

Identifying Factors Influencing Police Officers'
Willingness to Participate in Measures Reducing Ethnic Profiling

Student: Anne Margreet van de Bovekamp (s2155915)

Supervisors: dr. ir. P.W. de Vries and drs. B.S. Böing

University of Twente

4 July 2021

Abstract

The Amsterdam Police Force (APF) has been implementing a policy against ethnic profiling with varying results. Some factors have been identified to possibly influence police officers' willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, but it remains unclear why certain police teams are more successful than others in reducing ethnic profiling. The aim of this study is to establish the role of social identities, and factors such as group identification, working style, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust and self-efficacy in efforts to reduce ethnic profiling by police teams. Literature research and interviews were used to secure a better understanding of processes underlying police reform in order to, ultimately, implement this into police policy. In total, thirteen police officers, working as change managers in the APF, were interviewed. The results from those interviews showed some support for the influence of group cohesion, psychological safety, trust, and self-efficacy and gave insight into how these factors influence the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. Working region was identified as an additional potentially influential factor. However, due to subjective methods of data collection and arguable means of comparing police teams, further research is needed to examine the importance of the studied factors.

Introduction

The Dutch constitution states: “All persons in the Netherlands shall be treated equally in equal circumstances. Discrimination on the grounds of religion, belief, political opinion, race or sex or on any other grounds whatsoever shall not be permitted”. These are promising words that clearly state that all people in the Netherlands should be treated equally. Still, this equality cannot always be observed. According to Amnesty International (2021), one third of people of Turkish and Moroccan descent, one fourth of people of Surinamese descent, one fifth of people of Antillean descent, and one sixth of immigrants from Middle and Eastern Europe feel discriminated against by the Dutch police. Also, people with a non-Western background are twice as likely to be stopped by the police (Boogaard, 2020).

Discrimination by the police concerns ethnic profiling. Ethnic profiling can be described as the use of criteria or considerations concerning race, skin colour, ethnicity, language, nationality and religion for investigation and law enforcement, without any justifiable objective reason (Kuppens & Ferwerda, 2019). The police are aware of this problem and are trying to reduce it with appropriate measures.

The Amsterdam Police Force (APF), for instance, has been implementing a policy against ethnic profiling since 2012. However, it remains unclear how effective their policy actually is. Around two years ago, a consultancy firm (Beke) discovered that most measures were still unknown to at least one-third of all police officers. In addition, they found that the issue of ethnic profiling and this implemented policy caused much resistance among officers, resulting in them avoiding conversations and activities in regard to this issue (Kuppens & Ferwerda, 2019). Several underlying factors could play a role in explaining differences between the willingness to participate in these conversations and activities, but much is still unclear in that regard.

In order to look into the problem of ethnic profiling by the police, it is useful to gain insight into police culture. In this study the focus lies more on the dynamic of group attitudes that may vary between teams, instead of individual attitudes. Therefore, the police culture will be taken into account, rather than individual differences.

Police Culture and Reform

A study that was published eight years ago showed that Dutch police officers are, in comparison to police cultures in Anglo-Saxon studies, less conservative, less distrusting of strangers and machismo is less present (Terpstra & Schaap, 2013). Still, there are some similarities between the police cultures as well. To illustrate, 75% of Dutch police officers

agree that it is difficult to explain their work to outsiders, leading to a feeling of isolation from the world outside of their workplace, possibly creating a stronger bond between colleagues and a higher amount of trust between officers (Terpstra & Schaap, 2013). Similar discoveries were made by international studies, such as Westley (1970, as cited in Terrill et al., 2003) and Sato (2003), indicating that this is not limited to The Netherlands alone.

Regarding reform within the police, some difficulties can be found. Shiner (2010) illustrates that police officers have varying opinions about reform measures in relation to ethnic profiling, with some officers welcoming the measures, while others express hostility. Specifically for measures regarding a police style that follows the imposed procedures of police work, cynicism in police officers has been pointed out to be an inhibiting factor in following these measures (Trinkner et al., 2019). In addition, different groups can be found within the police, with each a different view on police working styles. Several different groups have been distinguished and have been given various names. For instance, Terpstra and Schaap (2013) make a distinction between crime fighters, guardians and protectors of the public, whereas McLean et al. (2020) distinguish between warriors and guardians. In this research, the terms warriors and guardians will be used. These groups within the police, with varying conceptions about the tasks and working methods of police officers could possibly lead to discrepancies in dealing with the problem of ethnic profiling within police teams. Both the varying reactions towards police reform measures and the different working styles within the police might lead to difficulties implementing reform measures regarding ethnic profiling.

In order to change one's behaviour, the environment has to be suitable. On a group level, group identification (Hogg et al., 2007), but also group cohesion (Hogg, 1993) are possibly relevant theoretical constructs that could affect one's willingness to engage in reform. These factors are related to the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel et al., 1979), which explains how people categorise themselves and others into social groups, leading to an improved self-esteem. Additionally, psychological safety is crucial for behavioural change (Schein & Bennis, 1965), for without psychological safety, people might not feel safe enough to change their behaviour, being aware of the possible negative consequences of their actions (Kahn, 1990). The same applies for trust in other members of the group which, when absent, can deprive people of the confidence to change their behaviour (Jones & George, 1998). Furthermore, self-efficacy can be influential on an individual level, affecting beliefs about how capable one is to perform certain behaviour (Bandura, 1977). Still, the extent to which these factors influence behavioural change regarding ethnic profiling by the police is not yet clear.

The aim of this study is to establish the role of social identities, and factors such as group identification, working style, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust and self-efficacy in efforts to reduce ethnic profiling by police teams. Literature research and interviews are used to secure a better understanding of processes underlying police reform in order to, ultimately, implement this into police policy.

Theoretical Framework

As mentioned above, group identification, working style, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust, and self-efficacy might have an influence on a person's willingness to change their behaviour. In order to understand these terms and their influence more, the Social Identity Theory and the different working styles within the police should be explained further.

Social Identity Theory and Group Identification

Reducing ethnic profiling within police teams requires both personal and group effort. To gain a better understanding of the processes within police teams, insight into group behaviour is necessary. One theory that tries to explain individual and group behaviour is the Social Identity Theory (SIT). People tend to engage in social categorisation, meaning that people categorise others and themselves in groups. People who are part of one's group become part of the ingroup, whereas others become one's outgroup. SIT states that people increase their self-esteem by favouring their ingroups over their outgroups (Tajfel et al., 1979, Hogg, 1993). The increase in self-esteem is a result of both one's membership to their ingroup and their ingroup's accomplishments. These accomplishments and, in turn, success of a group can be valued both absolutely, and relatively, compared to other groups (Blascovich et al., 1997).

SIT consists of two processes, namely, categorisation and self-enhancement. Categorisation refers to the division between in- and outgroups, and self-enhancement refers to seeing oneself in a more positive light than others, solely because of one's membership to their social group (Hogg, 1993). In fact, according to the SIT, self-enhancement is an important motivation behind one's behaviour in an intergroup setting (Dobbs & Crano, 2001). People who feel more connected to their ingroup will show more behaviour, and have more attitudes and beliefs fitting to their group (Oliveira & Murphy, 2015). In turn, this stereotypical behaviour confirms our ideas about social groups and their prototype behaviour (Hogg et al., 2007).

As described before, police officers can experience social isolation from the world due to lack of understanding of a police officer's job. This, in turn, often results in a strong identification with the job and with colleagues, leading to attacks on the police being perceived as personal attacks (Shiner, 2010). When police officers have a high level of group identification with their team, they might be more motivated and confident to pursue behavioural change. However, police officers can identify both with police officers in general and with their own working styles. This might lead to difficulties in changing behaviour, since a high level of group identification with one's working style (e.g., warriors or guardians) could have different outcomes. A high level of group identification with colleagues pursuing the same working style could lead both to a higher and lower level of willingness to change behaviour, depending on whether this change suits their particular working style.

Working style

Within the police, two contrasting groups, with their respective working styles, can be identified. Members of the first group are warriors, who see themselves as crime fighting warriors, whereas members of the second group are guardians, who try to reduce crime by working with the public (McLean et al., 2020). These groups are not completely separate, however, as officers can be both warriors and guardians, but it does illustrate that different views can be held about policing. Research by McLean et al. (2020) concluded that having a warrior mindset was related to “stronger control priorities during interactions with citizens, as well as more positive attitudes towards force misconduct” (p. 1112). The guardian mindset, on the other hand was “associated with greater communication priorities during interactions with citizens and less support of attitudes towards force misconduct” (p. 1112). This guardian mindset was put forward as leading to more positive police outcomes compared to the warrior mindset (McLean et al., 2020).

The presence of different groups within the police might not only lead to different views and priorities regarding policing, but it might also lead to a division within police teams. When it comes to changing behaviour, this division might impede the process, when people perceive colleagues as members of their outgroup instead of their usual ingroup. Still, it is important to mention that McLean et al. (2020) nuance the division between warrior and guardian mindsets by saying that police officers can be guardians as well as warriors. Therefore, the division between the two mindsets might not be as strict and this could lead to more nuanced attitudes and opinions of police officers as well.

Group Cohesion

Group cohesion has been explained by Hogg (1993) as follows: “The fundamental idea is that people who are interdependent in the pursuit of their needs and achieve or expect to achieve satisfactions from their association, develop feelings of mutual attraction and hence become a group” (p. 87). These group relations create a positive working environment, and consequently, safety and connection between people. In turn, this has a positive influence on psychological safety (Carmeli & Gittell, 2009). This attraction to both a group and its members does not mean that people have to genuinely like the other members. Instead, this attraction is a result of group members supposedly fitting in with the prototype of the social group (Hogg, 1993). Not only the members of the group can provide a feeling of trust and psychological safety, the support from the organisation behind the group can also positively influence work environment and, in turn, psychological safety (Edmondson et al., 2004). Possibly, having a high level of group cohesion leads to more openness to change within the group, and consequently, more behavioural change. However, when people experience a high level of group cohesion, this might also discourage them to change their behaviour, so the situation remains as it is at that moment. Therefore, the level of group cohesion could work both positively and negatively in regard to reducing ethnic profiling.

Psychological Safety

Psychological safety “describes individuals’ perceptions about the consequences of interpersonal risks in their work environment” (Edmondson et al., 2004, p. 4). Individuals weigh the risks of their possible decisions, before acting upon them. Similarly, Kahn (1990) described psychological safety as “feeling able to show and employ one’s self without fear of negative consequences to self-image” (p. 708). A psychologically safe environment does not mean that pressure or problems do not exist. However, productive discussions can take place, leading to less problems and accomplishing more mutual goals (Edmondson et al., 2004). Having a psychologically safe environment will make people feel that their actions will be accepted by others, rather than criticised (Edmondson, 1999). Therefore, in a psychologically safe environment, police officers might feel more confident to change their behaviour and not feel inhibited as a result of fear of negative reactions from colleagues.

Trust

Closely related to psychological safety is trust. Trust means that there is confidence between parties that neither party will be harmed or be at risk because of the other, or that the

parties will not exploit each other's vulnerability (Jones & George, 1998). The concepts of psychological safety and trust are similar, and both involve risk perception and vulnerability, preventing negative consequences and possible positive outcomes for groups (Edmondson et al., 2004). However, some differences can be distinguished. Trust focusses on how one perceives others, while psychological safety involves how one feels to be perceived by others. Also, trust is about potential consequences across a wide timeframe, whereas psychological safety is concerned with short-term consequences. Lastly, trust tends to be a concept between two parties, whereas psychological safety, or lack of it, is experienced mostly in group settings (Edmondson et al., 2004). Still, similar to a psychological safety, a higher level of trust might positively influence behavioural change.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy relates to a person's beliefs about how capable they are in letting their behaviour lead to a desired result (Bandura, 1977; Strecher et al., 1986). Self-efficacy influences anxiety, distress, and thought patterns. Therefore, if one has low self-efficacy concerning a particular task, they are more likely to contemplate possible behaviour, inhibiting the performance of this actual behaviour (Strecher et al., 1986). On the other hand, when self-efficacy is high regarding this task or behaviour, people are more likely to behave as intended. Consequently, police officers high in self-efficacy regarding decreasing ethnic profiling might be more likely to actually change their behaviour. More specifically, self-efficacy in change managers within police teams who focus on decreasing ethnic profiling might influence the progress of reform related to ethnic profiling, since they are the ones advocating change.

Sub-questions

In order to explore how and to what extent group identification, working style, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust, and self-efficacy may influence police officers' willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, the following questions can be asked:

- To what extent does group identification influence the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling?
- How does a person's working style (warrior or guardian) influence the effect of group identification on the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling?

- To what extent does group cohesion influence the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling?
- To what extent does psychological safety influence the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling?
- To what extent does trust influence the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling?
- To what extent does self-efficacy (of the change manager) influence a police officer's willingness to participate in measures to reduce ethnic profiling?

Methods

Design

This study is of qualitative and explorative nature and will explore whether and in which way the independent variables group identification, working style, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust, and self-efficacy relate to the dependent variable, the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. To gain more insight in these factors, semi-structured interviews were used.

Participants

For this study, 13 police officers working inside the APF participated. 2 participants were female, and 11 participants were male. The participants were selected by purposive sampling, based on their role (being change manager regarding ethnic profiling) on police teams that either perform relatively strong or weak on a large number of reform activities over the past two years. The task of these change managers is to create more openness and conversation about ethnic profiling. Every four months, the APF reviews the progress made by the police teams in participating in measures reducing ethnic profiling that is reported by the chiefs of the respective teams. This progress is measured by fifteen key performance indicators and the ranking list that follows from these indicators is annually discussed with the department heads. For this study, the most recent ranking from December 2020 was used. Participants were introduced with the help of one of the supervisors (Bas Böing), who is the program lead inside the APF. Their interviewee number, gender and team ranking are listed in Table 1.

Table 1*List of Interviewees Defined by Gender and Team Ranking*

Interviewee number	Gender	Team ranking
1	Male	Strong
2	Male	Weak
3	Male	Strong
4	Male	Strong
5	Male	Strong
6	Female	Strong
7	Male	Weak
8	Male	Weak
9	Female	Weak
10	Male	Moderate
11	Male	Strong
12	Male	Weak
13	Male	Strong

Procedure

Selected participants were introduced to the author without any reference to the team's ranking on reform activities. These rankings were revealed after finishing all interviews to prevent bias in the study findings.

The interviews were conducted using Microsoft Teams. Before the interviews started, the participants either gave written consent through an informed consent form (see Appendix B), or verbal consent that was included on the recording. The participants were encouraged to share their own opinions and experiences, and they were reassured that everything they said would be anonymised and they were not obligated to answer the questions, if they would prefer not to. The interviews were recorded with either a smartphone or a laptop. The duration of the interviews varied between 41 and 76 minutes.

Materials

The interview was semi-structured and included open-ended questions in order to introduce the topic, while giving the participants the opportunity to reflect on the topic and

share what they wanted to share. A few questions were used to start the conversation and to keep the conversation going while making sure all factors would be discussed. Additionally, probes were used to reach more insight into the situations described by the interviewee. The interview questions can be found in Appendix A. Before introducing a new topic, this topic was explained first, to prevent misunderstandings.

Results

In addition to the factors that have been discussed in the interviews, the results will be compared to the team rankings in an attempt to explain the influence of these factors regarding the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and openness about this topic. The team rankings are portrayed in Table 1 in the methods section. Also, the region in which police officers work was added as an extra factor, since four interviewees mentioned this to possibly be an influencing factor as well.

General Attitude Towards Measures Reducing Ethnic Profiling

Before addressing the factors that possibly influence the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, it might be useful to gain insight into the police officers' current attitudes towards those measures. The change managers experienced much resistance towards the measures by their colleagues, in both relatively strong and weak teams alike. In general, colleagues did not see the added value of the measures, did not want to spend too much time on them and felt personally attacked by the apparent need for the measures against ethnic profiling. Interviewee 9 and 13 summarised this by reciting the reaction of their colleagues when the measures were being discussed: "*Oh, is this really necessary? I am not guilty of ethnic profiling!*" (Interviewee 13) and "*So you are saying that I am a bad guy?*" (Interviewee 9). In sum, police officers who were part of the teams that were part of this study generally had a negative attitude towards the measures reducing ethnic profiling.

The change managers themselves felt predominantly more positive about the measures reducing ethnic profiling. They understood the concerns and the resistance of their colleagues, but they felt more aware of the importance of the measures and their added value.

Group Identification

Most of the interviewees experienced group identification in their team, but they experienced it in different ways. Interviewees 2 and 13, for example, explained that their teams behave as a team and on behalf of their team, but they found it important to also stay

true to themselves and make individual choices. Interviewees 6 and 9 both stressed that every group member had their own identity, but that individuals are influenced by their group members as well. *“I think everyone always has their own identity. But I do think that you are shaped by people who interact with you.”* (Interviewee 9).

Interviewee 1, however, mentioned he did not experience as much group identification with his team. He attributed this to his experiences working as a teacher, *“that is why you are already different with a group, in front of a group, above a group, below a group, next to a group, whatever you want to call it”*, resulting in him working more individually, rather than feeling part of a team. Nonetheless, even though he did not experience as much group identification with colleagues who differ in rank and job, he experienced this more with his more direct colleagues working on the same level as he does. Additionally, interviewee 3 mentioned he did not experience as much group identification. He attributed this to the fact that police teams currently consist of more than 120 people, making connections between colleagues less personal.

Regarding the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, not everyone observed the same relationship between group identification and this willingness, as well as openness in regard to the topic. Interviewee 5, 9 and 11 all agreed that group identification was an important factor, because, in their opinion, group identification leads to more openness and transparency between colleagues.

In contrast, interviewee 3 found it difficult to say whether or not this relation existed. Interviewee 1 personally did not experience group identification to be of influence regarding his openness towards the topic and the measures. Interviewee 10 shared this opinion but added that *“for a good conversation follow-up I think it is really very important.”* Also, interviewee 12 did not experience this relation, since the measures and the conversations were not necessarily voluntary.

When looking at the influence of group identification on willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, some observations can be made. Interviewees 1 and 3, who both did not experience much group identification, are part of stronger teams. In contrast, interviewee 2, who is part of a weaker scoring team, and interviewee 13, who is part of a stronger team, both experienced a positive level of group identification. Therefore, it seems that there is no clear influence of group identification on the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling.

Groups within the police

The majority of the interviewees recognised differences in working style between colleagues. However, all interviewees who recognised these different groups nuanced this by saying that most colleagues have the right balance between the two groups, and that it depends on the situation which working style they are most likely to have. Interviewee 13 supported this by using an example of a recent police chase involving shooting. He stated: *“Afterwards, the action is not even over, when they are still in the middle of it, they approach that guy lying there and they immediately start CPR. So, the switch from fighting crime to providing service is very short.”* Still, according to many interviewees, police officers often tend to have a preference for either fighting crime or providing service.

In comparison, interviewee 5 was the only interviewee who did not recognise such differences in his team. He mentioned: *“I dare to say that at this office, there are no colleagues who have a very clear preference, [...], in this respect.”* He attributed this to the fact that, currently, police officers can hardly choose their activities and both crime fighting and providing service are important parts of their job description. Interviewee 4 did experience differences, but he mentioned that crime fighting and providing assistance cannot be done without each other.

Regarding the influence of these differences in working style and the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, as well as openness about this, the interviewees held different views. Most interviewees did not experience this influence, however, interviewees 2 and 3 stated that they did, because colleagues who tend to be warriors show more resistance to these measures. Interviewee 3 illustrated this by saying: *“And then you have some of the colleagues, they think it's really good, really nice what you do, and some say, this is nonsense, that's not police work. And that's where the difference lies.”*

Interestingly, interviewee 7 experienced the influence of working style to be paradoxical in nature. Warriors in his team, as opposed to guardians, who tend to meet the measures reducing ethnic profiling with more resistance, actually tend to show good examples of professional police checks and have a positive influence on their colleagues in this regard. Interviewee 7 stated that in comparison to these colleagues with a warrior mindset, *“the [guardians] just sit there, they will connect a lot outside, but they don't take on that role inside [their police team].”*

In sum, interviewee 5 was the only one who did not experience differences between warrior and guardian working styles. Even though many interviewees admitted that police

officers often have a certain preference regarding working style, these working styles were often observed to balance each other out. Therefore, no clear distinction between relatively weaker and stronger scoring teams was found in regard to the influence of working style.

Group Cohesion

In general, the vast majority of the interviewees experienced a high level of group cohesion among their colleagues. About his team, interviewee 1 explained: *“I wake up with it, I go to bed with it, because it's just my team and I think that's just fantastic.”* An example used by interviewees 5, 9, 10, 11 and 13 to explain the feeling of group cohesion, was the fact that colleagues are concerned about each other's wellbeing after serious incidents. They illustrated this by explaining that colleagues *“will take over your emergency services shift, because they just want you to relax for a while”* (Interviewee 5) after being exposed to serious incidents, and that if *“something happens, like now [a recent police chase involving shooting], then I'm sure those colleagues might get tired of the amount of texts, calls and questions like, gosh, how are you and is there anything I can do?”* (Interviewee 9).

Nonetheless, interviewees 2 and 3 experienced the group cohesion in their respective teams to be decreased, since the police teams are currently quite large. Interviewee 2, however, emphasised that his team still had a high level of group cohesion and used similar examples as mentioned before to illustrate this. Lastly, interviewee 12 experienced a high level of group cohesion in general, but he did make it clear that this is not always the case. He elaborated on this by explaining that colleagues have to get used to each other and that therefore the dynamics in the team change when exchanges and transfers of colleagues occur.

When asked about the influence of group cohesion on the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and openness about the subject, all interviewees agreed that there was a relation. However, not everyone agreed about the direction of this relation. Most interviewees were of the opinion that group cohesion could have a positive influence in this respect. They illustrated this by saying: *“Yes, so I think that involvement with each other and certainly with the area where you work, yes, I think that also makes the people more open [towards the topic]”* (Interviewee 7) and that *“if you are less involved with each other, you are less likely to be open to a different opinion and open to other insights.”* (Interviewee 10).

Interestingly, interviewees 1, 2 and 12 shared the opinion that group cohesion could work in two different ways. One explanation of this duality was worded as follows: *“If you have a better relationship with someone, you might think, yeah, I find it easier to address [this*

topic]. On the other hand, you might think, yes, it's a good mate, you know, and then I'm not going to say anything, so I'm letting it go." (Interviewee 2).

Interviewee 1 and 12 explained another type of duality in regard to group cohesion. Group cohesion can be positive if leading figures in the group are open to change. However, if those leading figures are not open to this change, the group might go in the opposite direction.

In sum, most interviewees experienced a high level of group cohesion and all interviewees recognised a relation between group cohesion and ranking in relation to decreasing ethnic profiling. Both a positive and a dual relationship was mentioned. Interestingly, most interviewees perceiving a positive relationship are part of a relatively stronger team, whereas most interviewees perceiving a dual relationship are part of a relatively weaker team regarding team ranking in relation to measures reducing ethnic profiling.

Psychological safety

The vast majority of the interviewees experienced a high level of psychological safety in their teams. Interviewees 8, 12 and 13 were the only ones who did not, or hardly, experience psychological safety. Interviewee 12 did mention he would address situations he did not agree with, but this would not be easy, and he only felt able to do this because he has more experience than some other colleagues. Interviewee 13 explained the lack of psychological safety in his team by saying that "*actually everyone is a bit on their toes, like, what can I say, what can't I say. So, there is a lot of looking around you, so to speak.*" Similarly, interviewee 8 added that psychological safety is a difficult subject and that even though some people dare to share their opinions, others tend to laugh away difficult topics.

One factor that could possibly influence the experienced psychological safety in a team is one's position and rank in the team. Interviewee 4 explained that it might be easier to talk about the topic of ethnic profiling "*one, because I've been working on the subject for quite some time and two, because of my rank and my position, that I feel a little more free to discuss the subject.*" Interviewee 6 mentioned that she experienced psychological safety in her current team, which was sometimes lacking in her previous team. She attributed this to her new position as well, having a managerial position, being an inspector¹, rather than a constable².

¹ Also known as Lieutenant in the USA

² Also known as Officer in the USA

In addition, most interviewees experienced psychological safety. However, both interviewees 3 and 11 admitted that the police as an organisation have some possibilities to improve in this respect and that not all colleagues experience this safety. Still, when looking at himself, individually, interviewee 11 stated: *“I have no problem with that at all. I am approachable, I am open to criticism”*, showing that this perceived safety is influenced by personal factors as well.

With regard to openness about the topic and willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, all interviewees recognised the importance of psychological safety within a team. When asked what difference it would make if a team would not experience psychological safety, interviewee 1 responded saying: *“Then [addressing people] happens less, much less. I dare say that, in that case, it goes from 80 percent to less than 10 percent. That's an important aspect, you know, within the police force.”* Interviewee 5 also agreed that *“that's one of the most important things about our job.”*

In conclusion, psychological safety was experienced both in relatively stronger and weaker teams. Also, the relationship between psychological safety and the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and openness about the topic was observed by all interviewees from relatively strong and weak teams alike. Out of the three interviewees who did not experience a good level of psychological safety, two were part of weaker scoring teams. Still, three out of five members of weaker teams did experience psychological safety, suggesting that psychological safety might influence a team's ranking in relation to measures reducing ethnic profiling, but that the presence of this factor does not necessarily lead to more positive outcomes in this regard.

Trust

All interviewees agreed that there was a high level of trust among colleagues in their teams. Interviewees 5 and 6 were quite positive about the level of trust in their team, saying that *“everyone can be vulnerable here and we think that is very important and we attach great value to that.”* (Interviewee 5). Interestingly, interviewee 1, who is part of the same team as interviewees 5 and 6, was more reserved about this. Still, this trust is increasing in his opinion. Additionally, interviewees 2, 4 and 9 were quite positive about the level of trust in their respective teams as well. Interviewee 4 added, however, that it *“does require kind of continuous attention”*, but overall, he was positive about this. Interviewee 13 was positive about the trust between colleagues, but not as much about trust in the police as an organisation. He elaborated on this by giving an example of a colleague who spoke his mind

in a supposedly confidential situation but was still addressed about this afterwards. This led to people being more reluctant to speak their mind.

Interviewees 3, 8 and 12 stressed that everyone has specific group members they trust more and that it is easier to be vulnerable with those specific people. To illustrate, interviewee 3 explained that *“you know your colleagues, you know with whom you can be vulnerable and with whom not.”* Interviewee 8 added that overall, the *“feeling of trust within the team is good, but there are also some cases where it is, partly due to sensitivity of the subject, that it’s different, so to speak.”*

When looking at the relation between trust and willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, as well as openness about the topic, trust was seen as an important factor, which was closely related to psychological safety. Interviewee 1 stated that if the level of trust is high, *“then it’s a maximal relationship”*, whereas interviewee 10 thought the relation was *“a bit less than [psychological] safety”*, but important nonetheless. Other examples about the importance of trust were that people will have a closed attitude if the level of trust is low and that people sometimes are afraid of potential consequences if they say something others do not agree with.

To summarise, all interviewees experienced a high level of trust between their colleagues, and trust was seen as an important factor in relation to willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and openness about the topic. Still, since every interviewee experienced trust, this factor did not explain the differences in team ranking, contradicting the alleged importance of this factor.

Self-Efficacy

All of the interviewees experienced self-efficacy within themselves. Interviewee 1 explained: *“I have the tools, I have the experience, you know. I have the necessities that I can use, [...], and the support of [the program lead].”* Other interviewees also explained that they are confident about the subject of ethnic profiling, that they are verbally strong and that they are not afraid to speak their minds.

Even though all interviewees experienced self-efficacy, they still experienced challenges as well in feeling confident and convincing others about the importance of the topic ethnic profiling. Interviewee 8 mentioned that *“sometimes it’s really difficult”* and *“sometimes we have to deal with a challenge.”* Interviewee 11 added that it can be a challenge to deal with people who show resistance, but that he thinks that *“that’s the most*

interesting group [to work with].” Similarly, interviewee 4 noted that self-efficacy is present, but not guaranteed.

In regard to a team’s willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and openness about the topic, self-efficacy was recognised as an important factor. Interviewee 6 illustrated this by saying: *“It is the foundation of the entire workshop [which is one of the measures reducing ethnic profiling] and also the transmission of the message.”* Similarly, interviewee 9 added: *“I certainly think it is important, because of course you often have resistance, you often have to explain things or try to bring others into contact with each other.”*

Some interviewees stressed that self-efficacy on itself was important, but that the combination with some other factors was crucial in this regard. Interviewee 3 mentioned that it was important to have the right intrinsic motivation to become a change manager and that this task should not be imposed on people. Interviewee 7 noted that self-confidence in one’s social skills has impact too. Even when one is lacking confidence regarding the topic of ethnic profiling, having confidence in one’s social skills could result in being a successful change manager. Interviewee 10 stressed that *“the feeling [of self-efficacy] is of course slightly less important, but that people are actually capable, that is very important.”*

To conclude, all interviewees experienced self-efficacy and saw a positive relation between self-efficacy and being able to activate team members to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and creating openness about the topic within their teams. No differences could be observed between weaker and stronger scoring teams.

Working region

Four interviewees, interviewees 1, 6, 9 and 10, mentioned the region in which police officers work and their experience with this area and its inhabitants as an influencing factor in relation to attitude towards measures reducing ethnic profiling. These influences could be related to different demographic factors and different crime rates in each region. When police officers have negative experiences with certain areas or people with certain backgrounds, their view on the issue of ethnic profiling might be different as well. Interviewee 6 explained this as follows:

“[It’s] also the area where you work. Yes, for example, I am now in South, in Amsterdam. My colleagues in West, they have a very different view than I have, because they deal with a completely different target group and a completely different

population composition [than the one] I now experience. I think that is also very much related.” (Interviewee 6)

Therefore, even though working region was not a factor that was researched in this study, this might still have an influence on police officers’ willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, due to officers’ experiences and attitudes towards the issue.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to establish the role of social identities, and factors such as group identification, working style, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust and self-efficacy in efforts to reduce ethnic profiling by police teams. Literature research and interviews with change managers were used to secure a better understanding of processes underlying police reform in order to, ultimately, implement this into police policy.

In general, police officers were mentioned to have a negative attitude towards the measures reducing ethnic profiling. The interviewees themselves felt more positive about these measures than their colleagues. This could be because of their roles being change managers regarding this topic, but this could also have resulted from wanting to appear more positive towards the measures during the interview.

In line with the SIT, as explained by Tajfel et al. (1979), Hogg et al. (2007) identified group identification as a construct influencing willingness to participate in reform. In this study, differences were observed both in the level of group identification and the supposed importance of this factor in relation to willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. However, there was no clear distinction between the views of relatively stronger and weaker teams in this regard. Therefore, no clear indication for this relation can be made on the basis of these results.

With respect to working style, the difference between warriors and guardians, as described by McLean et al. (2020) was observed by the vast majority of the interviewees. Regarding the influence of working style on the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, the views of the interviewees varied. While some experienced guardians to be more open to these measures, others experienced warriors to have a more positive influence in this regard. However, even though both a warrior and a guardian working style could be seen as a positive influence, this study shows no suggestion of differences between relatively stronger and weaker teams in regard to measures reducing ethnic profiling. Still, also in line with McLean et al. (2020), the interviewees often noticed a combination between these working styles, showing that the distinction between the two

might not be as clear as often assumed. This could suggest that the distinction between guardian and warrior working styles is not as clear-cut it may seem. If this is the case, the influence of working style on willingness to participate in reform might also not be as apparent as often assumed.

Group cohesion, as explained by Hogg (1993) was also mentioned to possibly be of influence in one's willingness to participate in reform measures. In this study, no indications were found for differences between the level of group cohesion in relation to relatively stronger and weaker teams. However, mostly, interviewees from stronger teams experienced a positive influence of group cohesion, whereas a dual relationship was acknowledged by interviewees from weaker scoring teams. Therefore, group cohesion could well have a positive influence on willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, as long as the general attitude of the team is positive towards these measures. Otherwise, having a cohesive team might only negatively influence the team's openness to reform measures and, in turn, the team's ranking on participation in these measures. Still, these differences were only observed by a few interviewees, making this conclusion disputable, but potentially worth exploring further.

Schein and Bennis (1965), as well as Edmondson et al. (2004) emphasised the importance of psychological safety in realising behavioural change. In line with this, all interviewees indicated this importance as well. Some interviewees even mentioned this factor to be one of the most important parts of their job. Still, when looking at the results of this study, it is questionable whether or not psychological safety is contributing to officers' willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. The majority of the interviewees who did not experience psychological safety were members of relatively weaker teams. However, the majority of interviewees from weaker teams did, in fact, experience psychological safety. Therefore, no strong conclusions can be made in this regard and more research is needed to provide more clarity about the relation between psychological safety and the willingness to participate in reform. However, it seems that psychological safety can potentially be a contributing factor to the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling.

Related to psychological safety, trust has been suggested as an influencing factor in establishing behavioural change. In line with Jones and George (1998) the interviews agreed trust to be of importance and that lack of it would negatively influence one's openness towards measures reducing ethnic profiling. Still, in this study, there seem to be no differences in trust between colleagues and its importance between relatively strong and weak

scoring teams, providing no clear evidence for the influence of this factor on the willingness to participate in measures against ethnic profiling.

As for self-efficacy, as explained by Bandura (1977), there seem to be no differences between relatively stronger and weaker teams in relation to measures reducing ethnic profiling. All interviewees both experienced self-efficacy themselves and recognised its importance for establishing behavioural change and willingness to participate in reform. Even though there seem to be no differences between relatively stronger and weaker teams in this regard, all interviewees agreed with Strecher et al. (1986) about the importance of self-efficacy in changing one's behaviour. Therefore, this relation might still exist, but was not made clear enough in this study. Possibly, the interviewees lacked the ability to critically evaluate their own capacities and abilities, resulting in a distorted view regarding this factor. Also, the manner of questioning might also have influenced the interviewees answers in this regard. Asking questions about this factor in a more concealed manner might result in a more objective view on self-efficacy and, in turn, more insight into its importance for the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling.

In addition to the factors that were investigated, the region in which police officers work was mentioned as a factor that possibly influences one's willingness to participate in measures against ethnic profiling. Different neighbourhoods have different demographic properties. When working in a neighbourhood with ethnically mixed demographics, police officers might have different experiences than officers from predominantly white neighbourhoods, for example. These experiences might influence one's perception of the issue of ethnic profiling and the notion of the necessity of reform regarding this issue. When these experiences are negative in nature, police officers might be biased regarding ethnicity and criminal behaviour. Alternatively, the contact hypothesis by Allport (1954) suggests that contact between different groups reduces prejudice. Therefore, police officers working in regions with more varied demographics might be better used to interacting with people from different ethnical backgrounds. This, in turn, might lead to these officers being less likely to engage in ethnic profiling. However, more support is needed in order to draw conclusions about the relation between working region and the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling.

Overall, group cohesion, psychological safety, trust, and self-efficacy were recognised by the interviewees as important factors in relation to the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. An important addition was that group cohesion was only mentioned to have a positive influence when the attitude of the group already was positive,

where a negative attitude would only impede police officers' willingness to participate in reform. Therefore, the presence of psychological safety, trust, self-efficacy, and group cohesion in combination with a positive attitude towards reform measures could lead to police officers being more willing to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. Group cohesion and working style were not experienced by the interviewees to be as important in this regard as the other factors, making these factors seemingly less influential for the willingness to participate in reform. The question remains whether or not these factors are of influence, but in this study, their importance was not supported. In practice, this means that focusing on group cohesion, psychological safety, trust, and self-efficacy in police teams, could be beneficial in increasing police officers' willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling and, in turn, in reducing the issue of ethnic profiling by the police.

However, when looking at the differences between relatively stronger and weaker scoring teams in measures reducing ethnic profiling, only group cohesion and psychological safety were discovered as potentially influencing factors. For these two factors, slight differences were observed between relatively stronger and weaker teams. These results seem to suggest that both group cohesion and psychological safety can positively influence police officers' openness to reform, with the condition that the teams with a high level of group cohesion experience a positive attitude towards these measures. As for group identification, working style, trust and self-efficacy, the results of this study did not indicate differences between stronger and weaker teams. Therefore, these factors received less support for their influence on the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling by this study. Still, the ranking used to differentiate between relatively stronger and weaker teams might already be outdated and not actually representative of the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling by police officers. Therefore, conclusions based on the differences between relatively stronger and weaker teams might not be conclusive and should be researched further before drawing more convincing conclusions.

Limitations

When looking at the results of this study, some limitations have to be taken into account. First of all, the results may not be generalisable for Dutch police officers in general. In this study, merely 13 police officers of the Amsterdam Police Force were interviewed, all of whom having affinity with the subject of ethnic profiling. Nevertheless, the results are highly indicative for change managers in all districts of the APF.

Additionally, all interviewees experienced self-efficacy regarding this topic and their activities being a change manager. Therefore, their experiences in their teams regarding this topic might be different from their colleagues'. Also, the pride change managers feel for their teams might impede them from viewing their team and its accomplishments critically.

Not only the interviewees can give a distorted picture, the method of research can also lead to questionable conclusions. Firstly, because of the qualitative nature of this study, the results will always be subjective and based on the interviewees' own experiences. These experiences may differ between people and therefore, different interviewees possibly would have led to different results. Secondly, while doing interviews, variation can occur in the way questions are asked. This could lead to more suggestive questions and, in turn, less objective answers. Thirdly, due to the study being conducted in English, while the interviews were held in Dutch, some elements might be altered in translation, such as the weight of some statements or the description of the constructs. Lastly, most of the literature used in this study is international research, which leads to the question of how well this relates to the situation in The Netherlands. Even though the Dutch police culture was taken into account as well, this could have contributed to differences between observations in the literature and in the outcomes of this study.

Future research

In order to gain better insight into the factors contributing to the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, additional quantitative research is desirable. This might lead to a more specific and significant understanding of the factors involved. Still, in order to design a fitting quantitative study, the factors to be investigated will first have to be identified by means of more detailed literature research. Additional literature research might uncover a larger range of possibly influential factors and a more nuanced perspective on the factors included in this present study. Additionally, more interviews, with police officers from varying teams and with various functions and ranks (as opposed to only interviewing change managers) might uncover factors that have been undiscovered so far. Further research into these newly discovered factors might uncover a more complete and elaborate picture on how to successfully reduce ethnic profiling within police teams. Lastly, the importance of the area in which police officers work could be investigated further, after discovering a potential influence within this study. Police teams from different working regions, with their differences in demographics could be compared with each other in relation to the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. This could be done by

first including this factor in more explorative studies, together with uncovering other new factors. If this leads to more support for working region being influential in the willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling, further quantitative research could then be used to more objectively test this influence.

Finally, group cohesion and psychological safety, and possibly trust and self-efficacy as well, seem to be factors that influence police officers' willingness to participate in measures reducing ethnic profiling. Other influential factors may be uncovered and explained by additional research that goes beyond the scope of this study.

Reference list

- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Basic Books.
- Amnesty International. (2021, February 26). *Ethnisch Profileren*. Retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.nl/wat-we-doen/themas/discriminatie/ethnisch-profileren>
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: towards a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.
- Blascovich, J., Wyer, N. A., Swart, L. A., & Kibler, J. L. (1997). Racism and racial categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1364. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1364
- Boogaard, J. (2020, June 29). Onderzoek etnisch profileren: mannen van kleur twee keer zo vaak gecontroleerd. *Het Parool*. Retrieved from <https://www.parool.nl/amsterdam/onderzoek-etnisch-profileren-mannen-van-kleur-twee-keer-zo-vaak-gecontroleerd~b2706623/?referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F>
- Carmeli, A., & Gittell, J. H. (2009). High-quality relationships, psychological safety, and learning from failures in work organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 30(6), 709-729. DOI: 10.1002/job.565
- Dobbs, M., & Crano, W. D. (2001). Outgroup accountability in the minimal group paradigm: Implications for aversive discrimination and social identity theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27(3), 355-364. DOI: 10.1177/0146167201273009
- Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383. DOI: 10.2307/2666999
- Edmondson, A. C., Kramer, R. M., & Cook, K. S. (2004). Psychological safety, trust, and learning in organizations: A group-level lens. *Trust and distrust in organizations: Dilemmas and approaches*, 12, 239-272.
- Hogg, M. A., (1993). Group cohesiveness: A critical review and some new directions. *European review of social psychology*, 4(1), 85-111. DOI: 10.1080/14792779343000031
- Hogg, M. A., Sherman, D. K., Dierselhuis, J., Maitner, A. T., & Moffitt, G. (2007). Uncertainty, entitativity, and group identification. *Journal of experimental social psychology*, 43(1), 135-142. DOI: 10.1016/j.jesp.2005.12.008
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998). The experience and evolution of trust: Implications for

- cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 531-546. DOI: 10.5465/amr.1998.926625
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724. DOI: 10.5465/256287
- Kuppens, J., & Ferwerda, H. (2019). *De politieaanpak van etnisch profileren in Amsterdam: Een onderzoek naar effecten, criteria en meetbare indicatoren*. Bureau Beke. <https://bureaubeke.nl/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Downloadversie-Politieaanpak-van-etnisch-profileren-in-Amsterdam.pdf>
- McLean, K., Wolfe, S. E., Rojek, J., Alpert, G. P., & Smith, M. R. (2020). Police officers as warriors or guardians: Empirical reality or intriguing rhetoric?. *Justice Quarterly*, 37(6), 1096-1118. DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2018.1533031
- Oliveira, A., & Murphy, K. (2015). Race, social identity, and perceptions of police bias. *Race and justice*, 5(3), 259-277. DOI: 10.1177/2153368714562801
- Sato, M. (2003). Police recruits' training and the socialisation process: from the network perspective. *The Police Journal*, 76(4), 289-303. DOI: 10.1350/pojo.76.4.289.25826
- Schein, E., & Bennis, W. (1965). *Personal and Organizational Change through Group Methods*. New York: Wiley.
- Shiner, M. (2010). Post-Lawrence policing in England and Wales: Guilt, innocence and the defence of organizational ego. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 50(5), 935-953. DOI: 10.1093/bjc/azq027
- Strecher, V. J., McEvoy DeVellis, B., Becker, M. H., & Rosenstock, I. M. (1986). The role of self-efficacy in achieving health behavior change. *Health education quarterly*, 13(1), 73-92. DOI: 10.1177/109019818601300108
- Tajfel, H., Turner, J. C., Austin, W. G., & Worchel, S. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *Organizational identity: A reader*, 56(65), 9780203505984-16.
- Terpstra, J., & Schaap, D. (2013). Police culture, stress conditions and working styles. *European journal of criminology*, 10(1), 59-73. DOI: 10.1177/1477370812456343
- Terrill, W., Paoline III, E. A., & Manning, P. K. (2003). Police culture and coercion. *Criminology*, 41(4), 1003-1034. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.2003.tb01012.x
- Trinkner, R., Kerrison, E. M., & Goff, P. A. (2019). The force of fear: Police stereotype threat, self-legitimacy, and support for excessive force. *Law and human behavior*, 43(5), 421. DOI: 10.1037/lhb0000339

Appendix A

Interview scheme

Introductie

Voor mijn bachelor scriptie, vanuit de Universiteit Twente, onderzoek ik factoren die kunnen verklaren hoe politiemensen omgaan met etnisch profileren. Ik ben ervan op de hoogte dat professioneel controleren een term is die hiervoor vaak gebruikt wordt en dit onderzoek gaat zowel over etnisch profileren als professioneel controleren. Eerdere onderzoeken wijzen al op bepaalde factoren die van invloed kunnen zijn en ik ben benieuwd naar uw persoonlijke ervaringen en ideeën hierbij. Omdat ik op zoek ben naar uw persoonlijke ervaringen zijn er geen goede of foute antwoorden. Ik zou het interview graag opnemen, zodat ik het kan uitwerken en gebruiken voor mijn scriptie. Uiteraard zullen deze gegevens niet worden gedeeld, maar delen zullen wel gebruikt worden in het uiteindelijke verslag. Ik wil u vragen om het toestemmingsformulier te ondertekenen voordat we beginnen aan het interview. Heeft u nog vragen voordat we beginnen?

Vragen

- Allereest ben ik benieuwd naar u. Kunt u mij iets over uzelf vertellen?
 - Hoe oud bent u?
 - Hoeveel werkervaring heeft u?
 - Beschouwt u uzelf als een etnische of niet-etnische Nederlander?
 - Wat is uw connectie met het onderwerp?
- In de media is veel te doen over etnisch profileren de laatste tijd. Hoe kijkt u daar zelf en vanuit uw werk naar?
 - In hoeverre speelt etnisch profileren een rol in uw werk?
 - Hoe kijkt u aan tegen het probleem van etnisch profileren?
 - Waarom vindt u etnisch profileren een belangrijk onderwerp?
- Wat kunt u mij vertellen over de trainingen en maatregelen die zijn ingevoerd om etnisch profileren tegen te gaan en professioneel controleren te stimuleren?
 - Hoe kijkt u aan tegen deze maatregelen en trainingen?
 - Hoe kijken uw collega's hier tegenaan?
 - Heeft u hier een voorbeeld bij?
- Er zijn verschillende opvattingen over het werk van een politieagent. Sommige mensen zien het beschermen van individuele rechten, het helpen en het en samenwerken met burgers als de belangrijkste taken van de politie. Anderen zien het

boevenvangen als de hoogste prioriteit en vinden die mensenrechten minder belangrijk. Wat merkt u zelf binnen uw team over dergelijke opvattingen?

- Kunt u daar een voorbeeld van geven?/ Kunt u daar meer over vertellen?
 - Leiden deze verschillende opvattingen tot discussies en/of onenigheid?
 - Wordt er door deze groepen verschillend gekeken naar de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - In hoeverre speelt dit een rol bij u of uw collega's om mee te werken aan de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - Hoe sterk is dat verband op een schaal van 1 tot 10?
 - Kunt u daar toevallig een voorbeeld van noemen?
- Los van de verschillende werkopvattingen kunnen sommige politieagenten zich meer of minder identificeren met hun directe collega's dan anderen. In hoeverre identificeert u zich met de mensen met wie u veel samenwerkt?
- In hoeverre denkt u dat uw collega's zich identificeren met hun directe collega's?
 - Waar merkt u dat aan?
 - Kunt u hier een voorbeeld bij noemen?
 - In hoeverre speelt dit een rol bij u of uw collega's om mee te werken aan de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - Hoe sterk is dat verband op een schaal van 1 tot 10?
 - Kunt u daar een voorbeeld van noemen?
- In sommige teams voelt men zich meer betrokken met elkaar dan in andere teams. Kunt u wat vertellen over hoe de betrokkenheid tussen uw collega's is?
- Zou u uw team/collega's als hecht omschrijven?
 - Hoe ervaart u deze betrokkenheid zelf?
 - Hoe denkt u dat uw collega's deze betrokkenheid ervaren?
 - Kunt u hier een voorbeeld bij noemen?
 - In hoeverre speelt dit een rol bij u of uw collega's om mee te werken aan de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - Hoe sterk is dat verband op een schaal van 1 tot 10?
 - Kunt u daar toevallig een voorbeeld van noemen?
- Om een goede werksfeer te creëren is het van belang dat collega's zich veilig voelen bij elkaar en ze hun mening durven te uiten. Deze veiligheid wordt niet in alle teams hetzelfde ervaren. Als deze veiligheid er niet is, kan men bang zijn belachelijk

gemaakt te worden en te worden afgewezen als ze hun mening uiten. Voelt u zich veilig in uw team om uw mening te uiten en op te komen voor waar u voor staat?

- Hoe ervaart u dat in het algemeen?
 - Hoe ervaart u dat als het gaat over etnisch profileren?
 - Hoe denkt u dat uw collega's deze veiligheid ervaren?
 - Is het mogelijk om een collega aan te spreken op hun gedrag?
 - Hoe wordt daarop gereageerd?
 - Kunt u voorbeelden noemen van situaties waar de veiligheid er was of juist ontbrak?
 - In hoeverre speelt dit een rol bij u of uw collega's om mee te werken aan de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - Hoe sterk is dat verband op een schaal van 1 tot 10?
 - Kunt u daar toevallig een voorbeeld van noemen?
- Gerelateerd aan die veiligheid is het gevoel van vertrouwen dat u heeft in uw collega's. Als er een hoge mate van vertrouwen is, bent u niet bang dat anderen misbruik zullen maken van uw kwetsbaarheid en weet u dat u van uw collega's op aan kan. Kunt u wat vertellen over het niveau van vertrouwen tussen collega's in uw team?
- Heeft u een voorbeeld waarin dit naar voren komt?
 - Hoe ervaart u dat gevoel van vertrouwen tussen collega's?
 - In hoeverre speelt dit een rol bij u of uw collega's om mee te werken aan de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - Hoe sterk is dat verband op een schaal van 1 tot 10?
 - Kunt u daar toevallig een voorbeeld van noemen?
- Een andere factor die mogelijk een rol speelt bij de bereidheid om deel te nemen aan maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren is zelfeffectiviteit. Dit gaat over het vertrouwen in uw eigen capaciteiten om uw taken te volbrengen en uw doelen te behalen. In hoeverre voelt u zichzelf in staat om actief mee te werken aan maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
- Voelt u zichzelf in staat om het gesprek over etnisch profileren aan te gaan met collega's?
 - Kunt u hier een voorbeeld van noemen?
 - Denkt u dat uw collega's zichzelf in staat voelen om actief mee te werken aan maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
 - Waar hangt dit volgens u vanaf?

- In hoeverre speelt dit een rol bij u of uw collega's om mee te werken aan de maatregelen en trainingen tegen etnisch profileren?
- Hoe sterk is dat verband op een schaal van 1 tot 10?
- Kunt u daar toevallig een voorbeeld van noemen?
- Is er nog iets wat u wilt toevoegen?
 - Is er iets waar ik niet naar heb gevraagd?
 - Heeft u nog een aanvullende vraag of opmerking die waardevol is voor het onderzoek?

Bij alle vragen kunnen extra vragen worden gesteld om een duidelijker en completer antwoord te krijgen, zoals:

- Wat bedoelt u precies?
- Kunt u dat omschrijven?
- In welke mate speelt framing daarin een rol? Bijvoorbeeld door 'professioneel controleren' te noemen in plaats van 'etnisch profileren'?

Appendix B

Informed consent

Informatieblad voor onderzoek 'Het verminderen van etnisch profileren bij de politie'

Doel van het onderzoek

Dit onderzoek wordt geleid door Anne Margreet van de Bovekamp en begeleid door Bas Böing van de eenheid Amsterdam vanuit zijn rol als programmaleider en promovendus aan de Universiteit Twente. Het doel van dit onderzoek is om factoren te vinden die van invloed zijn op de bereidheid van politieagenten om mee te werken aan trainingen en maatregelen om etnisch profileren te verminderen. Deze inzichten kunnen helpen om de huidige beleidsaanpak te verbeteren.

Hoe gaan we te werk?

U neemt deel aan een onderzoek waarbij we informatie zullen vergaren door u te interviewen en uw antwoorden te noteren/op te nemen via een audio-opname/video-opname. Er zal ook een transcript worden uitgewerkt van het interview. Uitsluitend ten behoeve van het onderzoek zullen de verzamelde onderzoeksgegevens worden gedeeld met de Politie Nederland. De gegevens zijn op geen manier terug te voeren naar u.

Potentiële risico's en ongemakken

- Er zijn geen fysieke, juridische of economische risico's verbonden aan uw deelname aan deze studie.
- Tijdens uw deelname aan deze studie kunnen u vragen worden gesteld die u als (zeer) persoonlijk kunt ervaren, vanwege de gevoelige aard van het onderwerp. Wij stellen deze vragen enkel en alleen in het belang van het onderzoek. U hoeft echter geen vragen te beantwoorden die u niet wilt beantwoorden. Uw deelname is vrijwillig en u kunt uw deelname op elk gewenst moment stoppen.

Vergoeding

U ontvangt voor deelname aan dit onderzoek geen vergoeding.

Vertrouwelijkheid van gegevens

Wij doen er alles aan uw privacy zo goed mogelijk te beschermen. Er wordt op geen enkele wijze vertrouwelijke informatie of persoonsgegevens van of over u naar buiten gebracht, waardoor iemand u zal kunnen herkennen.

Voordat onze onderzoeksgegevens naar buiten gebracht worden, worden uw gegevens zoveel mogelijk geanonimiseerd, tenzij u in ons toestemmingsformulier expliciet toestemming heeft gegeven voor het vermelden van uw naam, bijvoorbeeld bij een quote.

In een publicatie zullen anonieme gegevens of pseudoniemen worden gebruikt. De audio-opnamen, formulieren en andere documenten die in het kader van deze studie worden gemaakt of verzameld, worden opgeslagen op een beveiligde locatie bij de Universiteit Twente en op de beveiligde (versleutelde) gegevensdragers van de onderzoekers. De opnames zullen worden verwijderd nadat het bachelor traject van de onderzoeker is afgerond. Alle gegevens worden geanonimiseerd zodat ze niet meer te herleiden zijn tot een persoon.

De onderzoeksgegevens worden indien nodig (bijvoorbeeld voor een controle op wetenschappelijke integriteit) en alleen in anonieme vorm ter beschikking gesteld aan personen buiten de onderzoeksgroep.

Tot slot is dit onderzoek beoordeeld en goedgekeurd door de ethische commissie van de faculteit BMS.

Vrijwilligheid

Deelname aan dit onderzoek is geheel vrijwillig. U kunt als deelnemer uw medewerking aan het onderzoek te allen tijde stoppen, of weigeren dat uw gegevens voor het onderzoek mogen worden gebruikt, zonder opgave van redenen. Het stopzetten van deelname heeft geen nadelige gevolgen voor u of de eventueel reeds ontvangen vergoeding.

Als u tijdens het onderzoek besluit om uw medewerking te staken, zullen de gegevens die u reeds

hebt verstrekt tot het moment van intrekking van de toestemming in het onderzoek gebruikt worden. Wilt u stoppen met het onderzoek, of heeft u vragen en/of klachten? Neem dan contact op met de onderzoeksleider.

Anne Margreet van de Bovekamp

a.m.vandebovekamp@student.utwente.nl

Desgewenst mag u ook contact opnemen met de begeleider Bas Böing

Bas.boing@politie.nl

Voor bezwaren met betrekking tot de opzet en of uitvoering van het onderzoek kunt u zich ook wenden tot de Secretaris van de Ethische Commissie van de faculteit Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences op de Universiteit Twente via ethicscommittee-bms@utwente.nl. Dit onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd vanuit de Universiteit Twente, faculteit Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences. Indien u specifieke vragen hebt over de omgang met persoonsgegevens kun u deze ook richten aan de Functionaris Gegevensbescherming van de UT door een mail te sturen naar dpo@utwente.nl.

Tot slot heeft u het recht een verzoek tot inzage, wijziging, verwijdering of aanpassing van uw gegevens te doen bij de Onderzoeksleider.

Door dit toestemmingsformulier te ondertekenen erken ik het volgende:

1. Ik ben voldoende geïnformeerd over het onderzoek door middel van een separaat informatieblad. Ik heb het informatieblad gelezen en heb daarna de mogelijkheid gehad vragen te kunnen stellen. Deze vragen zijn voldoende beantwoord.
2. Ik neem vrijwillig deel aan dit onderzoek. Er is geen expliciete of impliciete dwang voor mij om aan dit onderzoek deel te nemen. Het is mij duidelijk dat ik deelname aan het onderzoek op elk moment, zonder opgave van reden, kan beëindigen. Ik hoef een vraag niet te beantwoorden als ik dat niet wil.

Naast het bovenstaande is het hieronder mogelijk voor verschillende onderdelen van het onderzoek specifiek toestemming te geven. U kunt er per onderdeel voor kiezen wel of geen toestemming te geven. Indien u voor alles toestemming wil geven, is dat mogelijk via de aanvinkbox onderaan de stellingen.

	JA	NEE
3. Ik geef toestemming om de gegevens die gedurende het onderzoek bij mij worden verzameld te verwerken zoals is opgenomen in het bijgevoegde informatieblad. Deze toestemming ziet dus ook op het verwerken van gegevens betreffende mijn gezondheid/ras/etnische afkomst/politieke opvattingen/religieuze en of levensbeschouwelijke overtuigingen/lidmaatschap van vakbond/seksueel gedrag/seksuele gerichtheid en/of over mijn genetische gegevens/biometrische gegevens.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Ik geef toestemming om tijdens het interview opnames (geluid / beeld) te maken en mijn antwoorden uit te werken in een transcript.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Ik geef toestemming om mijn antwoorden te gebruiken voor quotes in de onderzoekspublicaties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Ik geef toestemming om de bij mij verzamelde onderzoeksdata te bewaren en te gebruiken voor toekomstig onderzoek en voor onderwijsdoeleinden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ik geef toestemming voor alles dat hierboven beschreven staat.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Naam Deelnemer:

Naam Onderzoeker:

Handtekening:

Handtekening:

Datum:

Datum: