology

Bamberg (1997; 2004) illustrates how people position themselves and are positioned through their stories and storytelling, thus forming images of who they are or who they want to be in relation to dominating discourses. According to Bamberg, narrators make claims that reach beyond the interview as they attach to culturally available discourses. Even if these claims are formed through and in a specific situation where the narrator recounts personal experiences, Bamberg stresses that these claims are decontextualised and have a wider significance than what is said about a specific situation. It is therefore of interest to try to understand how the narrator connects to various culturally available discourses and how these discourses shape coherence and make the story appear convincing (Talbot, Bibace, Bokhour & Bamberg, 1996). In this article, we align with a broad definition of narrative, taking an interest in how individuals use previous experiences and events to explain what they consider to be right or wrong, what happened, why, who can be accountable, and the narrator's role in the event (Talbot et al., 1996). We consider the narrators, teachers and police officers to be discourse-users (Bamberg, 1997) who shape meaning and coherence in their stories by referring to dominant discourses of professionalism. In line with Evetts (2010), we note that these references address occupational as well as organisational forms of professionalism, stressing agendas of internal collegial responsibility as well as external accountability.

Inspired by Bamberg, we conduct a three-step analysis to understand how collegiality is constructed as a resource and a challenge by the interviewed teachers and police officers when talking about their colleagues. This analysis enables us to explore how the participants narratively construct collegiality as a resource from their point of view, although this does not necessarily hold to be true from the perspective of clients or colleagues within the same profession.

First, we describe what the story is about and how the characters are positioned vis-à-vis each other. The central subject position in the analysis is the *colleague*. To analyse how the colleague's position is formed in the story, we disentangle the positions given to the main and more peripheral characters. Who is included and excluded in the fellowship, and on what grounds?

Second, we analyse how *collegiality* takes shape as a resource for teachers and police officers when positioning themselves in their discussions about colleagues. Here, we answer questions about how collegial fellowship is shaped and contrasted to others in the interaction between interviewee and interviewer.

Third, we analyse how collegiality can challenge professional relations at work. We also scrutinise how discourses of trust, loyalty and professionalism contribute to coherence, but also dissonance, in teachers' and police officers' stories about their colleagues. One central analytical question is how these discourses interface in stories about collegiality and raise questions about ethical and professional conduct in the two professions. This third step is elaborated on in a final discussion.

Findings

We have distinguished two dominating functions of collegiality as a resource in teachers' and police officers' stories about collegial relations. First, there are stories about certain groups of colleagues who are under some kind of pressure in relation to their professional core values, making it important for them to build trustful relations in order to manage a demanding workday. Second, collegiality is described as a resource when encountering potential critics of how teachers and police officers conduct their work and handle relations.

Collegiality as a result of trust in a group needing relief from demanding work

The first story is told by Boel, an experienced mathematics teacher who has worked for 15 years at different schools. The story concerns how she found support in her colleagues when her professional judgement was questioned by a psychological assessment of one of her students. The story illustrates how a strong collegial community at the school helped her deal with anger and frustration when she received the results of the assessment. By telling this story, she stresses how important the close collegial community is for her endurance in the profession. Prior to the quotation presented here, she claims that, for her, professionalism is a matter of being able to talk about difficult matters with colleagues at school because they are the only ones who really understand.

Excerpt 1, teacher interview

1	Boel	I can tell you about one occasion when I felt that my colleagues supported me. And
2		afterwards we can make fun of each other, so we say things about it. Well, I've been
3		fighting pretty hard for a boy ever since grade four. I'm totally convinced that he has
4		ADHD because he has exactly those symptoms. I've been working for 15 years with
5		quite a lot of children, you know, so I thought it was, he must get help now. […] Now
6		you have to do lots of things and there are long loops including meetings with a
7		psychologist who give suggestions that you should follow and implement, and then
8		you evaluate it. And all this didn't work out very well, it remains unresolved. And now
9		we came to this big evaluation and […] they say "No he doesn't have ADHD, he
10		concentrated perfectly in all our tests" and the kid isn't [concentrating] in the
11		classroom. And, I felt frustrated. I'm glad, obviously, for his sake. He doesn't have
12		ADHD – that must be a good thing. But for me it was like "How on earth will I be able
13		to help him now?". Because now I don't know what this is about at all, nobody does.
14		And for him […], he's stuck with the fact that he doesn't behave very well. But he
15		doesn't have the kind of problems we thought he had. Then I get really frustrated. And
16		I express that [to my colleagues] very clearly! I can say that I was pretty upset.
17	Int	When you got the result?
18	Boel	Yes, when I got the result. And then we had a meeting with the collegial team the same
19		day. Their responses were "Yes, but that's insane" or "Yes, so strange, what will you
20		do now?". Then, next time someone says "Well yes, I'm not sure I want to work with
21		you, you're so angry". They say it with a glint in the eye and then I say like "Yes but
22		now I've been angry so now I'm no longer angry". But to let it go and let go of some
23		frustration. So I don't take all that home and I don't scold my children because I'm not
24		that frustrated. And that's very important, very, very important for your own life, you
25		know. Because if you take it home and somehow try to discuss it with your husband,
26		it doesn't work. It's so exhausting and if you're not understood the frustration grows.
27		So, it's here [at school] you must do it [talk] with your colleagues. And next time it
28		might be someone else doing it and then you're supportive. There have been times
29		when someone almost started to cry because it's so hard and then you close up
30		somehow. We stick together, so I think we have a strong community. Of course, we're
31		different and obviously sometimes it hurts, and someone says something that
32		disappoints you. But still, if you don't want to work in this manner, it doesn't work –
33		you don't stay. If you don't want to work this closely, like we do, and if you don't want
34		to take part in this, then I don't think you'll stay. However, many [colleagues] say they
35		think that this social thing here is very, they have…
37	Int	Yes, it's important.
38	Boel	Yes, it's important. And you miss it when you come to another school.

In this story, Boel and her colleagues are positioned in relation to the psychologist and those responsible for the evaluation. The collegial community at the school is contrasted with the psychologist, who is positioned as an external expert with the power to determine whether or not the boy should be given a diagnosis (lines 9-12) and what should be done (lines 6-8). The colleagues are described as supportive, expressing sympathy (lines 19-21, 29), making jokes (lines 21-22) and sticking together (lines 29-31, 35). Boel's family is positioned as needing protection from the anger and frustration that teaching sometimes generates (lines 22-26) and from her exhausting need to talk about professional matters (lines 26-30). The colleagues are thus positioned as responsible for her professional wellbeing. Typically, the subject position *colleague* is supportive when dealing with the psychologist's decision and enables Boel to endure as a teacher (and as a mother) by listening to her when she needs to dwell on professional matters.

Thus, *collegiality* takes shape as a resource for the teacher in terms of debriefing, which facilitates sustainability in the teaching profession. The collegiality taking shape in the interview is best described as narrow in the sense that it is bound to the colleagues at Boel's own school. Earlier in the interview, she said that she had left a school because her colleagues did not collaborate much and did not share their problems. When telling this story, it is evident, however, that the teaching profession deals with negative emotions of frustration (15, 27), anger (21-22), and exhaustion (26). Therefore, this case emphasises collegial resources such as humour (20-21), support (29-30), honesty (31-32), and being understood (27) (see also Hargreaves, 2001; 2002). In the final lines, it is evident that Boel finds this particular school rich in these resources and she stresses the importance of being a *member of this particular staff*. This is also confirmed by the interviewer.

The next story is about the collegial work in a police team, told by Jim, a patrol officer with eight years of experience. In an answer to the interviewer, the officer describes what he perceives to be a good colleague. The story illustrates the significance of being loyal towards team members, not only in threatening situations but also in everyday routines.

Excerpt 2, police interview

1	Jim	I believe a good colleague, you're straightforward and clear and you're loyal. You're
2		there for your colleague. If someone receives a job just when they're about to eat, for
3		instance, you take that job instead – if you have already eaten – instead of "Oh, I'm glad
4		we didn't have to take this job!". You do what you can to support one another. "Have you
5		eaten?" someone asks. "No, we're just about to", "Then we'll take this instead", so you
6		help each other out. And you have an attitude in the team that you can ventilate problems,
7		even problems within the team. It's the same in the organisation, there you have to be
8		able to address problems that you find, yes, uncomfortable or whatever. […] people who
9		feel they can't be part of the team maybe, you dare to address that. […] So no,
10		straightforward, and honest, and that you're loyal. I think that's…
11	Int	Loyal towards?
12	Jim	I beg your pardon?
13	Int	Loyal towards whom?
14	Jim	The colleague! Towards each other, that you back up and help one another.

In this story, the position *colleague* is addressed in many different ways. The key subject position is explicitly centred around *the good colleague*, who is framed as a person who backs up other colleagues, who is empathetic, supportive, understanding and relieves team members' burdens (lines 1, 2, 4, 6). Being part of a team, a good colleague becomes characterised as "straightforward", "honest" and "loyal" (lines 1, 10). In contrast, and implicitly, the story reveals that a colleague should not be self-centred or avoid talking about problems, but should put the group first and actively contribute to sustaining an open conversational climate (lines 6-9). The "colleague" is ascribed significant agency, taking responsibility not only for oneself, but also for the work and roles of others in the collective.

When the interviewer explicitly asks for clarification about loyalty (with the whole unit, the individual officer or other potential subjects in mind), the officer seems not to hear or understand the question. The answer “the colleague!” (with exclamation mark), said in a tone of voice that made the question seem silly, contribute to 1) the question being perceived as foolish in the context; 2) constructing the colleague as a symbolic position that can be accomplished by all members of a unit; 3) visualising the taken-for-granted and natural in the context—loyalty is first and foremost directed to the colleague (and not to the employer, the supervisor or the mission).

Collegiality is narratively constructed by the interviewee as a resource in professional work in terms of loyalty, trust and solidarity. Backing each other up is central to the profession, where the working tasks are built upon unpredictable events. The closest unit working together is often two officers who form a patrol unit for the day, and they work together with two to four other units. The team decides between them when to take breaks and lunch. This dialogue is framed in the story as fundamental when it comes to sustaining *good collegiality*, formed by principles of needs and ideals of backing up and helping each other out. Although officers mostly work in pairs, it is the shift team that forms the central group constellation. The story provides evidence of the recurring metaphor in the context “all for one, one for all.” In this sense, the single colleague as an individual is diminished and the focus of a colleague is on being a *team member*.

Collegiality as a strength when encountering “the critical other”

In the following stories, collegiality is a resource when the narrators relate to external criticism of how they carry out their professional work. Who this “critical other” can be is of less relevance in the analysis, but for teachers, the critical other can be parents, supervisors, and other colleagues; and for police officers, it can be the media, the public, supervisors, and other colleagues.

This story is about a situation where an experienced science teacher ejects a student from the classroom and is questioned by the parents for using physical violence. The story is designed to inform the audience about the importance of trustful collegial relations in situations where a teacher’s professional authority is questioned by parents and students.

Excerpt 3, teacher interview

1	Mark	Last year I ejected a student from the classroom. Sometimes you have to bite your
2		tongue […]. These words, like "old bastard" that come when you close the door. I
3		usually ignore them if the kid got the message. But this time I didn't. So I got even
4		angrier because of these comments. So, I went out and was about to say "Now you'd
5		better calm down". And then the student turned around, so I grabbed his forefinger and
6		turned him around, saying "Listen to me now". At [the student's] home this was twisted
7		to me having pushed him into the window [disturbing noise] so they planned to report
8		it and so on. And in that situation, Erik who was working here, he had heard when I got
9		really mad. So, "Something is happening", so even if I didn't know it he had been
10		watching the whole thing.
11	Int.	The scenario.
12	Mark	So he could explain afterwards. Explain what had happened and relate that to my image.
13		And that was a relief to me, but at the same time I noticed that the parents became very
14		[…] "OK he'll protect…", you know. But to me it was rather nice that someone that
15		was loyal and had been listening. That he went out and watched what happened because
16		another colleague might have not even bothered to look at what was happening. And
17		that was nice. And I feel like here we have it. I mean, if we see someone, because
18		conflicts happens. That we go into the situation and support each other. Then, what
19		matters is to not knock someone down, if someone need help. So, if you need help
20		sometimes and sometimes you have those kinds of student that can make you really
21		mad. Now, in this case he was a rather nice guy normally, but this time he was
22		[laughing].
23	Int.	Yes, yes, but they are humans and it happened in certain situations.
24	Mark	Exactly, and then it was right. Then this loyalty from Erik was very nice. That he
25		actually had been looking out and could say "Oh but I… this happened". That was pretty
26		nice.

The colleague Eric is described as observant because he heard a noise outside and bothered to look at what had happened. He is also positioned as loyal to Mark, since he gave his version to the parents even if it is unclear if he had seen the whole situation. The student and the parents are positioned as hostile and as a threat to Mark's professional legitimacy. They accuse him of using violence and imply that they plan to report his behaviour. In their version of what happened, Mark is positioned as a potential perpetrator. That position is negotiated and questioned through the testimony of the colleague who has the authority to "explain", that is to give an objective version which the parents reluctantly accept (lines 13-14). The subject position *colleague* in this case is a loyal resource who helps out in a situation where Mark's professional reputation is at stake.

When telling this story, Mark is positioned as a victim of extraordinary circumstances where the student and parents could have overturned his professional authority and legitimacy. It is implicit in the interview situation that Mark's actions were ethically acceptable, because the story is told as an example of how important colleagues are within the teacher profession. The story stresses that teachers have to (re-)act when students do not behave in the classroom (lines 2 and 5), and that this puts teachers in situations that expose them to criticism from an ethical viewpoint. This is confirmed by the interviewer (line 23). However, respect for students' personal integrity and wellbeing is at the core of ethically acceptable behaviour for teachers (Colnerud, 2015). Mark claims to have done the right thing (lines 1-3)

and stresses that the situation was extraordinary (lines 2-5, 9). *Collegiality* is constructed as a resource that makes it possible for Mark to act and react in ethically critical situations relating to students, and to cope with criticism from parents or other external critics, "the critical others". The actual physical act (lines 5-7) is not discussed as a problem because the story is framed as an example of "good collegiality".

The next story deals with how a collegial crisis, in terms of an act that is perceived as a betrayal, is handled in a police unit. David, with seven years of experience as an officer, works in a patrol unit with many older, experienced colleagues. David describes how this group of 15 officers uses a closed chat function to communicate information to the group members. On one occasion, a picture leaks from the chat to the local media. The picture, framed as a joke, is of an officer who points a gun towards his head, pretending to shoot himself to escape a boring educational session. The media never publishes the picture, but does contact the district chief with concerns about the subculture in the police[1]. This was one of the reasons why the interviewer was invited to investigate collegial relations in the district. The story, told in a firm voice, is labelled as a "big crisis of confidence" by the narrator, and as an example of how the group "resolved a conflict". The excerpt concerns how the leak to the media was received by the group members:

Excerpt 4, police interview

[1] A group of officers had been involved in another media scandal a few days earlier concerning inappropriate words used during an operation.

David: There it is, in black and white, that one of the people in here has given this [picture to the media] […] So, one colleague [Karl] ended up in a bloody jam, and the management even talked about taking his gun and reassigning him. The picture is never published, but he takes a… yes, well in my opinion it's bad taste or poorly considered, but he takes a picture where he places the gun against his temple. […] The rest of the group attends a lecture and [wrote in the chat] "Haha, shoot yourself, 'cause this is so damn boring". We [David and Karl] were supposed to attend it a few days later. And Karl does it "yes, I'll do it". The picture is taken out of context, no, even with context with the text accompanying the picture in the chat, and ends up with the media. And there we have it, that was our first… we have always talked about our freedom of speech in the group, that we can joke and fool around with each other, and then this turns up. Me, I was badly affected, since I'm part of the [special unit that the officers perceive as the target of the leak]. So I took it to the group and sent messages to each and every one I knew I could trust […] and expressed my frustration instead and just wrote "Unfortunately, information from our group has leaked, we can no longer use this [chat]". Then, we decided to set up a meeting, right after duty, so we used the authority's premises, and we sat down and everyone had the chance to speak. And really, the thing that affected me most was not really that the media got hold of this picture. We are supposed to endure transparency from media, but the fact that it is taken from a private group, I mean we officers tend to develop a peculiar sense of humour. It is a coping effect sort of, it's in all different, I can think of doctors and nurses and the like, but the fact that this is exposed. So we had a crisis for a while, many people were upset, sad, disappointed, me included. But then, really, we aired this, and I among others said that "If someone has been careless with this picture and it's official, just say it, so we can deal with it". If you haven't [done that], we're not allowed to investigate the source, and I was very clear that "We don't care who gave it to the media, it doesn't matter, the question is how it left the [chat] group". But no one really took the blame, and I had really hoped that someone would be that brave and say "Yes, it was me, sorry it was me". […] But, there, nothing. No one said anything. Then I think it sort of gradually developed, I knew who I could trust before, I still know who I can trust. […] We closed that chat group and created a new one where we kept the level to "No, we can't use this forum to bullshit and joke around with each other, we just have to use it for "who is assigned to the outpost this shift, what's the plan for our workplace meeting" and so on. Purely informative. So that was that. And from there it has grown. It's like pruning a tree, sort of. To begin with it's the trunk and then branches will grow again. And yes, you know who you can trust.

In this story, the subject position "disloyal colleague" is constructed. The team crisis is built up around "the colleague who leaked" to the media, thereby putting another colleague in a "bloody jam" (line 2) and betraying the trust of the team. "The colleague who leaked" broke what is framed as an open agreement of group norms, where the team is framed as one where jokes and freedom of speech have long been an essential part of the norms of the group (lines 10-11). This means that the picture should be treated as a joke, and therefore not be handed over to "critical others". The following "and this turns up" (line 11) shapes a contrast, in which the informal agreement is not only destroyed but also seems to be an illusion. The foundations of the group cohesion have been modified. "The colleague who leaked" is also framed as indebted to the team, but who can, through honesty and a "sorry" (line 28), be given the opportunity to rebuild relations and the group's sense of cohesion.

Another position constructed in the story is the unit, metaphorically described as a tree. The unit is characterised by a long history of talking and joking (lines 10-11, 20), based on the

foundations of trust between the members (lines 13, 30). The chat was used as a "safe space" (Wieslander, 2019) for "inappropriate" behaviour and speech. This can be understood in terms of "backstage" and "frontstage" behaviour (Goffman, 1956). The media and the police management (line 2) are framed as "the critical others", and problems arise when the jargon in the chat (the backstage manners) reaches these actors and becomes part of the group's frontstage. On the other hand, the narrator explicitly frames the problem as not being scrutinised by "the critical others" (lines 18-19, 26), but that a team member disclosed information from a closed group, and thus betrayed the unit. The narrator's metaphorical use of a pruned tree to describe the new status of the unit stresses how important trust and loyalty within the unit are to him. In short, the subject position *colleague* is trustful and loyal.

The officer's long narrative about the event (which lasted for eight minutes without any questions from the interviewer) is an indication of a personal engagement and this being an important story to tell. This story is designed to make claims of giving the true version of what happened. None of the other officers in the unit spoke to the interviewer about this event, even though explicit questions were asked about the chat. The narrator positions himself as an engaged, responsible, and problem-solving colleague who takes the initiative to address the problem with the team (lines 11-17). This is in sharp contrast to the unknown and disloyal colleague who did not address what was regarded as a problem with the team. In this way, the focus is placed on the cause of the crisis, rather than a solution to the crisis. It is not considered that the crisis (the leak) could be a reaction towards an unethical practice or culture within the collegial group, rather that the misconduct is assigned to "the disloyal colleague". Leaking information from the close team becomes a betrayal and an unethical act.

Through this story, *collegiality* is vital in the encounter with "the critical other", reinforcing a sense of "us and them" between the team and potential critics, and thus creating a sense of a strong and unified "us" while keeping the norms of the team intact and unquestionable. The collegiality becomes a resource to the narrator through the way the group makes jokes and talks freely among themselves in an uncensored way, but also more specifically in the way the group handles the situation.

Discussion—collegiality as a two-edged resource

In this discussion, we argue that adding a "cross-professional dimension" to the analysis of collegiality in two professions contributes to a wider understanding of how professionals negotiate and constitute norms that are fundamental to their professional authority. Our results indicate that even if there are specific characteristics regarding how collegiality takes shape in each profession, collegiality is constructed around similar norms concerning trust, loyalty and professionalism. Previous research on the teaching and police professions often stresses that collegiality comes as a consequence of the unique characteristics in certain

situations or in local contexts (e.g., Craig, 2013; Hargreaves, 1994; Kelchtermans, 2006; Paoline, 2003). We agree on this, since this is where people meet and norms are constituted. However, we argue that it is also necessary to widen the perspective and pay attention to the more general norms that are common in most welfare professional relations. This is important in order to scrutinise the complexity of collegiality. We agree that both the front and the reverse of the coin of collegiality (Kelchtermans, 2006) need to be addressed, because they both have important implications not only for the professions but also for the clients—in this case students, parents, and the public. First, we address the front of the coin, that is, when collegiality stands out as a resource, according to the interviewees, that improves the professional work and community among teachers and police officers. Then, we discuss how collegiality sometimes challenges the internal relations between professionals and their trust vis-à-vis clients. Finally, we draw some conclusions on how the cross-professional analysis contributes to research on collegiality and professionalism.

Collegiality as a resource based on trust, loyalty and professionalism

The similarities between the two professions with regard to collegiality as both a resource and a challenge are not necessarily surprising. However, we argue that our results are interesting because they show in detail how extensive and in-depth these similarities are. One common feature that we think may explain this is the strong presence of a "critical other" in the narratives. In both professions, a collegial "us" emerges in the stories, an "us" that helps and supports one another in various situations, conflicts and choices that welfare professionals (at least police officers and teachers) need to make in their work. The instant decisions that are made by professionals in emotionally demanding professions are not always thought through and do not always turn out as intended or as suggested by the professional code of ethics. The teacher's story about the colleague witnessing potential maltreatment against a student is strikingly similar to events in the everyday work of police officers. Both professions risk being subjected to wrongdoing in their interaction with the public. Conflicts between teachers or officers and various actors are described as a natural feature of both professions. In both professions, a strong collegial loyalty is stressed that involves colleagues not betraying each other. Similarly, the results suggest that not only police officers (cf. Westmarland, 2005; Wieslander, 2016; 2019), but also teachers, share a reluctance to criticise one another. For the individual teacher or police officer, it is reassuring to know that they have colleagues who support them in relation of external critics. We will soon, however, get back to how this rationale also challenges professional relations and public trust.

Comparing the stories between teachers and police officers, we find similar statements about high expectations or demands for collegial support in terms of loyalty. More specifically, this collegial support means facilitating working for each other, giving support concerning work-related issues, and providing the opportunity to vent in an emotionally

strenuous workday (cf. Clement & Vandenberghe, 2000; Cowie, 2011; Hargreaves, 2001; Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016; Paoline, 2003). The need to vent and to receive emotional support from colleagues is not only made central but is also related to professionalism in the sense that both teachers and police officers construe this as necessary in their profession. For instance, in the teachers' stories, it is shown how collegial support becomes a necessity for teachers in order to avoid personal stress or dealing with extraordinary events. The police officers' stories are also framed by the need for strong and solid collegiality to endure the conditions of their professional tasks. In this profession, however, surrounded by potential danger, threats and extraordinary events, being honest with and sharing one's daily situation with one's colleagues is vital, not only for the police officer but also for his or her colleagues (cf. Granér, 2004). This likely makes a strong sense of loyalty more important to the work of police officers than to the work of teachers. In the stories of both professions, discourses on loyalty and professionalism thus co-relate and create coherence and legitimacy in what is said. The approved ethical and professional conduct is to be open with the challenges encountered at work. Professionalism in this sense involves talking and listening in a loyal and confident way to one another, and ensuring that what is said stays inside the collegial community's rather narrow borders, and thus becomes a matter of trust. Through the stories, the narrators themselves claim to be colleagues who take responsibility, act professionally and understand the importance of these internal norms for their specific work.

Loyalty and humorous language are often framed as central to the police culture (e.g., Wieslander, 2019). The findings presented here indicate that humour and loyalty are also central to the teaching profession, as shown, for instance, when one of the teachers mocks a colleague for being too angry. The final police story illustrates the importance of understanding the difference between jokes and seriousness, having a sense of confidentiality, and putting loyalty to the team first. The story reinforces trust between team members and, thus, portrays both trust and loyalty as central to professional behaviour (cf. Paoline, 2003; Wieslander, 2019). By advocating this, the narrators become committed representatives for collegial authority that governs occupational discretion and control. Apparently, such norms go across the professional borders.

Collegiality as a challenge to professional relations at work

Perhaps the most striking result is that what the teachers and police officers describe as resources are also sometimes burdens for colleagues and clients. A recurrent theme in the stories is that of colleagues who do not live up to expectations of how a colleague should be and act. This can, for example, concern misbehaviour, and situations might be awkward and thereby risky—not only for the people involved, but for the whole professional group. For example, rough action like ejecting a student and bullying behaviour within professional groups risk discrediting the whole professional community if they become public. Awkward situations, like the picture in the closed chat, are often awkward just because they become

public or reach external critics. This might give rise to risky situations for those involved, just as relations between the professionals can become forced, strenuous and perceived as disloyal.

Misconduct and unethical behaviour among teachers and police officers are defined in both legislation and regulations, and in codes of ethics specific to each profession (Colnerud, 2015; Granér & Knutsson, 2000). Professionals must have clear perceptions of what defines unethical behaviour, but our findings suggest this is negotiated in specific contexts and subjective in concrete situations (cf. Colnerud, 2015). For instance, it is not clear what is right or wrong in the story about the student being thrown out of the classroom or in the police officer's story of defining who is breaching an ethical stance. Taking a stand for a colleague can be part of or turn into an ethical dilemma—especially when there are actors other than colleagues involved. For instance, the involvement of "the critical others", such as the external expert, parents, the media, and the police supervisor, meant that the professionals felt forced to come together to create consensus around an acceptable version of what happened. In all these cases, professional trustworthiness, credibility and authority are at stake.

Collegiality as a resource can also lead to a challenge for professional relations when someone breaks the (unwritten) rules of acceptable behaviour. Our results indicate that there are differences regarding what is valued by individual professionals, and that this creates dissonances concerning norms of trust, loyalty and professionalism. Internally, in each story a sense of solid collegiality takes shape, based on the idea that everybody agrees on how the norms are interpreted. This solidity is not as solid as it seems, since conflicting interests are common among professionals (Kelchtermans, 2006; Löfgren & Karlsson, 2016). Externally, vis-à-vis clients, such conflicts of norms influence professionals' decisions and authority. For instance, criticising external experts, protecting a colleague's potential misbehaviour, or punishing a colleague who breaks a norm might affect professional decision-making.

Further, when collegiality causes feelings of disappointment and frustration, it may lead to morally questionable decisions and actions—which might even be regarded as unprofessional. As a consequence, individual students or citizens might be put at risk. Paradoxically, what can be regarded at one moment as a collegial resource and strength is treated as a betrayal when trust and loyalty are perceived to be challenged or broken. This is when professionalism is put at stake.

Conclusion: Distinct or similar understandings of collegiality?

From a cross-professional point of view, neither teacher collegiality nor police collegiality stand out as being as unique as is often suggested in previous research. In this article, we

have identified some specific characteristics for each profession. For example, the jargon and jokes could be described in terms of police cynicism, and the emotional management related to the perceived lack of diagnosis in the first case could be described as the front side of the coin of teacher collegiality (e.g., Chen, 2016; Granér, 2004; Kelchtermans, 2006; Wieslander, 2019). However, a main conclusion is that fundamental norms concerning trust, loyalty and professionalism play a significant role regardless of the profession when professionals talk about collegial relations. But why do these similarities occur and what are the "roots" of the professionalism in the two professions? The answer indicated earlier in the article mainly refers to the occupational form of professionalism described by Evetts (2010) which stresses joint responsibility and collegial control. Other answers to the question, however, might follow the rationale in the organisational form of professionalism, stressing external management by goals, accountability, and processes of standardisation. None of the professions define their collegiality, or their professionalism, in a vacuum and there is a clear "standardising" influence from external experts, managers, rules, and regulations in the narratives presented in this article. We suggest that the exposure of individualised responsibility and accountability within the two professions drives a perceived need for collegial community-building processes.

Article history

Received: 19 Aug 2019
Accepted: 12 May 2020
Published: XX Jun 2020

References

Bamberg, M. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 7*(1-4), 335–342. https://doi.org/10.1075/jnlh.7.42pos

Bamberg, M. (2004). Form and functions of 'slut bashing' in male identity constructions in 15-year-olds: "I know it may sound mean to say this, but we couldn't really care less about her anyway". *Human Development, 47*(6), 331-353. https://doi.org/10.1159/000081036

Ben Sasson, D., & Somech, A. (2015). Observing aggression of teachers in school teams. *Teachers and Teaching, 21*(8), 941–957. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2015.1005865

Brante, T. (2005). Om begreppet och företeelsen profession. *Tidskrift för praxisnära forskning, 1*, 1-13.

Charman, S. (2017). *Police socialisation, identity and culture: Becoming blue*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63070-0

Chen, Z. (2016). An exploratory study of police cynicism in China. *Policing: An International Journal, 39*(1), 175-189. https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-09-2015-0103

Clement, M., & Vandenberghe, R. (2000). Teachers' professional development: A solitary or collegial (ad)venture? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(1), 81–101. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00051-7

Colnerud, G. (2015). Moral Stress in Teaching Practice. *Teachers & Teaching, 21*(3), 346–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2014.953820

Cowie, N. (2011). Emotions that experienced English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers feel about their students, their colleagues and their work. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 27*(1), 235–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.006

Craig, C. J. (2013). Coming to know in the 'eye of the storm': A beginning teacher's introduction to different versions of teacher community. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 29*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.08.003

Evetts, J. (2010). Reconnecting professional occupations with professional organizations: Risks and opportunities. In I. G. Svensson & J. Evetts (Eds.), *Sociology of professions: Continental and Anglo-Saxon traditions* (pp. 123-144). Göteborg: Daidalos.

Granér, R. (2004). *Patrullerande polisers yrkeskultur*. [Diss.], Lund: Lund Dissertation in Social Work.

Granér R., & Knutsson, M. (2000). *Etik i polisarbete*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Goffman, E. (1956). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goodson, I, & Sikes, P. (2001). *Life history research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (2001). The emotional geographies of teachers' relations with colleagues. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*(5), 503–527. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(02)00006-X

Hargreaves, A. (2002). Teaching and betrayal. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3), 393–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/135406002100000521

Heider, K. L. (2005). Teacher isolation: How mentoring programs can help. *Current Issues in Education*, *8*(14), 1-7.

Jurasaite–Harbison, E., & Rex, L. A. (2010). School cultures as contexts for informal teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 26*(2), 267–277. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.03.012

Kelchtermans, G. (2006). Teacher collaboration and collegiality as workplace conditions: A review. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik 52*, 220–237.

Larsson, S. (2009). A pluralist view of generalization in qualitative research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 32*(1), 25–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/17437270902759931

Liljegren, A., & Parding, K. (2010). Ändrad styrning av välfärdsprofessioner: Exemplet evidensbasering i socialt arbete. *Socialvetenskaplig tidskrift 3-4, 2*70-288.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.2307/1288305

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record 91*(4), 509–536.

Löfgren, H. (2014). Kollegialitet och professionalism: Anspråk på gemenskap i lärares berättelser om sitt arbete. In M. Vinterek & A. Arnqvist (Eds..), *Pedagogiskt arbete: Enhet och mångfald* (pp. 76-94). Falun: Högskolan Dalarna.

Löfgren, H. & Karlsson, M. (2016). Emotional aspects of teacher collegiality: A narrative approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education 60*, 270-280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.08.022

Loftus, B. (2009). *Police culture in a changing world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199560905.001.0001

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Murray, C. (2020). From isolation to individualism: Collegiality in the teacher identity narratives of experienced second-level teachers in the Irish context. *Irish Educational Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2020.1739548

Paoline, E. A. (2003). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 31*(3), 199-214. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352(03)00002-3

Peterson, A., & Uhnoo, S. (2012). Trials of loyalty: Ethnic minority police officers as 'outsiders' within a greedy institution. *European Journal of Criminology, 9*(4), 354–369. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370812447266

Shah, M. (2012). The importance and benefits of teacher collegiality in schools—a literature review. *Procedia—Social and Behavioural Sciences* 46, 1242–1246. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.282

Skolnick, J. (1994). *Justice without trail: Law enforcement in democratic society*. New York: Macmillan. (3rd ed)

Stenslås, N. (2009). *En kår i kläm: Läraryrket mellan professionella ideal och statliga reformideologier.* Stockholm: Finansdepartementet.

Swedish Research Council (2011). *Good Research Practice*. Vetenskapsrådets rapportserie, 2011:3.

Talbot, J., Bibace, R., Bokhour B., & Bamberg, M. (1996). Affirmation and resistance of dominant discourses: The rhetorical construction of pregnancy. *Journal of Narrative and Life History, 6*(3), 225-251. https://doi.org/10.1075/jnlh.6.3.02aff

Waddington, P. A. J. (1999). Police (canteen) sub-culture: An appreciation. *British Journal of Criminology*, *39*(2), 287-309. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/39.2.287

Westmarland, L. (2005). Police ethics and integrity: Breaking the blue code of silence. *Policing & Society*, *15*(2), 145-165. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460500071721

Wieslander, M. (2016). *Den talande tystnaden. Utvärdering om anställdas uttrycksmöjligheter vid polisområde Östergötland*. Linköping: Polismyndigheten.

Wieslander, M. (2019). Challenging and destabilizing official discourses: Irony as a resistance resource in institutional talk. *Culture & Organization*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2019.1699093