

Preventing Ethnic Profiling in Police Contexts: the Role of Organisational Justice

Nadine van Rosmalen

S2485672

University of Twente

Master thesis: Psychology in Conflict, Risk and Safety

First supervisor: Dr. IR. P. W. de Vries

Second supervisor: Drs. B. S. Böing

January 9, 2022

Preface

In front of you lies the dissertation on the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling within the Dutch National Police. This research was written with a great interest in the psychological aspects behind the relationship studied.

Completing this master thesis also brings an end to studying Psychology in Conflict, Risk and Safety at the University of Twente. Despite the fact that the current covid crisis meant that this research took place almost entirely from home, I received very good guidance from my supervisors Dr. IR. P.W. de Vries and Drs. B.S. Böing. I therefore would like to thank them for their involvement, their motivational words and critical feedback.

Lastly, I am very thankful for the respondents who provided critical insights and thereby helped me in getting an in-depth understanding of the research topic.

I hope you enjoy reading.

Nadine van Rosmalen

Enschede, January 2022

Abstract

In recent years, ethnic profiling by police officers has been a widely debated topic around the globe. Also within the Dutch police departments (preventive) measures have been taken to combat this problem. The measures provoke a reaction of resistance among police officers, who in many cases have a negative attitude towards them. However, it is unclear where this reaction comes from and what role organisational justice plays in this attitude.

Therefore, this research aims to illustrate the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling within Dutch police departments. This research is conducted by means of an extensive literature research, after which existing data was analysed coming from questionnaires aimed at professionalising police stops. In this, the underlying variables of the relationship between organisational justice and the attitude of police officers towards preventive measures against ethnic profiling were described. This includes different types of organisational justice, both procedural justice and distributive justice. In addition, the social exchange theory, the role of organisational support and intrinsic motivation are discussed.

This research shows that organisational justice is a determining factor of the attitude of police officers towards measures against ethnic profiling. In general, diversity within the organisation is seen as positive by many employees. However, employees believe that the organisation does not practise what it preaches, because they think job selection processes are often focused on external characteristics to increase diversity within the organisation. Employees tend to behave according to how they feel they are treated. Since they experience an unfair treatment, this leads to resistance and a negative attitude towards preventive measures against ethnic profiling. These outcomes are explained by social exchange theory and the degree of perceived organisational support. When people feel unseen or treated unfairly, this can lead to implications that might be a reason for concern for the organisation. For example, a decreased motivation to pursue organisational goals, but also unfair treatments of suspects or the public. And, in the context of prevention of ethnic profiling, low organisational justice could lead to a negative attitude towards the organisation and its policies.

Keywords: *Organisational justice, ethnic profiling measures; procedural justice, distributive justice; social exchange theory, organisational support, police context*

Index

1. Introduction	3
2. Theoretical framework	5
2.1 Police culture	5
2.2 Defining organisational justice	6
<i>2.2.1 Distributive justice</i>	7
<i>2.2.2 Procedural justice</i>	8
2.3 The influence of organisational justice	9
<i>2.3.1 Organisational justice and organisational support</i>	9
<i>2.3.2 Organisational justice and the social exchange theory</i>	10
<i>2.3.3 Organisational justice and intrinsic motivation</i>	11
2.4 Organisational justice in relation to ethnic profiling	11
3. Method	13
3.1 Participants	13
3.2 Materials	13
3.3 Procedure	13
3.4 Analysis	14
<i>3.4.1 Inter-rater reliability</i>	15
4. Results	16
<i>4.1.1 Procedural justice</i>	17
<i>4.1.2. Distributive justice</i>	18
<i>4.1.3. Organisational justice</i>	19
<i>4.1.4 Organisational support</i>	20
<i>4.1.5 Attitude towards organisational measures</i>	21
<i>4.1.6 Vision towards diversity</i>	22
5. Conclusion	23
5.1 Discussion of findings	23
5.2 Conclusion in summary	24
6. Discussion	26
6.1 Practical implications	26
6.2 Recommendations	28
6.3 Limitations & future research	29
References	31
Appendices	37
Appendix A: Inter-Rater Reliability Codes.	37
Appendix B: Original citations dataset.	38

1. Introduction

Police officers have a responsibility to protect the public, enforce laws and represent order and justice in society (Wolfe & Piquero, 2011). Therefore, they have to make an estimation of safety based on the assessment of individual behaviour and/or objective evidence (Van der Leun & Van der Woude, 2011). However, in practise, it appears that these assessments are sometimes based on observable characteristics, such as type of car, clothing, or ethnicity (Çankaya, 2012). When this occurs and there is no objective justification for a police stop, it is called ethnic profiling (Kuppens & Ferwerda, 2019; Landman & Sollie, 2018). Ethnic profiling refers to carrying out law enforcement actions, based on generalisations of ethnicity, religion, race or national origin. Nowadays, it is a global and ongoing discussion and it can be seen as a contemporary problem (Van der Leun et al., 2011). Ethnic profiling has also been a topic of discussion within most Dutch police departments for several years. Research has been used to develop appropriate interventions to reduce ethnic profiling. Training courses, workshops, and many other interventions have been adapted to increase knowledge, awareness, and legitimacy of police actions. However, implementing this change within the organisation turns out to be a complex problem (Kuppens et al., 2019).

First of all, many employees do not feel the urgency to change. To address this problem, a top-down approach is applied to get people on board with organisational change. However, this also leads to resistance. Employees feel this reform is forced on them, regardless of whether they agree with the vision (Kuppens et al., 2019). This can lead to feelings of being criticised for their work or distrusted by the organisation, which can lead to defensive reactions (Shiner, 2010). In addition, some employees do not feel that they are treated fairly by the organisation and think the organisation itself, in response to ethnic profiling, excludes white male candidates from job selection. In other words, the organisation is seen as not practising what it preaches. Thus, the efforts to change are labelled as hypocritical (Effron et al., 2018; Shiner, 2010). These perceptions of unjust treatment by the organisation can be described as low levels of organisational justice. Organisational justice is the extent to which employees perceive the processes towards and outcomes of certain organisational decisions as fair (Colquitt, 2001). Low perceptions of organisational justice can harm the implementation of change within the organisation (MacQueen & Bradford, 2017; Shiner, 2010). In fact, when employees feel they

are treated fairly, they tend to return a positive attitude towards the organisation as a form of social exchange (Masterson, 2001).

Furthermore, research shows that the occupational culture of the police can be a barrier to implement change within the organisation (Hadley, 2014). Within police culture, there is a taboo atmosphere around sensitive topics, such as ethnic profiling (Terpstra & Schaap, 2011). This can be related to a lack of psychological safety. Psychological safety refers to a safe work environment in which employees feel comfortable taking social risks, like discussing such sensitive topics (Edmonson, 1999). To reduce ethnic profiling among police officers, it is essential to research the underlying factors of behaviour and attitude towards ethnic profiling and the factors that perpetuate this problem. The problem statement is as follows: police officers who feel unfairly treated by their organisation are more likely to display negative attitudes and behaviour in their efforts to reduce ethnic profiling. Therefore, this research examines the effects of perceived organisational justice on attitudes and behaviour towards ethnic profiling among police officers.

In this light, the following research question is presented:

What is the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling?

In order to answer the research question, the plan of this thesis is as follows. Firstly, extensive literature review will be conducted. Secondly, existing data will be analysed through different coding stages, using a codebook based on literature and topics that arise in the data. Eventually, the literature will be compared with the results to draw further conclusions. Afterwards, recommendations will be given based on the conclusions of this study.

2. Theoretical framework

This literature review provides relevant theoretical background that is important to understand the constructs in this study. In addition, the relevant literature is used to constitute the basis of the codebook for the analysis. Therefore, this conceptualisation forms the foundation for this research.

2.1 Police culture

The occupational culture of the police is characterised by a strong loyalty towards the ingroup and a negative attitude towards the outgroup (Hadley, 2014). Terpstra and Schaap (2011) illustrate in their research that arguing about private information or unpleasant subjects with people outside the police organisation, is seen as one of the worst things that a colleague can do. This comes from feelings of solidarity among police officers, which characterises police culture in many countries, including the Netherlands. Moreover, research shows that police culture is characterised by avoiding sensitive conversations and opening up to colleagues. Reason for this is the fear of being seen as too weak for police work or that being vulnerable leads to gossip or disrespectful behaviour by colleagues. These factors point to a work environment in which there is a taboo atmosphere and where psychological safety is experienced as low (De Vries & Ufkes, 2016). Psychological safety is defined by Edmonson (1999) as the shared assumption that an organisation is a safe environment to take social risks, such as exchanging feedback, openly sharing ideas to improve work processes, and discussing mistakes without negative consequences. This is important to motivate employees to help improve the organisation and can be influenced by factors such as perceived organisational support.

Some social issues also have an effect on the police organisation. One example is the current health crisis, which leads to a polarising society and a lot of tension among the public. Additionally, the ageing population, which means that many employees are retiring, leading to understaffing. These large-scale developments lead to a high workload for police officers (De Snoo et al., 2021). Factors that officers may encounter in their day-to-day work, such as hostile society and secrecy, can promote solidarity within a team (Westley, 1970). To release the pressure created by hostile society and the duty of secrecy, offensive jokes and banter are frequently used, which are often based on race, sexuality, or ethnicity (Hadley, 2014). Tajfel and Turner (1979) argue that the police culture determines the work rules that officers adhere to, which maintains the interaction style of the dominant group. On the one hand, this emphasises the distinction between the ingroup and outgroup, which reinforces feelings of

loyalty and solidarity to the in-group (Hadley, 2014). On the other hand, it can create a work atmosphere where everyone is expected to accept this behaviour to avoid being isolated from the group (Holdaway & Barron, 1997). Quinton and colleagues (2015) illustrate that perceived organisational justice prevents employees from adopting and accepting this cynical attitude as the norm of police culture.

2.2 Defining organisational justice

There are multiple ways to look at organisational justice. Greenberg (1993) described organisational justice as the degree to which an employee perceives the distribution of resources among employees as fair. In this description, organisational justice was defined in two dimensions: distributive justice and procedural justice. Procedural justice refers to the degree of fairness in the process towards certain decisions (Greenberg & Tyler, 1987) and distributive justice to the actual outcome (Colquitt, 2001). Later research showed that the perceived control in the process towards a decision affects the perceived fairness of the outcomes. In other words, if the process towards a decision is perceived as fair, the perceived fairness of the actual decision is expected to be higher. In literature, this effect is described as “the fair process effect” (Lind & Tyler, 1988). In later research, the two types of organisational justice were distinguished and studied as separate types of organisational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Other researchers have built on Greenberg’s work. Colquitt (2001) and Yean and Yusof (2016) conceptualise organisational justice in three dimensions, namely distributive, procedural and interactional justice. However, it has not been proven that a three-dimensional conceptualisation of organisational justice is by definition the best fit for every study. Interactional justice affects job performance and attitudes towards supervisors, while procedural justice focuses more on attitudes towards the organisation and its policies (Cropanzano et al., 2002). As this present study mainly focuses on the attitude towards the organisation and policies to reduce ethnic profiling, interactional justice is seen as less relevant for this present study.

Colquitt (2001) describes organisational justice as the extent to which employees consider they are treated fairly by their organisation. This refers to decisions that the management of an organisation makes that relate to the interests of the employee, and thereby, the process that precedes these decisions. For example, this may have to do with the salary or a promotion, but also with the tasks that an employee is assigned to or the division of a team. All of these decisions can affect an individual’s well-being. For this reason, employees will

assess these decisions based on the perceived degree of fairness (Colquitt, 2001). In turn, justice perceptions can affect an employee's attitude towards the person making decisions, for example, a supervisor or manager (Yean et al., 2016).

In this study, the conceptualisation of organisational justice by Colquitt (2001) and Yean and Yusof (2016) is used to study the effects of organisational justice in the context of ethnic profiling among the police in the Netherlands and thereby contribute to a gap in the literature. However, in this present study, a two-factor conceptualisation is used, in which organisational justice is described in terms of distributive and procedural justice.

2.2.1 Distributive justice

Distributive justice, in an organisational setting, refers to the perceived degree of justice concerning the allocation of certain resources (Roch et al., 2006). Specifically, it concerns the outcome of organisational decisions (Colquitt, 2001). In the context of organisational justice, this concerns organisational resources, such as salary or promotion.

According to Adams' inequity theory (1965), people tend to lower their input when they experience that their salary is insufficient compared to their commitment. Nozick (1973) reports on this topic that distribution is considered fair when everyone receives what they are entitled to concerning the distribution of certain goods. In other words, what matters is whether what someone receives equals what effort they put into it (Greenberg & Tyler, 1987; Nozick, 1973).

Deutsch (1985) added that this form of distributive justice concerns "the conditions and good that affect individual well-being". In his equity theory, Deutsch (1985) states that people are more motivated to work hard for their own needs than to comply with a culture of competition within the organisation. According to Deutsch, cooperation and equality are critical in a well-functioning organisation.

In addition, Wolfe and Piquero (2011) describe this form of organisational justice in terms of perceived fairness compared to other employees of equal status. Research into the role of organisational justice within policing shows that the distribution of goods among employees of equal status determines perceived fairness. When the distribution of outcomes among employees with equal status is considered fair, both the quantity and quality of police officers' work output increases (cf., Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). In contrast, if the distribution is perceived as unfair, this can lead to negative emotions and cognitions among employees. This can affect attitudes towards the organisation, but it can also negatively influence job performance or withdrawal (Cohen-Charash et al., 2001).

Given the relevance of this aspect within the police, distributive justice will be defined in this study as the perceived fairness of the allocation of goods compared to other employees of equal status.

2.2.2 Procedural justice

Greenberg and Tyler (1987) describe procedural justice as “the perceived fairness of the means used to make decisions” (p. 129). In other words, the extent of perceived fairness in the process towards certain organisational decisions (Greenberg et al, 1987; Wolfe et al., 2011). Blader and Tyler (2003) elaborated this definition by making a distinction between the underlying components of procedural justice. In their Four-Component Model, they distinguish between (a) formal decision making, (b) formal quality of treatment, (c) informal decision making, and (d) informal quality of treatment. Formal decision-making refers to the extent to which rules and protocols are followed while making decisions, whereas informal decision making encompasses how a particular authority figure or leader makes certain decisions. The formal quality of treatment is about how rules and protocols affect the treatment of employees, while the informal quality of treatment assesses how certain authority figures or leaders treat employees (Blader et al., 2003).

Other researchers, such as Tyler (2003) and Stenkamp and colleagues (2021), focused on the underlying elements of the level of justice in decision-making processes. According to Stenkamp and colleagues, procedural justice consists of four key components, described as “voice, neutrality, dignity and respect, and trustworthiness”. Similarly, Tyler (2003) describes the elements as: “being neutral, consistent, rule-based, and without bias; that people are treated with dignity and respect and their rights are acknowledged; and that they have an opportunity to participate in the situation by explaining their perspective and indicating their views about how problems should be resolved” (p. 300-301). The component ‘voice’ refers to the possibility to participate in a conversation and the feeling that people are listening. Furthermore, neutrality is described as being objective, honest and in balance. Dignity and respect concern respect and recognition of someone’s status and rights within a certain group. And trustworthiness refers to the commitment and benevolence of leaders to take care of the employees’ well-being (Stenkamp et al., 2021). These components can be linked to the informal quality of treatment of the Four-Component Model, and describe almost the same construct. Since the Four-Component Model is comprehensive for the key components of Stenkamp and colleagues (2021) as well as for the four components of Blader and Tyler, this model will be used in this present study.

Thibaut and Walker (as cited in Greenberg et al., 1987) describe procedural justice in terms of process control and decision control (i.e. the opportunity to provide input in the decision-making processes and thereby having input in the outcome of these processes), where it was believed that having input in the decision-making process would increase the feelings of decision control. However, later research by Lind et al. (1983) shows that having a voice in decision-making processes increases the feelings that a process is considered fair, regardless of whether it leads to the desired outcome. In other words, the opportunity to provide input into the decision-making process and to feel that it is being listened to by an authority figure influences perceived procedural justice (Greenberg & Folger, 1983; Tyler, 2003).

Therefore, the focus in this research is on the decision-making processes that determine the degree of perceived procedural justice, in which the underlying components of Blader and Tyler's (2003) four-component model are used.

2.3 The influence of organisational justice

2.3.1 Organisational justice and organisational support

Research shows that organisational justice in general influences the attitudes, perceptions, and behaviour of employees and thus influences the organisation (Carr & Maxwell, 2018; Yean et al., 2016). The degree of perceived organisational justice can also affect job performance, and the way employees behave towards customers or the public (Carr et al., 2018; MacQueen et al., 2017; Roch et al., 2006). This can be explained by the extent to which employees experience organisational support. When employees feel supported by their organisation, they feel more involved in the organisation, which leads to positive work outcomes. Examples of organisational support are stimulating self-confidence and creating a positive identity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005). In fact, the higher the perceived organisational support, the better the work performance and the lower the absenteeism rates (Eisenberger et al., 1986). Studies have shown that employees tend to lose their motivation to achieve organisational goals and become self-seeking when they experience a lack of organisational support (Simons & Roberson, 2003).

Furthermore, research within the police context shows that organisational justice fosters confidence in officers' own authority. Organisational support helps to stimulate self-confidence among police officers, which motivates them to trust on their own professional judgement. Officers who experience high levels of self-legitimacy are more likely to support fair and legally correct treatment of suspects because they can identify more with the organisation and its values (Quinton et al., 2015).

To summarise, police are more likely to handle suspects correctly (by the book), when they feel supported by and a part of a legitimate organisation.

2.3.2 Organisational justice and the social exchange theory

To explain the relationship between internal emotions and perceptions and external behaviour of employees, a link is made in research with the social exchange theory (Carr et al., 2018). The social exchange theory refers to, as the name suggests, the exchange of social contact and the social structures in which we participate in our daily lives (Cook et al., 2013). One of the founders of this theory, Homans (1958), describes social exchange as the exchange of activities between two or more parties, accompanied by costs or rewards. According to Homans, this exchange is based on mutual reinforcement. In other words, the behaviour of one party reinforces the behaviour of the other party, which in turn can influence the behaviour of the first party. For example, Eisenberger and colleagues (1986) argue that employees who are convinced that the organisation supports them to fulfil their socioemotional and physical needs, will model this behaviour to pursue the needs and goals of the organisation. Homans argues that when behaviour leads to positive outcomes, people are more likely to repeat this behaviour. This especially occurs when similar situations arise. In addition, when the outcome of certain actions is valuable to a person, that person is also more likely to repeat the behaviour.

Jasso (1986) built on this work and described the link with distributive justice. In his theory, he stated that people who receive what they anticipated, consider their exchange to be fair. Based on this, they either react from positive emotions of guilt when they receive more than they expected or from negative emotions of anger when they receive less than expected. Moreover, Wolfe and Piquero (2011) illustrate the relationship between organisational justice and the treatment of suspects by police officers. When police officers feel treated fairly by their organisation, they are more likely to treat suspects in a respectful manner. Another explanation is given by Ilies and colleagues (2005). They demonstrate in their research that employees, in general, tend to observe their supervisors and model his or her behaviour.

In addition, other researchers state that the social exchange theory explains that fair treatment leads to employees showing reciprocal behaviour in favour of the organisation. In fact, they 'repay' the organisation by showing a positive attitude and behaviour towards the organisation and its standards and values (Masterson, 2001).

In sum, if organisational justice is perceived as high, positive emotions among employees will be stimulated. Consequently, this will lead in turn to a positive approach towards the public and a positive attitude towards the organisation.

2.3.3 Organisational justice and intrinsic motivation

In their research, Zapata-Phelan and colleagues (2009) shed light on the mediation role of intrinsic motivation between the perceived organisational justice and job performance. According to the Fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), a person assesses a situation on justice based on the questions of whether it “could have been, should have been or would have been” leading to different outcomes. When it is judged that an authority figure, such as a supervisor, could, would, or should have acted differently, this can result in negative emotions, such as anger or blame. Moreover, the Fairness theory describes that procedural justice can have a significant influence on intrinsic motivation, whereby positive emotions lead to increased intrinsic motivation and thus better performance, while negative emotions lead to decreased intrinsic motivation with negative consequences on performance.

For this reason, the role of intrinsic motivation as a variable has been included in the summary of relationships of this study, as depicted in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Summary of relationships.



2.4 Organisational justice in relation to ethnic profiling

As in other organisations, organisational justice influences the attitude and behaviour of the employees within the police force. As mentioned before, organisational justice can affect the way police officers treat suspects and the public. In addition, it can influence the attitude and behaviour of police officers towards the organisation and its policies (Quinton et al., 2015). These relationships emphasise the importance of the role of organisational justice within the police context.

In recent years, the Dutch National Police Force has focused on preventing and reducing ethnic profiling. Ethnic profiling refers to carrying out law enforcement actions, based on generalisations such as ethnicity (Wolfe et al., 2011). The purpose of Dutch police departments

was to provide police officers with extra knowledge and skills to counter potential bias in their task of profiling (Kuppens et al., 2019). However, reducing ethnic profiling in practise proves to be a complex process. This can be explained by several factors.

Some employees consider the organisation's interventions as hypocritical (Shiner, 2010). When an organisation is seen as not practising what it preaches, this can be experienced as unfair. These perceptions of organisational injustice can lead to negative emotions (Jasso, 1986). On one hand, negative emotions influence the extent to which employees are intrinsically motivated in their work (Folger et al., 2001). On the other hand, social exchange theory shows that low levels of organisational justice, in turn, lead to negative behaviour towards the organisation (Masterson, 2001), but also towards the public (Wolfe et al., 2011).

Moreover, the occupational culture of the police is proved to be an impeding factor in implementing change within the organisation (Hadley, 2014). As mentioned before, this is characterised by a taboo atmosphere. When psychological safety within a team is experienced as low, employees feel less room to discuss sensitive topics (Edmonson, 1999). Topics such as ethnic profiling can be an example of this. To stimulate and guarantee psychological safety within the organisation, it is important that employees feel supported by the organisation (Eisenberger et al., 1986).

3. Method

In this section, the methodology of this present study will be explained. In this study, existing data from a survey on professional police stops were used. Organisational justice turned out to be a requiring topic in the data, which is the reason for doing further research on this dataset. In this present research, the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling is studied.

3.1 Participants

In this study, existing data was derived from an annual survey that was conducted in 2021 among the employees of a police force within a big city in the Netherlands. The data consisted of answers from 417 participants of which 67.4% consider themselves as male (N= 281), 21.8% as female (N= 91), and 10.6% (N=44) preferred not to answer the question. The average age of the participants was 43.34 years old ($SD= 10.785$), with a range between 24 to 67 years old. In terms of length of service, 84% of the participants had ten or more years of work experience within the organisation. Of the participants, 70.3% indicated that they consider themselves to be ethnic Dutch, 12.5% considered themselves as someone with (or parents with) an immigration background, whereas 17.3% mentioned they would rather not answer this question.

3.2 Materials

The survey consisted of quantitative and qualitative questions. The questions are all related to the main subject 'professional police stops' which is mentioned in the introductory text. The qualitative questions were open-ended. In these open questions, participants were allowed to explain their answers or comment on the subject or the annually recurring questionnaire. One example that is analysed within this study is "I would like to say the following about the subject or the annually recurring questionnaire". 130 participants answered this question, while 287 did not answer this question. Other examples are the statement questions in which the participants were asked to choose one option. For example, "I think it is important that the organisation consists of employees with diverse backgrounds". Participants could answer on a 5-point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree", with an extra option "I don't know".

3.3 Procedure

Every year, all operational police officers within the studied city receive an invitation from the chief of police to fill in a questionnaire. This takes place every year in the second

week of January. In his invitation, he explains the importance of professional police stops for the organisation. To further improve professional police stops, the chief of police invites the employees to share their vision on this subject.

3.4 Analysis

First of all, the program Atlas.ti was used to code and analyse the qualitative data from the research. To analyse the data, a combination of inductive and deductive coding was used. Van Staa and Evers (2010) call this analysis triangulation, in which the theoretical framework is brought together with the newly collected data. The aim of this method is to increase validity by creating a more complete picture and a deeper understanding of the dataset. This will be done by starting with a set of codes based on the theory, while new codes will be added during the analysis of the data (Saldaña, 2009).

Therefore, a codebook was established, based on the theoretical framework of this present study. This codebook could be complemented with new insights during the different phases of analysis. Moreover, the raw data was coded in different stages. In the first stage, called open coding (Williams & Moser, 2019), the units of analysis were selected and labelled to open codes in Atlas.ti. Units of analysis could either be a sentence or a part of a sentence. For example, the unit of analysis *“I think that quality and professionalism is more important than the fact that colleagues have different ethnicities”*, which was labelled as ‘prioritise professionalism over diversity’. Open coding was done for all the answers to the question “I would like to say the following about the subject or the annually recurring questionnaire”. Missed answers were manually deleted in Atlas.ti.

Secondly, axial coding was applied. In this stage of the coding process, the open codes were divided into overarching categories (Williams et al., 2019). These categories represented a set of codes and could arise from the theoretical framework of this study or the newly emerged codes from the analysis. An example is an open code ‘Organisational decisions have a negative influence on employees’, which was divided into the category ‘Low formal quality of treatment’. This category is based on one of the aspects of the Four-Component Model of Blader and Tyler (2003).

As a final step, the categories from the second stage were divided into final group codes. This process is called selective coding (Williams et al., 2019). These final codes could either be one of the factors of the conceptual model of this present study, as well as a new factor that could be linked to the categories. For example, the category ‘The policy is being followed too strictly’ was linked to the final code ‘Procedural justice’. The variation within the final codes

could range from both extremes of a category. For example, within the final code 'Procedural justice' both low procedural justice as well as high procedural justice were included.

After all coding phases were completed, a simple random sample was drawn from the dataset. To increase the inter-reliability of this qualitative research, this sample was sent to an independent researcher who assigned codes to the sample based on the codebook. After the codes were applied, the similarities of both coding results were assessed. Based on this, the level of agreement between the two researchers was calculated.

3.4.1 Inter-rater reliability

To ensure the reliability of the analysis, a second, independent researcher was involved in this study. This independent researcher received an anonymised sample of the data. Consequently, this researcher coded the data based on the final codebook of this study. Based on the results of both analyses, the percentage agreement between these two assessments was calculated. The results are displayed in appendix A. The observed agreement between both ratings is $\frac{85}{109} = 78\%$, which can be interpreted as acceptable within this research (Hodford, 2008).

4. Results

This research aims to study the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling. Therefore, a qualitative analysis has been conducted. The codebook of this analysis is displayed in Table 1. All original Dutch citations can be found in Appendix B.

Table 1.

Codebook.

Final code	Variation	Code frequency
Procedural justice	Feelings that processes towards certain decisions are not carried out fairly, the perception that the organisation is trying its best, the perception that organisational decisions negatively affect employees; the perception that policies are being followed too strictly; the opinion that the organisation should not allow itself to be influenced by external parties, such as society or politics.	135
Distributive justice	The belief that a situation could, should or would have led to different outcomes. The perception that certain decisions are unfair; or the perception that the distribution of certain goods (such as internal jobs) is unfair; the perception that the organisation does not act according to its policies, such as measures against ethnic profiling.	23
Organisational justice	The opinion that quality of performance is more important within the organisation than diversity. It refers to organisational processes towards certain decisions, as well as the outcomes of these decisions.	53
Organisational support	Feelings of not being heard, seen, or appreciated by the organisation; the perception that the organisation does not trust its employees' qualities and insufficiently stimulates employees in their own authority; the feeling that the organisation does not protect its employees in social discussions; suggestions to improve psychological safety; the feeling that there is no room to discuss sensitive topics or provide feedback; perceptions of a work environment in which colleagues talk about each other or make offensive jokes.	77
Attitudes towards organisational measures	Opinions on important factors in police stops; suggestions for measures against ethnic profiling or other topics; positive attitude towards certain measures; negative attitude towards the organisation as a whole.	66
Vision towards diversity	Opinions on the importance and need of diversity within the organisation; the belief that polarisation is a problem within the organisation; statements about the definition of diversity.	53

4.1.1 Procedural justice

The code procedural justice was defined as the perception of a fair process towards certain organisational decisions, or in contrast, the perception of an unfair process towards certain organisational decisions. The codes within this group range from feelings, thoughts, or statements about the perceived fairness of certain organisational processes. Notable is that perceptions of high procedural justice are not common within the dataset of this present study. Only one of the answers contained a vision of high procedural justice, namely “(...) *I think that the organisation does not systematically discriminate, but always tries to make the right decisions*”. In contrast, perceptions of low procedural justice seem to arise when employees do not feel heard, seen or appreciated by the organisation, or when processes towards decisions are seen as unfair. This is mentioned 22 times in the answers. An example is “*If the statistics, years of experience and the results show that you are doing well. Why then does our management withhold this data and hide the actual statistics?*”

Moreover, some participants think that certain decisions have not been made fairly, because the organisation’s decisions are influenced by politics or the public (7 answers). For example, “*The measures mentioned are mainly instruments used by (strategic) management to be able to prove to the politicians that ethnic profiling is being tackled*”. Procedural justice is also perceived as low when employees think that processes have been unfair and, as a result, decisions have a negative influence on employees. However, this is only explicitly mentioned three times in the data. An example of this is the statement: “(...) *The end justifies the means when it comes to a diverse combination of personnel. Outrageous!!! (...) The organisation (read: every colleague) suffers from this*”, in which the participant refers to the processes of job selection.

Finally, the most frequently given response within this code (23 answers) were situations in which the organisation was seen as not acting according to its own policies. This consists of situations in which the organisation takes measures to prevent ethnic profiling, but then discriminates itself by, for example, adjusting the requirements of application procedures to increase diversity within the organisation. Some participants perceive this as unfair and refer to a low perceived procedural justice. An example is “(...) *For example, I was told that if I had been more ethnically diverse or female, I would have had a better chance of a place on the MTL or a tailor-made programme. The paradox in this is that this evokes feelings of exclusion and specialization, while the intention of this movement was, in my opinion, to prevent that*”. Another participant states: “*We should set a better example within the organisation. (...) Within vacancies it is stated that in case of equal suitability, preference is given to someone with a*

non-Dutch ethnicity, but in practise it appears (...) that diversity is considered more important. There is no such thing as positive discrimination, only discrimination.” In other words, some employees have the feeling that prevention measures against ethnic profiling are being imposed on them, while in their view the organisation is discriminating itself.

In comparison with the answers to the question to what extent employees perceive diversity within the organisation as important, it is notable that the majority of employees who experience procedural justice as low have the opinion that diversity within the organisation is (very) important (20 answers). In comparison, only 7 participants think diversity is (un)important, while 8 participants neither agree nor disagree with this statement.

4.1.2. Distributive justice

The code distributive justice was used for feelings, opinions and attitudes concerning the outcome of certain organisational decisions. Some participants think that certain decisions are unfair (5 answers). For example, *“However, what happens now in this city is that some people are put in positions while other colleagues, without an ethnical background, but a better resume cannot work in that position. Then, I think you’re missing the point as an organisation”*. Furthermore, some participants mention that certain decisions can lead to negative behaviour among employees (3 answers). An example of this is *“This does not sit well with colleagues and does not help to create room for discussion”*. The belief that certain things are not equally distributed among employees of equal status, is mainly used in relation to the division of functions or promotions (6 answers). This is also linked to the perception that the organisation is not acting in accordance with their own policies and prevention measures, leading to unfair decisions. In the data, it is remarkable that dissatisfaction with the distribution of positions or promotions is strongly related to the process towards these decisions. Moreover, distributive justice is considerably less prominent than procedural justice.

Of the employees who perceive distributive as low, an equal number of employees find diversity (very) important (5 answers) as the number of participants that neither agree nor disagree that diversity is important within the organisation (5 answers). 4 participants who perceived distributive as low, consider diversity within the organisation as (very) unimportant. Thus, no causal relationship has been found between the perceived distributive justice and the degree to which diversity is considered important. Among the employees who experience distributive justice as low, the view on diversity is very diverse.

4.1.3. Organisational justice

The most reacquiring vision that emerged is that quality should be prioritised over diversity (53 answers). Twelve participants mentioned this statement together with the opinion that diversity is indeed important. However, it is believed that it should not be at the expense of quality. Most employees who share this opinion (32 answers) think that only someone's qualities, and not their background, should be considered when selecting and choosing employees. The most important aspect is that someone meets the requirements and has the qualities to be a good officer. For example, participants mentioned: *"I think diversity is important, but safety, integrity and trustworthiness are much more important to me"* or *"someone should have knowledge of, respect for and (...) be approachable for people from diverse backgrounds"*. Employees state that *"suitability does not depend on diversity"*. It is clear that some employees have a negative attitude towards certain organisational measures to increase diversity within the organisation, because they think that the organisation does not sufficiently take quality of job performance into account. However, there are major differences among these employees in their vision regarding diversity. One-third of the employees who believe that quality should be prioritised over diversity, indicate that they find diversity within the organisation (very) important (16 answers). Slightly less than a third indicate that they find it (very) unimportant (15 answers). The majority consider diversity neither important, nor unimportant (21 answers).

Some answers are mainly related to the processes towards certain decisions, such as the selection of new employees or division of certain functions among teams. For example, *"Everyone is welcome in this organisation, but only if that person meets the criteria. Positive discrimination is also discrimination"* or *"I do think diversity is important, but not at the loss of quality, and the organisation is currently focused on placing different ethnicities in certain positions no matter what"*. On the other hand, it is mentioned in the context of the eventual distribution among employees within the organisation, for example, *"I think it is the most important that the right people are in the right position. That is when diversity has more value"*. All answers within this code can be related to low levels of organisational justice, consisting both of low levels of procedural justice and low levels of distributive justice. Therefore, the beliefs, opinions, and statements that describe the preference to prioritise quality over diversity are categorised into the code 'organisational justice'.

4.1.4 Organisational support

The fourth code defines the perceived organisational support and the feelings, perceptions, and opinions that are related to psychological safety. This varies from the perception that there is insufficient organisational support within the organisation, to the perception that there is a lack of psychological safety. In addition, this includes the opinion that psychological safety is important.

The most common answer within this code is the perception that there is insufficient organisational support (40 answers). Employees tend to experience a lack of organisational support when they think that the organisation does not listen to them, when they perceive insufficient stimulation of self-confidence, or when they think the organisation does not trust on its' employees. For example, *"The organisation should assume in advance that colleagues do their work correctly, with integrity and without profiling"*. Some participants (12 answers) think that the organisation should focus more on the qualities of its' employees: *"We should spend more attention and time to appreciate the colleagues who are sticking their necks out. Unfortunately, this still doesn't happen, it is a shame"*. Moreover, two employees cite that the organisation should support its employees more in social discussions, which is categorised in low organisational support.

Secondly, the opinion that psychological safety is important is included within this code (15 answers). Employees mention that open conversations with colleagues are important (9 answers) and should take place more often (3 answers). In addition, three participants mention that providing feedback is important within teams. For example, *"The most important thing is (...) that we talk to each other and that colleagues dare to give feedback to each other"*. Some employees perceive their work environment as unsafe (9 answers). They experience insufficient room to discuss sensitive topics or to provide feedback, and they experience that colleagues are talking about each other or make offensive jokes. However, this is the least common answer within this code.

As a final point, some participants think that the term ethnic profiling is used too quickly. This varies from the idea that the public, the media, or the organisation refer to ethnic profiling very quickly, even in situations in which it is believed that ethnic profiling is not the case. Employees who share this view feel accused of ethnic profiling and do not feel seen, heard, or appreciated by the organisation. This leads to resentment and a negative attitude towards the subject ethnic profiling and the preventive measures against it. Examples of answers given are *"We are regularly accused of racism and ethnic profiling. I can barely stop a car without get a BLM comment thrown at me. Me and many colleagues (...) do not feel taken*

seriously, because the Dutch Police and the politics get carried away in this hype” or “The organisation should be careful that not every police stop of a person with an immigrant background is labelled as ethnic profiling. Because it is going that way”.

4.1.5 Attitude towards organisational measures

This code describes the attitude, opinions, and suggestions regarding certain organisational policies. First of all, some employees describe factors that they think are important during police stops (32 answers). The most frequently mentioned factor is the importance of explaining your decisions during a stop (12 answers). For example, *“Just let people/colleagues explain properly why they do a police stop and keep it with yourself, then you will not have any problems with it”*. Other, but considerably less, participants mention that self-reflection is important to justify a police stop (5 answers): *“I think it’s important that colleagues can put themselves in the shoes of others and can reflect on their own actions”*. In addition, a few participants state that the most important factor is that a police officer’s actions are based on Dutch norms and values. However, it is not described which norms and values exactly are concerned and whether it is believed that this is a problem concerning ethnic profiling.

Moreover, the attitude and suggestions regarding measures against ethnic profiling are included within this code. Nine participants showed a positive attitude towards preventive measures against ethnic profiling. For example, *“Diversity and preventing ethnic profiling is important”* or *“This should have more priority and should not lose attention!”*. However, four of them state that the current measures are outdated and no longer applicable. They believe that too much repetition of the subject ethnic profiling leads to irritation. Nevertheless, they believe that it is important to pay attention to the subject.

In addition, 21 participants suggested measures to prevent ethnic profiling. For example, *“The way to prevent ethnic profiling is to increase and maintain awareness among colleagues. This is not invested in”*. In addition, only one participant explicitly mentioned a negative attitude towards the organisation as a whole.

Furthermore, only a few participants reported other points of attention within the organisation that were negatively spoken about and in which improvements were requested. However, since these topics are not related to this present study, these answers are considered not relevant.

4.1.6 Vision towards diversity

The code 'vision towards diversity' consists of codes that describe the different attitudes towards diversity. Some employees mention that diversity within the organisation is important (14 answers): *"It is absolutely important that the organisation consists of employees with different ethnicities"*. Other employees argue that an open mindset towards diversity is also necessary (20 answers). For example, *"I think it is remarkable that some colleagues do not stand up for change and still look to someone's background"*. Moreover, some participants state that other characteristics than ethnicity should also be included within the term diversity (11 answers). Examples are *"I find it enduringly frustrating that diversity continues to be portrayed as (mostly) solely focused on ethnic background"* or *"For me, diversity is not only gender or ethnicity. I think it is also about talents and characters. If you only have dominant personalities with different backgrounds, then you still do not have a diverse team"*.

This code shows that some of the employees are positive about diversity within the organisation, and some of them believe that diversity should be increased. However, the answers within this code do not sufficiently show the perceived organisational justice or the attitude towards measures against ethnic profiling.

5. Conclusion

This study aims to examine the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling. Therefore, existing data was analysed, resulting from a questionnaire into professionalising police stops. The theoretical framework explains that organisational justice is related to ethnic profiling. This study confirms this relationship and also provides some new insights.

5.1 Discussion of findings

First of all, even though most employees value diversity, many of them mention that quality of job performance should be prioritised over diversity. This is mentioned in particular in the context of selection procedures for new recruits. Multiple respondents have expressed their feelings about the conducted selection procedures and their believes that it was unfair. Some employees think that the organisation does not sufficiently guarantee the quality of service provided by the police force, because diversity is currently prioritised over quality. They feel that, in order to increase diversity, external characteristics are considered when selecting new employees. As a result, some employees feel left out of opportunities within the organisation. They mention that they do not feel heard, seen, or appreciated by the organisation. Research of Lind and colleagues (1983) shows that feelings of being listened to by the organisation is a determining factor of perceived procedural justice. In combination with the fact that officers are forced not to look at external characteristics in their daily work, this gives employees the feeling that the organisation does not practise what it preaches. This is experienced as unfair, meaning that organisational, and in particular procedural justice is experienced as low. This confirms Shiner's (2010) statement that some police officers consider their organisation as hypocritical. In addition, this study shows that employees who perceive organisational justice as low show a negative attitude towards measures against ethnic profiling. This is in line with research by Wolfe and Piquero (2011), which argues that the degree of organisational justice influences the way police officers view the organisation and its policies.

Moreover, the theoretical framework describes that organisational justice can lead to negative emotions (Jasso, 1986). This study shows that some participants think that the organisation was influenced by politics. They believe that processes, such as job selection, are therefore adjusted according to the expectations of politics. This is experienced as unfair and some participants even state that these organisational processes have a negative influence on employees. Jasso (1986) also stated that negative emotions can lead to low intrinsic motivation.

According to the Fairness Theory (Folger et al., 2001), negative emotions can lead to anger reactions and even misbehaviour. However, this has not been confirmed in this study and therefore might be an interesting subject for future research.

Furthermore, the theoretical framework shows that a lack of organisational support leads to a decrease in motivation to achieve organisational goals, and that employees become more self-seeking (Simons et al., 2003). The results of this study demonstrate that many employees experience a lack of organisational support. This is especially the case when employees believe that the organisation does not listen to them, when they perceive insufficient stimulation of self-confidence, or when they think the organisation does not trust on its employees. In addition, the results illustrate that low levels of organisational support lead to a negative attitude towards the topic ethnic profiling and the preventive measures against it. One explanation is that employees feel unfairly accused of ethnic profiling and believe that the organisation should stand up for them in social discussions. Even though the degree of intrinsic motivation has not been measured, this study shows that low organisational support negatively influences the attitude towards prevention measures against ethnic profiling. The topic of intrinsic motivation related to organisational support and prevention measures against ethnic profiling might be an interesting field of study for future research.

5.2 Conclusion in summary

The objective of this thesis is to illustrate the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling within the police departments in the Netherlands. The main research question of this present study therefore is: *What is the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling?*

This research shows that most employees relate the perceived procedural justice mainly to job selection procedures. Procedural justice is experienced as low, which means that the process of job selection is perceived as unfair. The majority of employees who experience procedural justice as low, have the opinion that diversity within the organisation is (very) important. This in contrast to the employees who experience distributive justice as low. However, distributive justice is less apparent in this research than procedural justice. Nevertheless, employees experience that the organisation prioritises diversity over quality, by looking in particular at external characteristics and no longer at the inner qualities or experiences of a person. By being instructed not do this themselves, many employees experience this as unfair, which means that organisational justice is experienced as low. This

study shows that employees therefore show a negative attitude towards organisational measures to stimulate diversity.

In addition, the degree of perceived procedural justice within the police is influenced by the degree to which employees feel heard or seen by the organisation. First, this is experienced by employees who feel that their qualities are not being looked at when it comes to allocating positions or promotions. They believe that diversity is prioritised and therefore they feel not seen by the organisation. In addition, some employees feel that they are not seen or heard, because they think they are falsely accused of ethnic profiling. Most of the employees therefore experience a lack of organisational support and think that the organisation should defend its employees in social discussions.

In conclusion, the role of organisational justice in the prevention of ethnic profiling has been labelled dominant by this study. This means that low perceived organisational justice leads to a negative attitude of police officers towards the prevention measures against ethnic profiling and possibly even to a negative attitude towards the public. The degree of perceived organisational support plays an important influencing factor in this relationship.

6. Discussion

This chapter presents the practical implications of the findings of this study. Based on these implications, recommendations for the Dutch national police are discussed. The final part of this chapter will elaborate on the limitations of this study and provide suggestions for future research.

6.1 Practical implications

In this study we found that organisational justice and organisational support are the most dominant factors in the prevention of ethnic profiling. Assuming these results are representative, this seems to be a reason for concern for the Dutch national police. When employees feel unseen and treated unfairly, this can lead to implications. The first implication is that employees' motivation to pursue organisational goals will decrease when they do not feel supported (Simons et al., 2003). This study illustrates that many employees at the Dutch police department experience a lack of organisational support. This is especially the case for employees who feel unheard or insufficiently stimulated in their self-confidence by the organisation. In addition, some employees believe that the term ethnic profiling is used too quickly and often incorrectly. In social discussions or the media, police officers do not feel supported by their organisation. An example is the current health crisis, in which society is polarising and tension among the public increases. This leads to officers having a lot on their plate. Moreover, the outflow of employees due to an aging population can affect the importance of organisational support, as the workload of the employees who are still working increases (De Snoo et al., 2021). When the workload is this high, it does not seem desirable that motivation to pursue organisational goals decreases. However, if employees do not feel seen or heard, this could perhaps lead to a decrease in loyalty towards the organisation and therefore to further outflow of employees. The police organisation should realise the importance of supporting and paying attention to their employees, especially in times when they need this support the most. Otherwise, the organisation might lose them.

The second implication is the increasing chance that police officers will treat the public unfairly, when they feel unfairly treated themselves. A study by Shiner (2010) shows that employees view the organisation as hypocritical. The organisation asks them not to look at external characteristics in their work, while the organisation itself takes external characteristics into account during selection procedures to improve diversity. This is experienced as unfair, which means that organisational justice is considered as low. In addition, Wolfe and Piquero (2011) demonstrate in their research that police officers tend to treat the public similar to the

way they feel treated themselves. An explanation given by Ilies and colleagues (2005) is that employees tend to model their supervisor's behaviour. Assuming that employees do indeed treat the public as they feel they are treated, this would imply that organisational injustice leads to unfair treatment of suspects. Alternatively, research by Quinton and colleagues (2015) shows that police officers who are supported in their self-legitimacy are more likely to treat suspects fairly, because they identify more with the organisation. In other words, organisational support can be an important factor to reduce the negative effects of low organisational justice. However, many employees experience a lack of organisational support. The more important it should be for the organisation to adjust their policies and pay attention to the perceived organisational justice and organisational support of employees. Since organisational justice is mostly mentioned in relation to selection processes of positions and promotions, it is recommended that the organisation uses an open and transparent approach during these processes. By being aware of the negative effects of low procedural justice, the organisation can better monitor that such processes are conducted fair and neutral.

Another implication is that low perceived procedural justice can lead to negative feelings. Although intrinsic motivation has not been explored as a factor in this current study, the theory shows that negative feelings lead to decreased intrinsic motivation. This can have negative consequences for work performance (Folger et al., 2001). Research of Lind and colleagues (1983) demonstrate that feelings of being listened to by the organisation is a determining factor of perceived procedural justice. The research results of this present study suggest that procedural justice is perceived as low. In this study the four-component model of Blader and Tyler (2003) was used. When the research results are compared with this model, it can be stated that informal and formal quality of treatment, in particular, is experienced as low. In this model, these two components refer to the way authority figures treat their employees; and how rules and protocols affect the treatment of employees. Moreover, research of Lind and colleagues shows that having input into decision-making processes, increases the perception that a process is fair, even if the outcome is not desired. With a view to the selection processes of new employees, this would mean that when people feel heard or seen in the process, even though the decision remains on someone else, people are more likely to experience this as fair. With regard to prevention measures against ethnic profiling, it could be expected that when people have input into the process, they are more likely to accept the measures. Even when they may not agree with the measures themselves. If the organisation wants employees to have a more positive attitude towards measures and policies, it is time to listen more closely to the input and thoughts of the workforce.

The final implication of this study is that low organisational justice can lead to negative behaviour in return. Employees experience that the organisation prioritises diversity over quality, by looking in particular at external characteristics and less at the inner qualities or experience of a person. This is perceived as unfair and leads to a negative attitude towards organisational measures to stimulate diversity. The relation between organisational justice and attitude can possibly be explained by Homans' social exchange theory (1958). Homans argued that behaviour mutually reinforces each other. In this context, this would mean that the belief that an organisational process is fair leads to positive feelings among employees and thus to a positive attitude. Masterson's explanation of the social exchange theory is that fair treatment leads to employees showing reciprocal behaviour in the interest of the organisation as means of 'repayment' (2001). This would also mean that fair and positive treatment leads to positive behaviour in return. While in contrast, the perception of unfair treatment leads to negative behaviour in return. These arguments emphasize the importance of organisational justice for the well-being of employees, but also for the effectiveness of organisational measures to prevent ethnic profiling. As organisational justice appears to play an important role in the prevention of ethnic profiling, this research can serve as a basis for the national police to view the stagnation of certain prevention measures against ethnic profiling from a different perspective.

6.2 Recommendations

This research shows that many employees share the opinion that diversity within the organisation is important. However, this is compensated by the fact that processes towards certain decisions, in particular the selection of (new) employees, are perceived as unfair. To increase this degree of procedural justice, it is important that employees feel heard, seen, and/or appreciated by the organisation. When employees feel supported by the organisation, this leads to more positive feelings and a more positive attitude (Cropanzano et al., 2005). Therefore, the national police should ensure that employees feel more supported and stimulate self-confidence among police officers more.

Moreover, when people feel that they can give their input in a process, the degree of perceived justice increases, even if it does not lead to the desired decision (Lind et al., 1983). For this reason, it is recommended for the organisation to create more opportunities for discussions and feedback in a safe environment. Organisational support is needed to stimulate psychological safety within the organisation (Edmonson, 1999). In addition, it is advised to

show a transparent approach in explaining certain processes and decisions. It is expected that this will lead to better understanding when certain decisions are made.

As a final point, to increase organisational justice, the organisation must set the good example. To this end, it seems of great importance that selection processes for positions and promotions are not focused on external characteristics. When this does happen, even if it is in the context of increasing diversity, the selection procedure is perceived as unfair, given that the organisation expects a neutral approach from employees during police stops. This leads to a negative attitude towards the preventive measures against ethnic profiling. Anonymous applications might be helpful in this regard.

6.3 Limitations & future research

The methodology of this present study has some limitations that should be taken into consideration when interpreting the results. First of all, existing data was used from questionnaires regarding the professionalisation of police stops. In this data, the topic organisational justice was mentioned often, which was a reason to conduct this research. This means that the main focus of the questionnaire was not organisational justice and its effects on attitudes to preventive measures against ethnic profiling. Therefore, future research focused on this particular topic may provide deeper and new insights into the underlying components of this present study. One example of other questions that could be explored is whether there are alternative explanations for low perceived organisational justice. Future research could focus, for example, on whether employees who feel accused of ethnic profiling are also more likely to base their reactions on feelings of unfairness. Therefore, a questionnaire could focus on the extent to which employees feel accused of ethnic profiling. Secondly, the role of intrinsic motivation in the prevention of ethnic profiling could be further explored. In this present study, it was not possible to delve deeper into the relationship between organisational justice and intrinsic motivation, and its effects on the attitude and behaviour of employees towards these interventions. It is, for example, possible that employees who have little or no motivation in their work, are generally unwilling to participate in changes or interventions. New research can further explore this relationship.

Furthermore, this current study was time-limited, which contributes to the fact that not all topics raised in literature could be included in this study. The topics that are most relevant have been chosen. Future research could further extend this current study by examining a broader aspect in literature.

Another limitation is the extent to which this current study is representative of the entire police force within the Netherlands. This research was conducted within the police force of a large city in the Netherlands. First of all, there may be selection bias. Of all employees within the relevant police force, 417 employees filled in the questionnaire. It is unclear to what extent this selection is representative for the entire department. This should be taken into account when interpreting this study. Moreover, no comparison has been made with other police forces in the Netherlands. Future research should be conducted to explore regional differences within the police departments on this subject.

As a final point, this study has been conducted in English, while the data resulting from the questionnaire is written in Dutch. As a result, possible misinterpretations of answers may have arisen or the strength of a statement may not be sufficiently translated. Nevertheless, the original citations are included in appendix B, so that the reader can include their own judgment in their interpretations.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 2, 267-299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60108-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2)
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg, & R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Advances in organisational justice* (pp. 89-110). Stanford University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.nl/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KQU_nqwIJv4C&oi=fnd&pg=PA89&dq=interactional+justice+the+action+and+the+profane&ots=v80OwRouNn&sig=yfBdRiapfRyZRSjUIK9j1OMpzeg&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=interactional%20justice%20the%20action%20and%20the%20profane&f=false
- Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A Four-Component Model of Procedural Justice: Defining the Meaning of a “Fair” Process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29(6), 747-758. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167203029006007>
- Çankaya, S. (2012). *De Controle van Marsmannetjes en ander Schorriemorrie*. Boom Lemma.
- Carr, J. D., & Maxwell, S. R. (2018). Police officers’ perceptions of organizational justice and their trust in the public. *Police Practise and Research*, 19(4), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2017.1387784>
- Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organisational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386>
- Colquitt, J. A., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., Conlon, D. E., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organisational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>

Cook, K. S., Cheshire, C., Rice, E. R. W., & Nakagawa, S. (2013). Social Exchange Theory. In J. DeLamater & A. Ward (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 61-88). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *31*(6), 874-900.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279602>

Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C. A., & Chen, P. Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organisation Management*, *27*(3), 324-351. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601102027003002>

Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice: a social-psychological perspective* (1st ed.). Yale University Press.

De Snoo, T., Wennekes, S., & Smit, A. (2021). *De politie een zorg (voor later?)...* (Politieacademie Report). Retrieved from Boom criminology, Politie Academie website: <https://www.politieacademie.nl/kennisenonderzoek/kennis/mediatheek/PDF/101183.PDF#page=98>

De Vries, P., & Ufkes, E. G. (2016). *Evaluatieonderzoek Politie Challenge Day: Eindrapportage*. University of Twente. Retrieved from <https://ris.utwente.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/5136290/Rapport+PCD+Ronde+1+Definitief.pdf>

Edmonson, A. (1999). Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *44*(2), 350-383. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999>

Effron, D. A., Markus, H. R., Jackman, L. M., Muramoto, Y., & Muluk, H. (2018). Hypocrisy and culture: Failing to practise what you preach receives harsher interpersonal reactions in independent (vs. interdependent) cultures. *Journal of*

Experimental Social Psychology, 76, 371-384.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2017.12.009>

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. *Advances in organisational justice*, 1(1-55), 12. Retrieved from [https://books.google.nl/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KQU_nqwIJv4C&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Folger,+R.,+%26+Cropanzano,+R.+\(2001\).+Fairness+theory:+Justice+as+accountability.+In+J.+Greenberg+%26+R.+Cropanzano+\(Eds.\),+Advances+in+organisational+justice&ots=v800xOtCPj&sig=hPQynKZjH5dza28gHLLJIQvqCvE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Folger%2C%20R.%2C%20%26%20Cropanzano%2C%20R.%20\(2001\).%20Fairness%20theory%3A%20Justice%20as%20accountability.%20In%20J.%20Greenberg%20%26%20R.%20Cropanzano%20\(Eds.\)%2C%20Advances%20in%20organisational%20justice&f=false](https://books.google.nl/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KQU_nqwIJv4C&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=Folger,+R.,+%26+Cropanzano,+R.+(2001).+Fairness+theory:+Justice+as+accountability.+In+J.+Greenberg+%26+R.+Cropanzano+(Eds.),+Advances+in+organisational+justice&ots=v800xOtCPj&sig=hPQynKZjH5dza28gHLLJIQvqCvE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Folger%2C%20R.%2C%20%26%20Cropanzano%2C%20R.%20(2001).%20Fairness%20theory%3A%20Justice%20as%20accountability.%20In%20J.%20Greenberg%20%26%20R.%20Cropanzano%20(Eds.)%2C%20Advances%20in%20organisational%20justice&f=false)

Greenberg, J. (1993). Stealing in the name of justice: Informational and interpersonal moderators of theft reactions to underpayment inequity. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 54(1), 81-103. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1993.1004>

Greenberg, J., & Folger, R. (1983). Procedural Justice, Participation, and the Fair Process Effect in Groups and Organisations. *Basic Group Processes*, 235-256. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5578-9_10

Greenberg, J., & Tyler, T. R. (1987). Why Procedural Justice in Organisations?. *Social Justice Research*, 1(2), 127-142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01048012>

Hadley, G. J. (2014). *Performance culture meets police culture: The relationship between political ideologies, police reform and police culture*. (Prof Doc thesis). University of Portsmouth, Hampshire, United Kingdom.

Hodford, D. (2008). Content Analysis Methods for Conducting Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, 4(2), 173-181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2007.03.003>

- Holdaway, S., & Barron, A. M. (1997). Supervising Black and Asian Officers. *Resigners?*, 156-168. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-14345-0_11
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behaviour as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader-follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 373-394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.002>
- Jasso, G. (1986). A new representation of the just term in distributive-justice theory: Its properties and operation in theoretical derivation and empirical estimation. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 12(3), 251-274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0022250X.1986.9990014>
- Kuppens, J., & Ferwerda, H. (2019). *De politieaanpak van etnisch profileren in Amsterdam*. Bureau Beke. Retrieved from <https://bureaubeke.nl/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/Downloadversie-Politieaanpak-van-etnisch-profileren-in-Amsterdam.pdf>
- Landman, W., & Sollie, H. (2018). *Tegengaan van etnisch profileren. Een internationale literatuurstudie naar effecten van interventies (Politiewetenschap 91A)*. Politie & Wetenschap. Retrieved from <https://www.politiewetenschap.nl/publicatie/politiewetenschap/2018/tegengaan-van-etnisch-profileren-308/>
- Lind, E. A., Lissak, R. I., & Conlon, D. E. (1983). Decision Control and Process Control Effects on Procedural Fairness Judgment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 13(4), 338-350. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1983.tb01744.x>
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice. *Contemporary Sociology*, 18(5). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2073346>
- MacQueen, S., & Bradford, B. (2017). Where did it all go wrong? Implementation failure—and more—in a field experiment of procedural justice policing. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 13(3), 321–345. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-016-9278-7>

- Masterson, S. S. (2001). A trickle-down model of organisational justice: Relating employees' and customers' perceptions of and reactions to fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(4), 594-604. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.594>
- Nozick, R. (1973). Distributive Justice. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 3(1), 45-126.
Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2264891>
- Quinton, P., Myhill, A., Bradford, B., Fildes, A., & Porter, G. (2015). *Fair cop 2: Organisational justice, behaviour and ethical policing*. Retrieved from Information Policy Team London, United Kingdom, College of Policing website:
https://whatworks.college.police.uk/Research/Documents/150317_Fair_cop%202_FINAL_REPORT.pdf
- Roch, S. G., & Shanock, L. R. (2006). Organisational Justice in an Exchange Framework: Clarifying Organisational Justice Distinctions. *Journal of Management*, 32(2), 299-322. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305280115>
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Shiner, M. (2010). Post-Lawrence policing in England and Wales: Guilt, innocence and the defence of organisational ego. *British Journal of Criminology*, 50(5), 935-953. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azq027>
- Simons, T., & Roberson, Q. (2003). Why managers should care about fairness: The effects of aggregate justice perceptions on organisational outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3), 432-443. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.432>
- Stenkamp, A., Waseem, Z., Rad, A., Tan de Bibiana, J., Bradford, B., & Belur, J. (2021). *Examining Organisational Change and Procedural Justice: An International Cross-Site Evaluation of Two Police Departments*, 1–53. Retrieved from <https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/examining-organisational-change-and-procedural-justice.pdf>
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict*. The social psychology of intergroup relations. Brooks/Cole.

- Terpstra, J., & Schaap, D. (2011). Politiecultuur: een empirische verkenning in de Nederlandse context. *Proces*, 90(94), 183-196. Retrieved from <https://repository.ubn.ru.nl/bitstream/handle/2066/93297/93297.pdf>
- Tyler, T. (2003). Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law. *Crime and Justice*, 30, 283-357. Retrieved from <http://jstor.org/stable/1147701>
- Van der Leun, J. P., & van der Woude, M. A. H. (2011). Ethnic profiling in the Netherlands? A reflection on expanding preventive powers, ethnic profiling and a changing social and political context. *Policing and Society*, 21(4), 444-455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2011.610194>
- Van Staa, A., & Evers, J. (2010). Thick-analysis: strategie om de kwaliteit van kwalitatieve data-analyse te verhogen. *Kwalon*, 43(1). <https://doi.org/10.5117/2010.015.001.002>
- Westley, W. A. (1970). *Violence and the Police: A sociological study of Law, Custom and Morality*. MIT.
- Williams, M., & Moser, T. (2019). The art of coding and thematic exploration in qualitative research. *International Management Review*, 15(1), 45-55. Retrieved from <http://americanscholarspress.us/journals/IMR/pdf/IMR-1-2019/IMR-v15n1art4.pdf>
- Wolfe, S. E., & Piquero, A. R. (2011). Organisational justice and police misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 38(4), 332-353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854810397739>
- Yean, T. F., & Yusof, A. A. (2016). Organisational Justice: A Conceptual Discussion. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 219, 798-803. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.05.082>
- Zapata-Phelan, C. P., Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & Livingston, B. (2009). Procedural justice, interactional justice, and task performance: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 93-105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.08.001>

Appendices

Appendix A: *Inter-Rater Reliability Codes.*

		Researcher 1		
		Absent	Present	Total
Researcher 2	Code is absent	5	14	24
	Code is present	10	80	85
	Total	20	89	109

Appendix B: Original citations dataset.

Citations Procedural justice

“I think that the organisation does not systematically discriminate, but always tries to make the right decisions.”

“Het is een gevoelig onderwerp maar ik denk dat de organisatie niet stelselmatig discrimineert maar juist altijd probeert de juiste afweging te maken.”

“If the statistics, years of experience and the results show that you are doing well. Why then does our management withhold these fixed data and hide the actual statistics?”

“Als de statistieken, je jaren lange ervaring en de resultaten aantonen dat je goed bezig bent. Waarom verzwijgt onze leiding dan deze vaststaande gegevens en verdoezelen ze de daadwerkelijke cijfers.”

“The measures mentioned are mainly instruments used by (strategic) management to be able to justify/prove to the politicians that ethnic profiling is being tackled”.

“De genoemde ‘maatregelen’ zijn vooral instrumenten gehanteerd door het (strategisch) management om naar de politiek te kunnen verantwoorden/bewijzen dat etnisch profileren wordt ‘aangepakt’.”

“(….)The end justifies the means when it comes to a diverse combination of personnel. Outrageous!!! (...) The organisation (read: every colleague) suffers from this.”

“(….) Daarnaast lijkt het doel nu de middelen te heiligen voor wat betreft een diverse samenstelling van het personeelsbestand. Schandalig!!! (...) De organisatie (lees alle collega’s) heeft hier last van.

“(….)For example, I was told that if I had been more ethnic diverse or female, I would have had a better chance of a place on the MTL or a tailor-made programme. The paradox in this is that this evokes feelings of exclusion and specialization, while the intention of this movement was, in my opinion, to prevent that”.

“(….)Zo heb ik, als voorbeeld, te horen gekregen dat als ik divers(er) van achtergrond was of van het vrouwelijke geslacht ik wel meer kans had gehad op een plek op de MTL of een maatwerk-traject. Het paradoxale in deze is dat dit juist gevoelens van buitensluiting en verbijzondering oproept terwijl de intentie van deze beweging volgens mij was om dat te voorkomen..”

Citations distributive justice

“(….) However, what happens now in this city is that people are put in positions while some colleagues without a different ethnical background with better resumes cannot work in

“(….) Echter wat er nu gebeurt in deze stad is dat mensen op posities worden neergezet terwijl sommige collega’s zonder etnische achtergrond met betere papieren daar niet komen. Volgens mij sla je dan als organisatie de plank mis.”*

that position. Then, I think you're missing the point as an organisation. (* Nederlandse stad waarin dit onderzoek heeft plaats gevonden.)

"This works in the allergy of colleagues and does not help to create room for discussion." *"Dit werkt in de allergie van collega's en helpt niet het punt bespreekbaar te maken en te houden."*

Citations organisational justice

"I think diversity is important, but safety, integrity and trustworthiness are much more important to me." *"Ik vind diversiteit binnen de politie belangrijk, maar veiligheid, integriteit en betrouwbaarheid vind ik vele malen belangrijker."*

"someone should have knowledge of, respect for and (...) be approachable for people from diverse backgrounds." *"Ik ben van mening dat de organisatie moet bestaan uit collega's, die kennis hebben van, respect hebben voor, rekening houden met en benaderbaar zijn voor mensen met een diverse achtergrond."*

"suitability does not depend on diversity." *"Geschiktheid is niet afhankelijk van diversiteit."*

"Everyone is welcome in this organisation, but only if that person meets the criteria. Positive discrimination is also discrimination." *"Iedereen ongeacht afkomst is welkom in de organisatie, maar alleen als die persoon aan alle eisen voldoet. Positieve discriminatie is ook discriminatie."*

"I do think diversity is important, but not at the loss of quality, and the organisation is currently focused on placing different ethnicities in certain positions no matter what." *"Ik vind diversiteit belangrijk, maar niet ten koste van kwaliteit. En daar is de politie momenteel wel op ingericht om koste wat het kost diverse achtergronden op posities te plaatsen."*

"I think it is the most important that the right people are in the right position. Precisely then diversity has more value." *"Maar wat ik belangrijker vind is wanneer de juiste mensen op de juiste plek zitten. Juist dan heeft diversiteit zijn meerwaarde."*

Citations organisational support

"The organisation should assume in advance that colleagues do their work correctly, integer and without profiling." *"De organisatie moet er in het begin vanuit gaan dat collega's netjes, integer en zonder profileren hun werk doen."*

"We should spend more attention and time to appreciate the colleagues who are sticking their necks out. Unfortunately, this still doesn't happen, it is a shame." *"We zouden meer aandacht en tijd moeten besteden en vooral de collega's die hun nek uitsteken waarderen. Helaas gebeurt het nog steeds niet, het is een schande."*

“The most important thing is (...) that we talk to each other and that colleagues dare to provide feedback to each other.”

“Belangrijkste is denk ik (...), dat er onderling over gesproken wordt en collega’s elkaar durven aan te spreken.”

“We are regularly accused of racism and ethnic profiling. I can barely stop a car or I get a BLM comment thrown at me. Me and many colleagues (...) do not feel taken seriously, because the Dutch Police and the politics get carried away in this hype.”

“Wij worden regelmatig beticht van racism en etnisch profileren. Ik kan amper een auto staande houden of krijg een BLM opmerking naar mijn hoofd geslingerd. Ik en met mij vele collega’s voelen ons (...) niet serieus genomen doordat de korpsleiding en de politiek zich laat meeslepen in deze hype.”

The organisation should be careful that not every police stop of a person with an immigrant background is labelled as ethnic profiling. Because it is going that way.”

“De organisatie moet oppassen dat niet iedere staande houding van een persoon met allochtone achtergrond wordt weggezet als etnisch profileren. Want die kant gaat het nu op.”

Citations attitude towards organisational measures

“Just let people/colleagues explain properly why they do a police stop and stay close to yourself, then you will not have any problems with it.”

“Laat mensen/collega’s gewoon duidelijk uitleggen waarom ze de controle doen en blijf bij jezelf dan heb je er ook geen moeite/problemen mee.”

“I think it’s important that colleagues can put themselves in the shoes of others and can reflect on their own actions.”

“Ik zie een belang in het feit dat collega’s zich kunnen verplaatsen in een ander en kunnen reflecteren op eigen handelen.”

“Diversity and preventing ethnic profiling is important.”

“Diversiteit en het voorkomen van etnisch profileren is belangrijk.”

“This should have more priority and should not lose attention.”

“Dit moet een hogere prioriteit hebben en niet verwateren!”

“The way to prevent ethnic profiling is to increase and maintain the knowledge of colleagues. This is not invested in.”

“De manier om etnisch profileren te voorkomen is door kennis van collega’s te vergroten en dit te onderhouden. Hier wordt niet op geïnvesteerd.”

Citations vision towards diversity

“It is absolutely important that the organisation consists of employees with diverse ethnicities.”

“Het is zeker van belang dat er medewerkers met een diverse achtergrond werken binnen de organisatie.”

“I think it is remarkable that some colleagues do not stand up for change and still look to someone’s background.”

“Ik vind het bijzonder dat collega’s niet opstaan voor verandering en toch nog naar afkomst kijken.”

“I find it enduringly frustrating that diversity continues to be portrayed as (mostly) solely focused on ethnic background.”

“Ik vind het blijvend frustrerend dat diversiteit steeds weer wordt weergegeven als (grotendeels) uitsluitend gericht op etnisch achtergrond.”

“For me, diversity is not only gender or ethnicity. I think it is also about talents and characters. If you only have dominant personalities with different backgrounds, then you still do not have a diverse team.”

“Diversiteit is voor mij niet alleen geslacht of achtergrond. Wat mij betreft gaat het ook over talenten en karakters. Als je alleen maar dominante persoonlijkheden hebt van verschillende achtergronden heb je nog steeds geen divers team.”
