



Reflexivity and Criminal Justice

*Intersections of Policy,
Practice & Research*

EDITED BY
Sarah Armstrong
Jarrett Blaustein
Alistair Henry



Reflexivity and Criminal Justice

Sarah Armstrong • Jarrett Blaustein • Alistair Henry
Editors

Reflexivity and Criminal Justice

Intersections of Policy, Practice and Research

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Sarah Armstrong
Department of Sociology
University of Glasgow
Glasgow, United Kingdom

Alistair Henry
Law School
Old College
Edinburgh, United Kingdom

Jarrett Blaustein
Menzies Building
Monash University, School of Social Sciences
Clayton, Australia

ISBN 978-1-137-54641-8 ISBN 978-1-137-54642-5 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-54642-5

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016956650

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2017

The author(s) has/have asserted their right(s) to be identified as the author(s) of this work in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, , trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Cover illustration: Dmitriy Abramov / Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

The registered company address is: The Campus, 4 Crinan Street, London, N1 9XW, United Kingdom

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Richard Sparks and his co-investigators from the ESRC project 'Crime Control and Devolution: Policy-Making and Expert Knowledge in a Multi-Tiered Democracy' for affording us the opportunity to collectively reflect on the intersections between policy, practice and research during a seminar that was held at the University of Edinburgh in December 2013. It was at this event that the idea for this volume was born. We would also like to thank our mentors and colleagues, both past and present, and of whom there are too many to acknowledge individually, for helping us to develop our awareness of the importance of reflexivity in the context of criminological research. We are grateful to Dominic Walker, Jules Wilan, Josie Taylor and the production team at Palgrave for their ongoing patience and support and we would like to thank all of the authors who feature in this volume for their bold and thoughtful contributions.

Contents

1	Impact and the Reflexive Imperative in Criminal Justice Policy, Practice and Research	1
	<i>Sarah Armstrong, Jarrett Blaustein, and Alistair Henry</i>	
	Part 1 Reflexive Approaches to Criminal Justice Policy Research	31
2	Interpreting Influence: Towards Reflexivity in Penal Policymaking?	33
	<i>Harry Annison</i>	
3	When the Stars Align: Juvenile Justice Policy Reform in New South Wales	57
	<i>Elaine Fishwick</i>	
4	Towards Hope, Solidarity and Re-humanisation	81
	<i>Ruari-Santiago McBride</i>	
5	Policy as a Crime Scene	101
	<i>Sarah Armstrong and Anita Lam</i>	

6	Reflexivity in Statistics as Sociology of Quantification: The Case of Repeat Victimization Modelling	123
	<i>Bilel Benbouzid</i>	
Part 2 Collaboration and Knowledge Exchange in Practice		147
7	Criminological Knowledge and the Politics of Impact: Implications for Researching Juvenile Justice	149
	<i>Lesley McAra</i>	
8	Reflexive Academic–Practitioner Collaboration with the Police	169
	<i>Alistair Henry</i>	
9	The Shifting Legitimacy of Knowledge Across Academic and Police/Practitioner Settings: Highlighting the Risks and Limits of Reflexivity	191
	<i>Karen Lumsden</i>	
10	The Politics of Establishing Reflexivity as a Core Component of Good Policing	215
	<i>Dominic A. Wood and Emma Williams</i>	
11	Getting In, Getting Out and Getting Back: Conducting Long-term Research in Immigration Detention Centres	237
	<i>Mary Bosworth and Blerina Kellezi</i>	
Part 3 Positionality, Power and the Reflexive Imperative		263
12	Cartel Biographies: The Researcher as Storyteller and the Preservation of the Research Wilderness on the Inside of the Subject	265
	<i>Christopher Harding</i>	

13 Who Needs Evidence? Radical Feminism, the Christian Right and Sex Work Research in Northern Ireland <i>Graham Ellison</i>	289
14 Insider? Outsider? Reflections on Navigating Positionality When Researching Restorative Justice Policing <i>Kelly J. Stockdale</i>	315
15 Situated Perspectives on the Global Fight Against Torture <i>Andrew M. Jefferson</i>	335
16 Ethical Criminologists Fly Economy: Process-oriented Criminological Engagement ‘Abroad’ <i>Jarrett Blaustein</i>	357
Index	381

Contributors

Harry Annison is Lecturer at the School of Law, Southampton University. His primary research interest is penal politics and policymaking. His articles have been published in *Theoretical Criminology*, *the Journal of Law and Society* and elsewhere. He is the author of *Dangerous Politics: Risk, Political Vulnerability, and Penal Policy* (2015).

Sarah Armstrong is Director of the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research. Her research concerns prisons and punishment policy and practice including an ESRC funded research project called ‘Ethnography of Penal Policy’.

Bilel Benbouzid is Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of East Paris (UPEML). Prior to this he was a postdoctoral researcher at Center for Sociological Research on Law and Criminal Justice Institutions (CESDIP) and he holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Lyon. His research interests are in the area of science and technology (STS), sociology of statistics and the status of knowledge in crime prevention policy.

Jarrett Blaustein is Lecturer in Criminology at Monash University. He is the author of *Speaking Truths to Power: Policy Ethnography and Police Reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina* (2015) and has published his research in the *European Journal of Criminology*, *Policing & Society* and *Theoretical Criminology*.

Mary Bosworth is Professor of Criminology at the University of Oxford where she is Director of the Border Criminologies research group. She is also, concurrently, Professor of Criminology at Monash University, Australia. Mary

has published widely on issues to do with race, gender and incarceration, including, most recently the first national study of life in British immigration removal centres: *Inside Immigration Detention* (2014).

Graham Ellison is Reader in Criminology in the Institute of Criminology and Criminal Justice, School of Law, Queen's University Belfast. His main area of research lies in the fields of police and policing, particularly in divided societies such as Northern Ireland. Latterly his research has focused on international policing and the policing and regulation of commercial sex. He is the co-author of *Globalization, Police Reform and Development: Doing it the Western Way?* (with Nathan Pino) and *Policing in An Age of Austerity: A Neocolonial Perspective* (with Mike Brogden). He has just completed a British Academy/Leverhulme Trust funded study into the policing and legal regulation of commercial sex in four European cities.

Elaine Fishwick is a Sydney-based researcher, writer and academic scholar of social policy, criminology and human rights. From 1988 until 2010 Fishwick was a member of a rights based community advocacy organisation in New South Wales called the Youth Justice Coalition (YJC), which has provided her with practical experience of the policy making process. Fishwick is also a co-author, with Leanne Weber and Marinella Marmo, of *Crime, Justice and Human Rights* (2014) and co-editor of the soon-to-be-released *Routledge International Handbook of Criminology and Human Rights*.

Christopher Harding is Professor of Law in the Department of Law and Criminology at Aberystwyth University, with research and teaching interests in the international and European dimensions of crime, crime control and criminal justice, with a particular interest in the criminalisation of business cartels and the emergent regime of EU criminal law.

Alistair Henry is Senior Lecturer in Criminology at Edinburgh University. He is an Associate Director of the Scottish Institute for Policing Research and is co-chair of the European Society of Criminology's Policing Working Group. He has published on issues of policing, community safety, knowledge exchange and negotiated orders.

Andrew M. Jefferson is a prisons researcher at Danish Institute Against Torture (DIGNITY), specializing in the ethnographic study of prisons and prison reform processes in the global south. He works at the intersection between activism and research on justice, human rights and confinement. Jefferson is the

author (with Liv Gaborit) of *Prisons and Human Rights: Comparing Institutional Encounters* (Palgrave Macmillan).

Blerina Kellezi is Lecturer in Psychology at Nottingham Trent University. Her research investigates how people deal with and are affected by extreme life events like war, dictatorship, torture and immigration detention. She is particularly interested in the role of social identities, appraisal, social support, inter-group conflict, and transitional justice on well-being.

Anita Lam is Associate Professor of Criminology at York University. She is the author of *Making Crime Television* (2014). Her research examines representations of crime across various forms of media.

Karen Lumsden is Senior Lecturer in Sociology at Loughborough University. She is the author of *Boy Racer Culture: Youth, Masculinity and Deviance* (2013) and *Reflexivity: Theory, Method and Practice* (forthcoming), and co-editor of *Reflexivity in Criminological Research: Experiences with the Powerful and the Powerless* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). Karen's articles have appeared in many journals including *Sociology*, *Qualitative Research*, *Policing & Society* and *Mobilities*. An ethnographer of crime and deviance, her research interests also include policing, car culture, youth, and social media.

Lesley McAra is Professor of Penology at the University of Edinburgh, School of Law. She is Co-Director (with Susan McVie and David Smith) of the Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime, a longitudinal programme of research on pathways into and out of offending for a cohort of around 4,300 young people. She also has been pioneering methods of co-production and exploring the role of the performance arts in promoting community safety and well-being.

Ruari-Santiago McBride is a post-doctoral researcher at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. His current research interests include the biopolitics of personality disorder, the reordering and disordering of prisoner subjectivities, policy ethnography, the history of therapeutic communities, gender non-conformity, and heteronormativity. He likes to cycle, garden and protest.

Kelly J. Stockdale is Lecturer in criminology at Northumbria University. Her doctoral thesis explored the implementation of restorative justice across a police force. She has over ten years' experience working in the criminal justice system, working in various tactical and strategic roles as a police intelligence analyst.

Emma Williams is Programme Director for the Policing BSc at Canterbury Christ Church University and also works on the MSc and MA programmes. She previously worked as a principal researcher at The Metropolitan Police Service and the Ministry of Justice. Emma has worked on numerous research projects in policing including; policing and sexual violence, public confidence and policing, intervention evaluations and the CJS Reform Programme. She is specialised in operational research and ensuring that learning from research is developed into practical solutions for the police organisation.

Dominic Wood is Head of the School of Law, Criminal Justice and Computing at Canterbury Christ Church University. He was a founder of the Higher Education Forum for Learning and Development in Policing and its Chair from 2009–2014. He has developed and led numerous academic programmes designed for serving police officers over the past 20 years and has contributed to all nine editions *Blackstone's Student Police Officer Handbook*.

List of Figures

Fig. 5.1	Excerpted graphic from the Scottish Prison Commission (2008) report, on prisoners' backgrounds	113
Fig. 11.1	External image of Campsfield House	244
Fig. 11.2	Housing block (Morton Hall)	244

1

Impact and the Reflexive Imperative in Criminal Justice Policy, Practice and Research

Sarah Armstrong, Jarrett Blaustein, and Alistair Henry

This volume grows out of two parallel but distinct developments in social science research that affect the way researchers study and seek to have an impact in the areas of crime and criminal justice. These are the increasing acceptance and practice of (some form of) reflexivity in social science research, on the one hand, and, on the other, the changing context of research itself. On the latter point, we note that criminologists working across different jurisdictions are experiencing heightened pressures to render their research relevant and appealing to external audiences. These pressures are linked in part with the fact that governments in Australia, the UK and the USA (along with other countries) are increasingly keen to

S. Armstrong (✉)
University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

J. Blaustein
Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

A. Henry
University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

ensure that their investment in the higher education sector is delivering 'value for money'. This implies that research and teaching activities that are government-funded must increasingly align with, or at least demonstrate alignment with, what these governments define as the public interest. In Australia, for example, the Australian Research Council, which is responsible for administering public research funding, has identified a list of nine strategic 'Science and Research Priorities' to organise funding of 'support for science and research on the most important challenges facing Australia' (developed partly from a 2014 white paper 'Boosting the commercial returns of research'; see ARC 2016). With the possible exception of 'cybersecurity', none of these strategic priorities appear to be directly relevant to criminology or indeed, the social sciences. The specified research priorities relate primarily to what are known as 'STEM' subjects (Science, Technology, Engineering and Medicine), thereby prioritising an increasingly narrow set of subjects and research methodologies that reflect a pragmatic and in our view myopic governmental understanding of what constitutes societal value.

This growing emphasis on pragmatism further implies that universities as the institutional sites within which much of what constitutes criminological research today takes place are also expected to operate efficiently. Notions of accountability, and more specifically financial accountability (Power 1999), thus constitute powerful discursive mechanisms that ultimately contribute to the legitimisation of an overarching programme of public divestment from the higher education sector. Politicians are prone to justifying these cuts by invoking the language of austerity. Some academics have come to associate contemporary discourses of austerity with a wider neoliberal project, one that is generally cited as a threat to the future of the sector and the pursuit of independent academic inquiry. A recent and influential paper notes that the high productivity and compressed time frames of the 'neoliberal university' create isolating and divisive work conditions, further undermining critical and independent research agendas (Mountz et al. 2015).

No longer able to rely primarily on government investment as a primary source of research income, universities have also started placing greater emphasis on the need for academics to assume the role of research entrepreneurs. The STEM subjects are perhaps ideally placed

to develop lucrative partnerships with industry, but the social sciences are not immune to this development. Researchers from all disciplines are facing pressures to market their work to prospective research partners (read: funders) as well as users spanning the public, private and third sectors. Many academic criminologists along with their counterparts from other disciplines have vocally opposed these managerial pressures and expressed concerns about the implications of research commodification with respect to academic autonomy. For criminologists, the preservation of academic autonomy is especially crucial due to the discipline's historical legacy as a technology of governmental control (Foucault 1980) and our recognition of the risk that policy makers and practitioners may utilise our concepts, data and theoretical constructs to justify coercive practices or unjust policies, impinge upon the rights and freedoms of vulnerable individuals and groups, and potentially even generate harms (Cohen 1988). The intersections that exist between criminological research, policy and practice might therefore be characterised as ethical minefields.

Ironically, while the political and institutional environment in which research takes place is becoming more instrumental and less well funded, criminology as a discipline is flourishing. This is evident from the growth of undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes and jobs across Europe and North America. Our sense is that this is due, at least in part, to the field's relative strength in arguing for its own relevance and importance given the perennial policy fixation on questions of crime and security in these regions. Of course, this is not to take away from the excellence of much criminological research. Indeed, what has been particularly marked in the past 20 years has been the field's enriching pluralism and the ability to support so many research traditions and perspectives (Loader and Sparks 2011; Bosworth and Hoyle 2011). While some criminologists have characterised this trend as disciplinary fragmentation, broken into 'independent', 'critical' and 'administrative' schisms (Young 1986; Ericson and Carriere 1994; Hough 2014), we tend to side with commentators who see pluralisation as a process of mutual enrichment because it implies that criminology is no longer, if it ever truly were, tied to its originating thinkers and disciplinary influences. Criminologists today not only draw on the methods of but also have

important things to say to and are taken seriously by historians, sociologists, geographers, philosophers, political scientists, economists, cultural theorists and more.

In addition to looking outward for inspiration, criminologists increasingly are looking inward, critically and reflexively scrutinising their own field and the research that is produced through it. While there remains in some corners an impulse towards particular strands of scientific (and particularly medicalised or psychologised) methods and models like the experiment (of which even medical researchers are increasingly critical and sceptical), post-positivist, reflexive engagement has become ever more of an explicit topic as recent criminological texts attest (see, e.g. Lumsden and Winter 2014; Bosworth and Hoyle 2011). It is our contention then that the concept of reflexivity provides a valuable resource for navigating the practical and ethical dilemmas posed by our changing research environment. And in this, we believe the volume offers a new and important contribution for thinking about reflexivity and its potential to illuminate the nature of the social, of which researchers, universities, policy processes and makers are a part. Specifically, all the contributors to this book are grappling in different ways not only with how to employ notions of research in particular projects but also with how we might engage wider political, economic and social contexts of the worlds that both researcher and researched occupy. Criminal justice and academic settings are increasingly governed through the same technologies of measurement and performance—how do we begin to document, analyse and make sense of this? We argue that criminologists must be sensitive to how structural and cultural conditions within the higher education sector have come to influence the questions we seek to explore and the methods and collaborative research partnerships we draw upon to do so. Hence, reflexivity is conceived in this book as not only a way of approaching the encounter of researcher and researched but also, as our subtitle states, a way of centring and exploring the intersection of policy, practice and research.

In this chapter, we set out some of the dynamics in the research environment that require us to think through and expand upon ideas of reflexivity as a problem not only for research but also for policy and practice in criminal justice. First, we discuss the current context of criminal

justice research and review key aspects of the reflexivity concept as these have arisen in social science debates so far. We then present a reworked notion of reflexivity, incorporating both its potential and its challenges, that can be employed to develop insights on the interconnected areas of criminal justice research, policy and practice. Throughout our discussion, we refer to the ways in which the contributors to this volume themselves are engaging the notion of reflexivity. Though each chapter provides its own examples of and stance towards reflexivity, this book overall makes the case for an expansion of a criminological agenda in which the processes, objects and actors often treated as ‘backstage’ to the analysis of crime and punishment join the conventional objects of analysis front and centre.

The Current Context of Criminal Justice Research

Criminological research is inherently political because ‘crime’, its object of study, lacks a fixed reality. It is a social construction, the contours of which vary across time and jurisdiction and which are in part shaped, validated or reconfigured by the work of criminologists, albeit not in isolation (Maguire 2012). Indeed, the representations of crime and order made by political actors, criminal justice institutions, third sector and campaigning organisations and, of course, the mass media probably play a more crucial role in framing public, and criminological, understandings of the ‘crime problem’ than does academic research. This implies that criminological research has never had anything approaching a monopoly over criminal justice discourse and ‘crime talk’ (Garland and Sparks 2000: 2–5).

Up until the 1970s, in the UK and the USA at least, crime was largely viewed by political elites and parties as a technical administrative matter with, to contemporary eyes, surprising levels of party political consensus over its management (Loader 2006). However, from then on, crime control came to play important roles in shaping both party political debate (Downes and Morgan 2012) and the very public sensibilities to which such debates speak (Garland 2000; Simon 2007). Crime and its con-

trol became increasingly salient in state claims to sovereignty and authority (Garland 1996), even eclipsing broader public service and welfare rationales for action, becoming the driver of policy initiatives in wider fields including education, family law, child welfare and housing (Simon 2007; Crawford 1998). All of this meant that criminological research, where it even tried to engage with criminal justice policy and practice, tended to do so within a highly politicised, oft contested and thus notably emotional sphere of public policy, a sphere which, as already noted, was crowded with other powerful actors, vested interests and alternative representations. Many developments have taken place subsequently thus complicating and showing the evolution of this well-rehearsed history of the politics of crime control in the UK and the USA. We focus on a few such developments here in order to sketch what we see as the main features of the current context within which criminological research gets done.

Shifting Grounds of Concern

Downes and Morgan (2012) argue that the days of intense partisan criminal justice politics may be on the wane, going as far as to suggest that the governing through crime agenda may currently be ‘debased currency’ (2012: 203). Perhaps in the aftermath of global recession, crime control has played a less decisive role in post-2008 elections and there is, for the moment, considerable agreement across political parties on key areas of criminal justice, in particular around ‘volume crime’ and its management through adaptive or ‘dispersed’ strategies that look beyond criminal justice institutions themselves for solutions (Downes and Morgan 2012: 183). Rather, they argue that much public debate about crime control in the UK (though one might consider the Black Lives Matter movement in the USA in a similar vein) has coalesced around specific scandals, only some of which, such as the 2011 urban disorders in England, have really sparked the kinds of demonising rhetoric that had characterised much crime talk in recent years (2012: 201–203). Whether this will present a more welcoming climate for deliberation around criminological research in the longer term remains to be seen (see, e.g. Brown et al. 2015). Also counter to this optimism, it might be argued that it is the terms and focus of contestation that have shifted (as well as multiplied, hybridised

and pluralised) targets of othering and stigmatisation, and in the present moment, it appears that migration flows and terrorism have emerged as potent rallying points for fear and reactionism. As Mary Bosworth and Blerina Kellezi note in their chapter to this volume, reactions against migration have produced an entirely new system of control and detention that should be of interest to criminologists. They narrate the emotional toll of these new forms of the carceral, not only on the confined but also on the researcher as well, employing a reflexive lens to suggest how these sites cannot be equated simply with imprisonment, presenting distinct logistical, affective and intellectual challenges for researchers.

Criminal Justice Policy Research

There are already quite extensive literatures on the various components of the criminal justice system. What has been rather less developed is research more explicitly focused on criminal justice policy itself: the actors involved, the roles of expert knowledge within it and the processes through which it takes shape (Newburn and Sparks 2004). There are some notable exceptions (inter alia, the work of Paul Rock; Armstrong 2010; Annison 2015; Blaustein 2015; Morrison and Sparks 2015; Souhami 2007; McAra 2005, 2016; Jones and Newburn 2002); however, the lack of attention to policy is becoming, particularly in the context of a research agenda premised on some notion of ‘impact’, an increasingly glaring lapse in criminological scholarship, a gap this volume aims partly to fill. Armstrong and Lam’s chapter, for example, argues there is a ‘double absence’ of policy in criminological research, suggesting scene-thinking as a way of bringing policy into the same frame as the core criminological issues of ‘the street’.

Institutional Funding Regimes, Impact and Knowledge Exchange

Right from the formation, in the UK, of the Cambridge Institute of Criminology and the Home Office Research Unit, the ways in which criminological research has been institutionally supported and funded

have drawn a critical eye (Garland 2002; Martin 1988). Where funding becomes an issue, the priorities and focus of the funders play an important role in shaping a priori assumptions about what the problems of the day are, the preferred methods for investigating them and the main channels through which research is disseminated. They might be said to play a key, even a defining, role in determining what the contours of a discipline is, although in criminology the support of independent universities, and criminology's ongoing expansion as a discipline within them, has historically ensured that funders have enjoyed no such monopoly. Two relatively recent and interrelated developments in the institutional support and funding of criminological research invite consideration of the extent to which we can take for granted the independence of universities, or at least treat universities as places where researchers are entirely free to develop their own agendas. These include the aforementioned 'impact' agenda (in the UK and Australia) and a growing emphasis on 'knowledge exchange'.

In the UK research impact is defined and promoted through nationally organised and compulsory assessment of research activity (most recently in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework, or REF), and it will be incorporated into the Excellence in Research for Australia evaluation in 2018. Such benchmarking exercises are used, along with assessments of the quality of research work in general, to determine levels of research funding that academic departments in universities receive, meaning that impact represents an important determinant of the very viability of these departments. Impact in the context of the 2014 UK REF was defined as leading to worthwhile effects on policies and practices in the wider social world. Impact case studies required individuals to demonstrate how their academic work underpinned documentable change. Of course, there remains an element of debate and contestation about the impact agenda and the extent to which its requirements are in fact feasible aspirations for researchers (see, Stella 2014), or whether they demand uncomfortable over-claiming and time scales. Impact therefore represents an important theme for a number of contributors featured in this volume. For example, Elaine Fishwick's chapter notes that real and positive change can be achieved through research but suggests the paths of this are so unpredictable and circuitous that complexity theory is necessary for analysing

them. Similarly, Lesley McAra's chapter argues that pathways to impact are cultivated and navigated over years and decades, time frames which are less amenable to the rapid documentation and measurement sought by universities to evidence their institutional success.

Related to the impact agenda is a growing emphasis on knowledge exchange, a concept that we do not wish to discredit but rather subject to analytical scrutiny. Knowledge exchange came late to criminology, being much more developed in medicine and nursing for example, and underpins the evidence-based policy and practice (EBPP) agendas, also representing a field of research in its own right. Earlier variants tended to assume that research was a kind of commodity to be packaged and disseminated for unidirectional transfer to those for whom it would be useful. This simple understanding of how research knowledge might come to influence policy or practice was quickly challenged as more nuanced understandings of the complexities and partiality of the process emerged (Henry and Mackenzie 2012; Nutley et al. 2007). The evolution of terminology from 'knowledge transfer' to 'knowledge exchange' attempted to reflect the ideal, if not always the reality, that practice should also be influencing research. 'Knowledge exchange' often is treated as a universally positive value and practice, and we note that it more properly refers to particular developments (such as EBPP as noted) and should be analysed more in terms as a movement, with a particular history and set of actors and forces in the same way as we might do with 'what works'. This is not to suggest that sharing knowledge is not beneficial to research or those that it affects or is based on, but that it has come to take on a particular set of meanings and modes of documentation (Rappert 1999). This bears directly on the next point.

Collaborative research associations between universities, practitioners and policy makers Undoubtedly related to the particular understanding of knowledge exchange and impact as salient for 'research users' has been the growth of formalised collaborative associations between universities, practitioners and policy makers whereby longer-term relationships and more direct collaboration on the research process are envisaged between them. Perhaps the best known in the UK criminology is University College London's Jill Dando Institute of Security and Crime Science which, as well as including government as a partner, also

seeks to involve criminal justice organisations and the commercial sector. Bilel Benbouzid's chapter in this volume describes the founding of the Jill Dando Institute, and how a disagreement over statistical modelling, combined with the divergent missions of a crime science centre and solely university based research, led to distinct statistical models of repeat victimisation. More recently, the N8 Research Partnership in England has established a Policing Research network that involves eight university collaborators, government, Police and Crime Commissioners, police services and partner organisations with relevant interests. Indeed, the editors of this collection have affiliations with similar enterprises in Scotland, including the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research (SCCJR), a collaboration between the Scottish Government, the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council and four Scottish Universities; and the Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR), a collaboration between Police Scotland, the Scottish Police Authority and 13 Scottish Universities. Other collaborations have emerged or are emerging around the world including the Centre for Evidence-Based Policy in the USA and the now defunct Centre for Excellence in Policing and Security in Australia. In many Northern European countries (Norway, the Netherlands and Finland, e.g.), police colleges for the education and professional development of police officers have university status and are staffed by research-active academics, in contrast to the approach in the UK documented by Wood and Williams in this volume whereby academics contribute to police education in a more piecemeal fashion. Like funding regimes, these institutional reconfigurations of the places within which research gets done have the potential to profoundly shape criminology and criminal justice for the better (e.g. by supporting more appreciative, engaged, sensitive to practice) or for the worse (e.g. by contributing to less independent, critical and theoretically sophisticated forms of scholarship; or, by imposing 'Northern' understandings of good research and policy onto 'Southern' subalterns, see Blaustein in this volume). The global dimensions and implications of 'collaboration' should not be overlooked as potential sites of critical inquiry: one of the editors of this book, recently returned from a trip to Hong Kong with the aim of negotiating university-to-university part-

nerships, was struck by the frequency of 'global branding' as part of the language of exchange as well as standards of quality (with UK academics hired as consultants to provide REF-like reviews of departments in Asian universities).

Changes to the institutional landscape of criminology thus span a wide and evolving range of developments, from criminology being a niche interest conducted in support of criminal court and prison processes (Garland 2002) to the establishment of specialist sites of criminological expertise as in the aforementioned Cambridge Institute of Criminology and the Home Office Research Unit (Martin 1988), or in the work of Chicago School scholars (to give a US example), to the expansion of criminology within the (increasingly globalised) university sector, to the formation of partnership arrangements between statutory agencies and universities (Henry 2012). Where criminology gets done and under what institutional arrangements shapes its character, its relationship to power, and the problems and challenges to which it directs its gaze.

In the present volume, both Alistair Henry and Karen Lumsden pay particular attention to the challenges and possibilities of academic–practitioner collaboration. Henry focuses on the potential (and limitations) for such institutional arrangements to contribute to the cultivation of reflexivity towards the research process amongst practitioners themselves. Lumsden interrogates her experiences of 'doing' reflexivity within this kind of setting, paying particular attention to the 'public engagement/public criminology' dimensions of such endeavours (see also, Loader and Sparks 2011).

Summing up, the current context of criminological and criminal justice research thus far described is complicated, characterised by reconfigured zones of political contestation (more global phenomena on the fringes of traditional criminology), new fields of inquiry (policy making itself) and an emergent institutional landscape of resourcing, assessment and collaboration. Accordingly, we argue that a reflexive disposition is likely to assist in the negotiation of this terrain, but before elaborating on this, it is necessary to consider how the concept of reflexivity is commonly understood within the social sciences by accounting for its sociological origins.

Reflexivity: Some Starting Points

Reflexivity in social science research involves researchers recognising the fact that their insights about social worlds and processes (as socially constructed, and mediated by tensions and intersections between agency and structure) also apply to themselves, the social worlds of the academy and to their own work (see Alvesson and Skoldberg 2009). As such, it is a critique of the myth of positive science and its claims to objectivity and autonomy. According to this myth, social science is done to the world, rather than constructed through and negotiated with it. Reflexive insight challenges truth claims and sees research as interpreting the world through collaboration with it, collaboration that inevitably also changes the world (Law and Urry 2004). Hence, it is something to be taken seriously, particularly in the criminal justice field where state power is exercised in its most extreme forms and where research contributes so substantially to the social construction and definition of the very ‘problems’ to which it purports to attend. These understandings have come to influence the study of reflexive methodologies in the context of criminological research (see Lumsden and Winter 2014) as well as the discussions of how criminal justice research intersects with policy and practice which feature in this volume. This warrants a brief review of their historical development in the discipline of sociology, specifically in relation to influential work of Alvin Gouldner and Pierre Bourdieu, both of whom are referenced by a number of contributors to this volume.

Calls for a ‘reflexive sociology’, that is, a mode of sociological inquiry that seeks to account for how researchers influence and are influenced by the production of scientific and cultural knowledge, can be traced back to the work of the late Alvin Gouldner (1970). Knowledge, according to Gouldner (1970), consists of both ‘information’ and ‘awareness’. Whereas Gouldner believed that positivists have a tendency to reduce their conception of knowledge to the former, his reflexive sociology posits that ‘the inquiring subject and the studied object are seen not only as mutually interrelated but also as mutually constituted’ (Gouldner 1970: 493). It is therefore the social scientist’s awareness of their relationship to the object of their study and of the fact that this relationship is a product of their both personal and professional circumstances which prompts Gouldner

(1970: 491) to characterise reflexive sociology as a 'moral sociology' rather than one which purports to be 'value-free' (Id.). Indeed, the values of social scientists and the disciplinary and institutional cultures which they inhabit are deeply embedded within information with the effect that information cannot be described as 'neutral' (Gouldner 1970: 494).

As a 'moral' enterprise, reflexive sociology can be described as embodying two key transformative dimensions: self-transformation and social transformation. Self-transformation is linked with the pursuit of and revelation of self-awareness. It is the acknowledgement that the social scientist 'cannot know others unless he [sic] also knows his intentions toward and his effects upon them; he cannot know others without knowing himself, his place in the world, and the forces – in society and in himself – to which he is subjected' (Gouldner 1970: 497). Social transformation refers to the wider field of knowledge production and accounts for altering definitions of what constitutes valid knowledge, the purposes for which it is sought, and perhaps the means by which it is utilised. For Gouldner, this meant contesting the hegemonic tendencies of Western sociology that he argued were guided largely by positivist aspirations of controlling the social world through the disembodied production of objective knowledge. Gouldner (1970: 504) thereby positions the reflexive sociologist as a partisan, that is, a political being who embraces reflexive sociology as a 'work ethic' that 'affirms the creative potential of the individual scholar'.

Influential in a formative sense, with respect to the subsequent popularisation of critical and reflexive, approaches to sociology and criminology (see, e.g. Taylor et al. 1973), Gouldner's work has also been the subject of criticism within the discipline of sociology. Notably, Hammersley (1999) describes Gouldner's calls for reflexive sociology as a form of 'moral gerrymandering', criticising those who advocate a 'value-free' sociology yet presenting his own prescription for reflexive sociology as 'embodying universal human values, and therefore as not in need of sociological explanation' (Hammersley 1999: para. 2.3). In other words, Gouldner is argued by Hammersley (1999: para. 2.3) to 'present himself as operating in the realm of freedom' while simultaneously reducing the actions and mentalities of those he challenges to functions of cultural, institutional, structural and ideological influences and constraints. Hammersley questions whether sociology as a discipline has, or indeed

should have, a privileged role in generating knowledge that dictates social action. Rather, he suggests that ‘social action involves contexted processes of interpretation...[which] rely on diverse forms of knowledge...rather than being the “application” of a body of general knowledge or even of a method’ (Hammersley 1999: para. 3.7). On the basis of these critiques, Hammersley (1999: para. 4.1) argues against the practice of formulating ‘grand conceptions of sociology’s roles’ adding that ‘reflexivity cannot provide the basis for specifying the mission or the method of sociology’. Accordingly, his contention is that sociological analysis should limit itself to comparatively ‘modest’ descriptive and explanatory aims and take ‘no account of whether we believe what we are studying is good or bad’ (Hammersley 1999: para. 4.5).

The Gouldner and Hammersley debate offers one useful springboard for thinking through reflexivity. Rather than seeing this as presenting a binary choice between different versions, we see an evolving understanding of how the researcher begins to account for herself and understand her role in a field of study. These themes arise as well in feminist epistemologies which similarly challenge the ideas of value-free knowledge and objectivity. A feminist reflexive stance acknowledges the researcher’s position as ‘normative and interested’ (Cuthbert [forthcoming](#): 2, citing Marshall 2008: 688); at the same time, it encourages vigilance of the risks of ideological imperialism and universalism. Indeed, feminist (and queer) theory are underused resources in criminology, often limited (ironically and mistakenly) to areas of research cordoned off as ‘feminist’ and typically limited to explicit studies of gender. Cuthbert’s ([forthcoming](#)) discussion of feminist epistemology and methods establishes these as having long adopted positions that reflexive criminological work is only now beginning to engage. This includes the recognition that knowledge is always situated (Haraway 1988); that critical research should ‘account for the conditions of its own production’ (Stanley 1990: 13) and that researchers should be willing to open themselves up to their participants (Cuthbert, [forthcoming](#), citing Reinharz 1992).

Pierre Bourdieu’s work also has proven influential in terms of shifting the gaze of Western sociologists inward, that is, by prompting them to consider their status as ‘cultural producers of knowledge’. Like Gouldner,

Bourdieu advocated a ‘sociology of sociology’ (quoting Bourdieu in Wacquant 1989: 33) which actively encouraged its academic practitioners to engage in ‘self-analysis’ by considering their epistemological orientation and discursive influences in relation to their positioning within particular fields of knowledge production. It is Bourdieu’s emphasis on locating oneself within a field as opposed to a particular profession or institutional or structural configuration that distinguishes his call for reflexive sociology from that of Gouldner. This distinction is important because it recognises that one’s discipline and indeed the higher education sector constitute structuring mechanisms in their own right (see Stella 2014; Mountz et al. 2015). For Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology then, the boundaries of the field of knowledge production appeared to coincide with the boundaries of the university as the social institution ascribed this unique societal function.

As noted previously, however, the university today finds itself continuously prompted to reassert its value as a public good worthy of public expenditure. It must do so by demonstrating its ability to generate research and pedagogical practice of relevance to different ‘users’ spanning the public, private and third sectors. Bourdieu’s vocabulary for understanding this reflexive praxis remains especially relevant because it can accommodate a plurality of knowledge producers representing different institutional positions. Furthermore, against the backdrop of impact, knowledge exchange and academic–practitioner collaboration described at the beginning of this chapter, reflexive sociology establishes the foundations of an important ethos for recursively moderating one’s contributions to the production of knowledge as well as for regulating the manner by which such knowledge is disseminated and adopted as a result of our contact with empowered spaces or positions in these fields.

Reflexive Criminology?

Reflexivity has very much arrived as a dimension of social-scientific thinking and practice, even though it took a little longer for the concept to gain a foothold within criminology, at least explicitly. The chapters

that follow cumulatively explore, from varying perspectives, the work that criminologists do and the conditions under which they do it, the nature of the research process and the institutions which shape it, for better or worse. We believe that the chapters featured in this volume represent timely and important contributions to an ongoing dialogue about the purpose and value of criminological research but we acknowledge that these issues have long been focal points for critical criminologists who take issue with the collusive, repressive and anti-intellectual origins of the discipline (see, e.g. Heidensohn 1968; Cohen 1988).

We note however that one effect of the particular forms of critical criminology that have emerged has been to discourage exploration of areas and involvement with actors perceived to be the source of oppressive and anti-intellectual impulses in criminology. So criminologists study drug users and drug dealers but not civil servants working on harm-reduction strategies. Co-production is enthusiastically pursued with young people but not with statisticians. Studying and working *with* practitioners, and particularly policy makers, remain, despite the impact agenda, ingredients of a spoiled identity for the criminologist. The contributors to this volume go against this grain. Each has spent considerable time studying, working with, and even trying to change, crime and justice policy and practice through research. Their collective contribution lies in illuminating the ways in which criminological research intersects with, constituting and being constituted by, the fields of criminal justice policy and practice that it studies.

We argue that reflexivity reveals much about the complex, sometimes messy, reality of the research process, allowing for more credible, transparent and modest engagements across research, policy and practice. In this section, we discuss the key points and values of reflexivity for criminal justice researchers, attempting to show how such an orientation in social research can widen and deepen our understanding of the world. However, we have no intention of promoting a 'reflexive criminology' uncritically. We recognise that there are risks of reflexivity as well as particular pathologies and discuss these as well. The aim of this concluding substantive section is to begin developing a clearer sense of how criminologists adopt and might develop reflexive approaches, leaving the rest of the chapters in the book to show how different scholars

are ‘doing’ reflexivity rather than simply ‘being’ reflexive (Mauthner and Doucet 2003).

An important insight of the reflexivity literature is that researchers are complex persons who are themselves, in all this complexity, part of the research process, whether they like to acknowledge it or not. Biographical details and demographic characteristics of the researcher (such as age, race, gender and class) shape and frame their work—from their choices of topics and questions, to methodological preferences and skills, to how they interpret the worlds they study and to how they themselves are interpreted by people in that world. These choices might also be informed by more particular aspects of personal lives and histories (whether a parent, a survivor of trauma, a victim of crime or an ex-offender, e.g.). Across different reflexive stances is shared a sense that choice of discipline, methods and subfields will have been guided more or less consciously by these factors and related/subsequent preferences (personal, political and professional). Many of the contributors to this volume therefore have decided to incorporate autobiographical details into their discussions of the methodological and practical challenges and prospects inherent to doing research in the sphere of criminal justice. Christopher Harding, for example, uses his chapter in this volume to provide an autobiographical discussion of the role that researchers play in constituting and validating narrative constructions of their ‘outlaw’ subjects by drawing on his own biography in academia and history of researching cartels.

In short, the researcher is as much of a social construct as any social world or practice that she might hope to study. Scientific rationality and method make claims to distance and rigor but ultimately do not separate researchers from the world or its influence that would secure them clear objective independence and claims to the ‘truth’. Increasing articulation of and reflexivity around issues of biography and standpoint is therefore also one of the promising dimensions of reflexive, credible and modest research. Being reflexive about one’s position in relation to a field means making transparent and holding oneself to account for choices right through the process—from picking topics, designing, doing and interpreting the research and disseminating it. Such a disposition exposes research as always already a negotiated, collaborative and political encounter with the world, not a disembodied, technical process done to it. For