Professional Anomalies

Diversity Policies Policing Ethnic Minority Police Officers

Sinan Çankaya[a]

Abstract

This paper discusses how diversity policies within organizations contribute to paradoxical outcomes in face-to-face interactions. The findings are the result of a long-term ethnographic study on the processes of in- and exclusion of ethnic minority police officers in the Netherlands between 2007-2011. Since the 1980s the Dutch police struggle both in terms of recruitment and retention of ethnic minorities. Various policy measures have been taken since then. The main argument is that diversity policies construct and perpetuate ethnic differences. This discourse impacts processes of in- and exclusion in everyday interactions, increases 'groupness' and leads to dilemmas in ways of feeling and acting among ethnic minority police officers. In specific situations, the norm images of a 'good' police officer, such as integrity, solidarity and neutrality, diametrically clash with the ideal images within diversity policies. Paradoxically, diversity policies within the Dutch police context sustain everyday inequalities for ethnic minorities, while striving for equality.

Keywords: ethnic categorization, police organization, police culture, ethnicity, in- and exclusion, discrimination, racialization, diversity policy

a   Dr. Sinan Çankaya has earned a Bachelor's degree in Cultural Anthropology (University Utrecht) and a Master's in Conflict Resolution (Bradford University, with honours). His Ph.D thesis (Tilburg University) focuses on the inclusion and exclusion processes of Turkish-, Moroccan- and Surinamese-Dutch police officers. From 2007 to 2011, Çankaya conducted several researches for the Amsterdam Police Force. Currently, Çankaya conducts a research on security guards in semi-public environments, commissioned by The Hague School of Applied Sciences (corresp.: sinan_cankaya@hotmail.com).

1. Introduction

Changes in the demographic make-up of Western societies have increased awareness in organizations to enhance the accommodation and inclusion of minorities. In response to these alterations in society, private and public organizations have adopted policies to recruit and retain minorities. In general, the various policy measures to increase the labour market participation of minorities are framed within the notion of 'diversity policy' (Van Ewijk, 2011). In policy processes, new power/knowledge regimes, identities and 'truths' are constantly constructed and reconstructed (Motion & Leitch, 2009, 1046). Diversity policies are particularly relevant because these programs mainly target (ethnic) minority members and

aim at adjusting organizational identities and roles to adapt to macro events in society (Zanoni & Janssens, 2007). Individuals from ethnic minority groups are expected to be 'good' employees - just like any other organizational member - but the prescriptive axioms of diversity policies provide minorities with additional systems of meanings and demand compliance to a specific subset of organizational goals. Recent contributions to diversity research show how these programs exert normative control on ethnic minority members by pigeonholing them in fixed categories (Litvin, 1997), assuming deficiency (Iverson, 2012) and perceiving their 'differences' in instrumental ways (Dickens, 1994; Wrench, 2007).

Research on diversity practices often overlooks the practical and ideological implications of these programs. Little is known about the ways the presumed beneficiaries of these policies, namely minorities, perceive and interpret the constituent norms of these programs and the potential conflicts that might arise between the interests of employees and an organization. Furthermore, the literature remains unclear on the relationship between diversity policy measures and the level of interactions in organizational contexts (see Van Ewijk, 2011, 24-25). Generally, in policy documents, it is assumed that ethnic minorities are an organizational asset because of their 'additional cultural knowledge and skills' (Çankaya, 2011). These examples raise questions regarding the approbation, reproduction and contestation of diversity policy discourses by subjects and the ways in which policies might contribute to the (re)production of unequal power relations in organizations (see also Zanoni & Janssens, 2007). Iverson (2012, 153) also points to the ways in which policies unwittingly undermine their own policy objectives. Theoretical assumptions need to be confronted with the empirical realities of employees.

In this paper, I will address the case of the Amsterdam police organization in the Netherlands. The findings are the result of long-term ethnographic fieldwork during the period 2007–2010. 'Diversity' has for years been and still remains an important issue for the Dutch police organization (Çankaya, 2011). A wide representation of ethnic minorities within the police is considered important for the legitimacy of the police due to the increased diversification of Dutch society. Similarly, it is assumed that the social and cultural capital of these police officers is valuable for police work. Police staff descending from ethnic minority groups are said to act as 'bridge builders' *(bruggenbouwers)* to their 'own' ethnic groups. As of 2004, the National Centre of Diversity *(Landelijk Expertisecentrum Diversiteit)* of the Dutch Police Academy argued that diversity is not a social issue, but a business issue; diversity is important for achieving the professional goals of police forces.

I will discuss the ramifications of diversity policy measures on the sustenance and/or the disruption of power relations within and among groups in organizations, and, therefore, processes of inclusion and exclusion. The theoretical relevance of this discussion is to clarify how taken-for-granted processes in organizations have unintended and unwanted outcomes in everyday interactions. Eventually, organizational roles, rules, norms and discourses become self-evident, appear as natural artefacts and are difficult to perceive for individual members (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002). Management by others often becomes self-management and technologies of top-down control become 'technologies of the self' (Foucault, 1988). I will argue that

the normative ideal image of the 'good' police officer causes tensions and dilemmas among ethnic minority police officers and reproduces their unequal and marginal positions within the police organization. To fully understand the normative and moral control that is exerted via the idealized images of the 'good' police officer, I will use the theoretical notion of norm images (Hoetink, 1967, 1973; Gowricharn, 1992, 2005; Çankaya, 2011).

2. Normative control in organizations

This study aims to contribute to the existing literature in three ways. First, it empirically clarifies the relationship between organizational policies and the responses of subjects. Second, it focuses on the overlooked relationship between organizational control and diversity policies. Third, the notion of the racialized 'Other body' attempts to make up for the poor conceptualization of the physical body in organizational contexts thus far and highlights the commodification of ethnic minorities racialized bodies in organizations and institutions in multicultural societies.

Organizations use control mechanisms so that individual members pursue the long-term goals of organizations in a concerted, efficient and effective manner (Barker, 1999). By controlling the available cultural knowledge in organizations (Sackmann, 1991), members can be disciplined to act in accordance with organizational norms. Policy measures, such as a vision, mission, documents, metaphors, training courses and formal education, shape the ways in which people understand themselves in organizational contexts (Watson, 1994) and operate as a means to socialize staff members in the prescriptive norms of being 'good' employees.

In contrast to functionalist interpretations of organizations, where bureaucratic control is generally overvalued and conceptualized by 'hard' procedural measures, structures and targets, post-structuralist and interpretive strands in organization theory look at the negotiated and problematic status of achieving shared meanings through bureaucratic control (see also Kunda, 1992). Modern bureaucratic control is often impersonal, diffuse, indirect, decentralized, subtle, invisible and fragmented (Foucault 1980, 1984, 2004; Barker, 1999; Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003). In contemporary analyses, control is less about forced compliance and more about the 'soft' processes of influence as agents actively engage with it (Zanoni & Janssens 2007, 1374). These analytical developments explain the frequent use of the notion of 'identity regulation' in organization theories. The central idea is that control is 'accomplished through the self-positioning of employees within managerially inspired discourses about work and organization with which they become more or less identified and committed' (Alvesson & Willmott, 2002, 620), and the concept clearly accounts for the agentive capacities of individuals. Identity regulation is a very powerful form of organizational control as policy discourses are connected to the self-images of individuals. This implies that policy influence is not absolute, omnipotent and deterministic as agents can resist dominant policy meanings (Collinson, 2000; Alvesson & Wilmott, 2002; Zanoni & Janssens, 2007). However,

this process is always constrained by available discursive resources (Humphreys & Brown, 2002).

The problem with discourse-centred approaches in organization theory is the negligence of the material constraints and structures within an organization. Zanoni and Janssens (2007, 1372) state that employees are not solely controlled through discourses and urge researchers to relate discourses and forms of identity regulation to the material structures in organizations. I will make use of Bader and Benschop's (1988) distinction between an organizational and an interactional structure, which they apply to interpret the accommodation of organizational members, to dialectically connect these two levels. Processes of inclusion and exclusion at the organization level focus mainly on the relatively stable asymmetrical power relations arising from unequal labour positions (Bader & Benschop 1988, 231-232). On the one hand, these structural positions deny individuals and groups *access* to organizations. On the other hand, they effectively hinder the social mobility of groups. The interactional structure is reduced to more ambiguous and uncertain daily face-to-face interactions and the opportunities and barriers arising from these interpersonal relationships.

It follows that the permanent and structural forms of control mainly relate to the forms generated or co-produced by roles, rules, measures, policies and procedures, i.e. the organizational structure. Concrete examples are employees with visible religious symbols. Within the Dutch police organization, religious symbols are denied due to hegemonic discourses on neutrality and secularism. The relative, temporal and situational forms of normative control are reduced to the interactional level. All in all, the unit of analysis in terms of the organizational structure is mainly collectives and groups, unlike the case of the interactional structure, where the unit of analysis is the individual.

Organizational and interactional levels do not exist independently of each other. The theoretical premise is that the higher system level of the organization, because of explicit power differences, structures the lower level of interactions (Bader & Benschop 1988, 62). Moreover, the relatively stable organizational structure 'provides the conditions for certain discourses to emerge' (Zanoni & Janssens 2007, 1375) while other discourses are marginalized (Fairclough, 1998). Employees can resist dominant meanings, especially in face-to-face interactions, though this manoeuvrability is always shaped, mediated, constrained and partly pre-structured by processes on the organizational level (see also Zanoni & Janssens, 2007). My theoretical presupposition is that the intersecting organizational and interactional structures produce policy discourses and organizational roles, which are both productive and repressive, preferring and allowing certain subject positions while restricting and marginalizing others (Sveningsson & Alvesson, 2003; Woodward, 2006; Watson, 2008; Andersson, 2012; Iverson, 2012).

Alvesson and Wilmott's seminal notion of 'identity regulation' (2002) concentrates mainly on the organizational control that is achieved by managing the 'insides' (Deetz 1995, 97) of employees: their self-images, identifications and feelings. Their analytical focus overlooks two important issues. The first is the concrete conceptual relationship between identification processes (the 'insides') and organizational roles.

I will argue that rules, routines, procedures and knowledge are relatively stable and force members to behave in certain ways. Another apparent omission, due to their primary focus on subjectivities, is the disregard of the impact of normative organizational control on the physical bodies of employees, i.e. on the 'outsides' of employees.

3. Norm images: controlling the insides and the outsides

The notion of 'somatic norm images' derives from the work of Dutch anthropologist Hoetink (1967, 1973) who researched the choice of romantic partners in the Caribbean. In the post-colonial Caribbean region, social stratification was partly based on skin colour, the lighter one's skin tone, the higher one's status in society. The aesthetic and hierarchized valuation of the body articulated inequality and class differences in the Caribbean. Hoetink (1967) concludes that partner choice is based on idealized body norm images that function as selection criteria, and he defines somatic norm images as the physical characteristics, 'which are accepted by a group as its norm and ideal' (Hoetink 1967, 120). These norm images influence self-perceptions and perceptions of others as well as feelings of belonging and self-worth. As a consequence, they structure the social realities of actors.

The body is not a given natural and finished product. As Bourdieu (1985) mentions, it is affected by powerful social, cultural and economic processes, for instance visible in the study of gendered bodies and the changing physical and cultural norms for women and men. The disciplining of the body is generally not a matter of one-sided coercion but of co-creation through 'technologies of the self' and normalization (Foucault 1988, 2009). Technologies of the self, or forms of 'self-policing' (Foucault 1988), induce Dutch male and female police officers, for instance, to regularly frequent the gym, whereby they come to embody the dominant professional norms of physical prowess (Çankaya, 2011). The norm of being 'fit and strong' is valued in the informal occupational culture - in the horizontal relationships between street cops - but is similarly facilitated and encouraged through policy discourses emphasizing vitality.[1] The policy goal of 'vitality' is, for instance, achieved through practices of measuring and monitoring the body, generating statistical averages that open the way for body-oriented power/knowledge regimes (Foucault, 2009).

Gowricharn (1992) developed the concept of somatic norm images further by including body-related ornaments, such as tattoos, piercings, clothing and hairstyle. A second improvement was his addition of cultural norm images. This notion encapsulates the behavioural expectations, idealized normative practices and guidelines of a group (Gowricharn 2005, 70). Cultural norm images have a moral component: the implicit ideal type encompasses ideas on good and bad behaviour, influences decisions in everyday life and contributes to the valuation of different individuals.

---

[1] While these strategies resonate with images of masculinity, they are also intertwined with dominant somatic and cultural norm images of productive bodies in neoliberal capitalism. The body is ideally vital, energetic, healthy and able to work in order to sustain the economy.

Norm images are not absolute, finite or static but spatially, culturally and historically contingent. Despite the dominance of a certain norm image in a specific society, company, sector or group, actors' agentive capacities leave room to fight, scrutinize, debate, change, reaffirm and maintain the existing norm images (Çankaya, 2011).

Norm images thus allow conceptual space for variation, temporality and a situational approach; an employee can be privileged in a certain context based on a fit between his or her appearance and the preferred somatic and cultural body and marginalized in other locations. All together, somatic and cultural norm images serve to value, judge, monitor, evaluate and scrutinize individuals. The concept's situational and flexible character will prove beneficial in the analysis of the valuation and commodification of ethnic minority police officers' gendered, racialized and ethnicized 'insides' and 'outsides'. Somatic and cultural norm images encapsulate the normative controlling of the emotions, feelings, roles, behaviour and physical body of organizational members.

4. Policies policing police personnel: the Dutch context

In the Netherlands, the diversification of the police force is set on the agenda by the central government. Through policy documents, quotas, positive action programs, protocols and internal monitoring mechanisms, the ministry of Internal Affairs controlled and directed, through standardization and formalization, the diversification of the Dutch police organization (Kleijer-Kool, 2013). The image of a white police force serving a vast array of users in a multicultural society was increasingly seen as problematic. The central idea was that an ethnically heterogeneous police force could suppress police discrimination, reduce violence and conflict, improve contact with ethnic minority communities and prevent the social and economic marginalization of ethnic minorities. The assumption in this recruitment perspective is that diversifying the workforce leads to 'better' or 'fairer' policing. However, regarding the Dutch context, there is little to no research on how the public actually responds to and perceives the diversification of the police (see Weitzer, 2000 for his discussion on the United States) or whether migrant police officers work in 'different' or more 'effective' ways (see Broekhuizen, Raven & Driessen, 2007).

The diversification of the Dutch police has generally followed a highly culturalized and essentialist logic; through ethnic minorities' 'own' 'channels', 'networks' and 'communities', new officers were to be recruited, the 'uniqueness' of ethnic minorities was constantly highlighted in policy documents and white Dutch officers were sent to 'cultural courses' about ethnic minority groups (Kleijer-Kool 2013, 81). This approach resonates with the British approach toward multicultural issues (see Holdaway, 1991), in contrast to, for instance, France, where the political values of what Zauberman and Lévy (2003, 1090) call the 'Republican Ideal' deny the political relevance of the personal identities of citizens, such as their ethnicity and religion. The Dutch history of pillarization might have contributed to an ethnicized and culturalized approach to the diversification of the Dutch police organization.

Despite all policy initiatives since the 1980s, the percentage of ethnic minorities within the Dutch police organization has always remained behind the targets set by the central state (De Graaff & Van der Wal, 2011). In 2002, the national number of minority police officers was 5.7% of the total Dutch police force. Eight years later, in 2010, the national average of ethnic minority police officers rose to 7.0% (see Kleijer-Kool, 2013). Despite this slight improvement, the number of ethnic minorities within the Dutch police organization still does not reflect demographic changes; in 2014, ethnic minorities made up 21.4% of Dutch society. In the Amsterdam police force, where this research was conducted, ethnic minorities represented almost 10% of the total number of employees in 2002. At the end of 2012, this percentage rose to 14%; however, the percentage of ethnic minority citizens in Amsterdam circulates around 50% of the total population (Codrington, 2014). Ethnic minority police officers are clearly underrepresented in the Dutch police force compared to demographic changes in society.

A recurring problem is not only recruiting but also retaining police officers from ethnic minority groups (De Ruijter, Le Grand, Jahfel & Üstüner, 1998). Almost 20% of ethnic minority police officers want to leave the police force, compared to 8% of white Dutch officers wanting to do the same (Kleijer-Kool 2013, 73). From 2002 until 2012, 842 ethnic minorities were recruited to the Amsterdam police force; however, in the same period, 534 people from ethnic minority groups left the organization (Codrington, 2014). Hart-Kemper and Nas (1998, 3) designate this process as the 'revolving door-effect'. In line with the work of Loftus (2008) and Holdaway (1997) in Britain and Peterson and Uhnoo (2012) in Sweden, ethnic minority police officers in the Netherlands (Çankaya, 2011) are also faced with suspicion and mistrust due to the problematization of their loyalty to the police corps and colleagues. The significance of loyalty is a response to the occupational, organizational and institutional working environment of police officers, such as the ambivalent relationship to the citizenry, the punitive supervisory tactics of the management and the perception of police work as potentially dangerous (Reiner, 1992; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993; Paoline, 2003; Moskos, 2008; Peterson & Uhnoo, 2012). It is assumed that the occupational culture offers few opportunities for police staff from ethnic minority groups. Ethnic stereotypes that underlie racist jokes affect the feelings of acceptance among ethnic minorities negatively (Holdaway, 1997; Holdaway & O'Neill, 2007; Van Tankeren, 2007; Mutsaers, 2014). In addition, Broekhuizen et al. (2007) conclude that ethnic minority police officers feel disadvantaged as regards promotions and that they often feel less safe than do their white colleagues. As a consequence of these processes of exclusion, ethnic minority police officers often decide to leave the job (Siebers & Mutsaers, 2009; Çankaya, 2011).

The various policy measures undertaken to recruit and retain ethnic minority police officers is generally summarized with the container term 'diversity policy' *(diversiteitsbeleid)*. In this paper, the term 'ethnic minority police officers' refers to the four minority groups on which the policy initiatives were largely focused: the Turkish-, Moroccan-, Surinamese- and Antillean-Dutch. Precise numbers on the specific ethnic groups are absent, as the Dutch government's top-down classification system lumps members of various ethnic minority groups together as

'allochthonous' *(allochtonen)*, and so-called 'natives' under the umbrella of 'autoch-thonous' *(autochtonen)* (see Paulle & Kabir, 2014, for a discussion). The policy measures were nationally coordinated. An example of a diversity policy initiative is the 'Affirmative Action Plan Police and Ethnic Minorities' that lasted from 1989 to 1994. This national program caused a lot of damage to the perception of ethnic minorities within police organizations. Ethnic minorities appeared to have been hired though they did not meet the job requirements (Broekhuizen et al. 2007, 20). Soon, the prejudiced view arose that none of the police officers from ethnic minority groups were up to the job and that their 'colour' was the only reason they were hired. Twenty years later, this policy still has its negative effects in everyday encounters and facilitates forms of interactional exclusion (Çankaya, 2011).

Mason and Dandeker (2009) distinguish two types of deontological arguments for justifying diversity measures: those that appeal to fairness and those that appeal to self-interest. In effect, this characterization refers to a common distinction in the literature, namely that between the equal opportunities approach and the managing diversity approach (Liff, 1997; Wrench, 2007). Generally, the equal opportunities approach aims for social equality by compensating for unwanted and unintended outcomes of general policies (Van Ewijk, 2011, 684). In contrast, the currently popular managing diversity approach aims to benefit from the 'differences' among employees by its instrumental application.

Within the Dutch context, 'diversity' was previously interpreted as a social issue. In other words, the dominant meanings of policy makers and their motivations fitted within the equal opportunities perspective. Themes related to diversity were put on the political agenda by trade unions and political parties, and the focus was on target groups as victims (Poelert, 2006, 25). Ethnic minorities had to have a job, also within the police organization. Moral considerations especially dominated within this paradigm. Following a re-examination and reconceptualization of these policy axioms, presently, 'diversity' is perceived as a business issue, a means for an evolving professional police 'to be effective in a changing context' (Poelert, 2006, 27). Diversity as a business issue refers to an instrumental valuation of 'diversity' for everyday police work. Within this perspective, practical arguments dominate so that 'differences' between employees are used effectively within companies (Wrench 2007: 3). Nowadays, the management within the police organization rather choose for a bold and decisive rhetoric; diversity is no longer about helping pitiful migrants, but about the necessity of 'multicultural forces' *(multiculturele krachten)* and bridge builders *(bruggenbouwers)* for effective policing.

The essentialist description of the 'added value' of ethnic groups within police organization is very similar to the prior conceptualizations of gender in policy documents. Benschop, Halsema & Schreurs, 2001) compared diversity policies of the banking system and the police organization. The authors conclude that, in the banking world, diversity policies were meritocratic and individualistic in nature, using descriptions of key skills, competences and cognitive characteristics in gender-neutral terms. The discourse was on equal opportunities for everyone, regardless of gender. Within the police organization, the researchers encounter an essentialist discourse that reproduces stereotypes of masculinity and femininity. The

political pressure for more 'diversity', which resulted in the 'emancipatory target group approach' (Wekker & Lutz, 2001, 42), shifted the policy focus to emphasizing differences between 'feminine' and 'masculine' skills and groups (Benschop et al., 2001, 5-6). A similar essentialist perspective of diversity can be observed in the case of ethnic minority police officers.

5. The multicultural craftsman in policy discourses

The policy answer to the ethno-cultural diversification in Dutch society was found in the ideal type of the *multicultural craftsman/woman* (henceforth multicultural craftsman)[2] that forges in various policy documents, setting a normative standard for present and future police staff. With the norm image of the multicultural craftsman, the following is meant:

The professionalism of police officers and the management to deal with the many cultures and lifestyles in our organization and in society (LECD, 2009, 37).

The norm image contains two elements: (1) competences and (2) knowledge aspects. The competences refer to 'the ability to apply knowledge, experience, personal qualities and skills integrally' (LECD, 38). The following competences are particularly constitutive of this ideal type: an open and respectable attitude to various subcultures, intercultural sensitivity, the ability to learn and self-reflection. The knowledge aspects focus on staying up to date on developments in the world, as well as knowledge about different cultures and lifestyles in society. All in all, the norm image underlines the desired behavioural and cognitive characteristics of 'good' police officers.

It is worth noting that the norm image of the multicultural craftsman is presented as a rupture with old conceptualizations of 'diversity'. For instance, the norm image of the multicultural craftsman aims to target the whole of police personnel, regardless of internal differences, such as ethnicity or gender, thereby aiming at de-coupling the issue from specific target groups. The policy document 'Police for Everyone' of the National Expertise Centre for Diversity (LECD) states:

> *For police leadership and police staff the traditional group-oriented approach is inadequate to deal with the existing complexities in our organization and in society. The traditional interpretation of diversity was based on dichotomies as old/young, male/female, religious/non-religious, straight/gay, highly skilled/unskilled, autochthonous/allochthonous, poor/rich, etc.* (LECD, 2009, 37).

The same document underlines that a specific group-oriented approach remains nevertheless relevant:

> *A specific group-oriented approach remains necessary. With more 'colour' and variation in skills and backgrounds, the multicultural craftsmanship will develop*

---

[2]   The Dutch word *multiculturele vakman* is equally gender biased as its English equivalent.

> *more quickly. (...) About which groups are we talking? The police will benefit from*
> *more: disabled people, women (especially in higher management positions), people*
> *from different ethnic backgrounds, the elderly and homosexuals* (LECD, 2009, 42).

It becomes clear that the norm image of the multicultural craftsman is still related to – among other groups – ethnic minorities *(With more 'colour'...)*. My explanation for this contradiction is the shift from diversity as a social issue to diversity as a business issue. Diversity is increasingly approached from the perspective of business performances.

The explicit assumption is that police officers from ethnic minority groups improve the quality of police work because of their 'special knowledge' as a result of their 'immigrant experience'. In policy documents and scientific publications, this presupposition is repeated over and over (Bovenkerk, San & De Vries, 1999; Broekhuizen et al., 2007; Flentrop & De Vries, 2010). Bovenkerk et al. (1999, 91) state for instance that:

> *'The chances for minority members will increase when the police organization*
> *recognizes that it needs people with insight in and experience with ethnic diver-*
> *sity. This is needed because of the growing percentage of ethnic minority groups*
> *in the Dutch population, the high crime rates among certain groups in the ethnic*
> *minority population, and the growing tensions between different ethnic groups.'*

Apparently neutral competences and skills are ethnicized and become a form of ethno-cultural capital. This encapsulates the assumption of substantive knowledge of non-native ethnic groups, the ability to speak a non-Dutch minority language and cultural empathy because of a shared history, life course, ethnicity, skin colour or culture with citizens of ethnic minority groups. The situations and conditions in which the norm image is activated are (1) when ethnic minority police officers interact with their 'own' ethnic groups and (2) when ethnic minority police officers speak a non-Dutch language during everyday police work. Thus, it is assumed that, in some cases, the reactions of citizens from ethnic minority groups will be more positive to ethnic minority police officers than to officers from the ethnic majority. The (re)production of the norm image of the multicultural craftsman presupposes, therefore, a form of ethnic solidarity, identification and empathy that can be instrumentally applied for 'effective' policing. What are the implications of this norm image for the position of ethnic minority police officers within the police force?

6. The multicultural craftsman in practice

The managing diversity discourse encourages ethnic minority police officers to apply their 'own' language strategically to connect with 'their communities'. However, speaking a non-native minority language during street-level police work is problematic. As the job is characterized by the latent risk of violence and perceived as potentially harmful (Reiner, 1992; Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993; Moskos, 2008), in such

situations, ethnic majority police officers feel they cannot anticipate *potentially* esca-
lating situations (Çankaya, 2011). The use of a non-native language also undermines
the traditionally recognizable 'us' and 'them' dichotomy between police/non-police
because, in general, police officers present themselves as one front to citizens
(Skolnick, 1966; Westley, 1970; Rubinstein, 1973; Manning, 1977; Reuss-Ianni,
1983; Punch, Tieleman, Van den Berg, 1999; Perlmutter, 2000; Moskos, 2008).
Or, in a dramaturgical sense, in the public domain, which is a front stage setting,
police officers operate as a 'team' – being 'any set of individuals who cooperate in
staging a single routine' (Goffman, 1959, 85). When an ethnic minority police officer
uses an 'Other' language, a symbolic barrier is erected amongst police officers.
The construction of language barriers contributes to feelings of exclusion among
subgroups of the ethnic majority:

> *'There was once a Turkish man and he did not understand a thing in Dutch! So I*
> *am Turkish and I talk in Turkish to him. It was a quiet and friendly conversation,*
> *we were both joking and I de-escalated the situation. My Dutch colleague was*
> *standing behind me. I finished my conversation and we walked back to the car.*
> *My colleague turned towards me angrily and said, 'What the hell are you doing!*
> *You just talked Turkish!' I just stood there and really did not understand the guy.*
> *I was only trying to do our task in the most efficient and effective way possible.*
> *I was only trying to perform our mission efficiently. He thought I was gossiping*
> *behind his back. He is supposed to trust me. I would never do that! '*(Police of-
> ficer, Man, Turkish-Dutch)

It is important to note that the ethnic majority police officer mistrusts his direct
colleague. When ethnic minority police officers speak a non-Dutch language, this
act simultaneously triggers images of an assumed ethnic solidarity and loyalty
with one's own 'ethnic minority group', which might conflict with the loyalty to
the police corps and direct colleagues. As a consequence, speaking a non-native
language activates the more dominant norm images of incorruptibility and loyalty:

> *'We had a Turkish boy and he sometimes sat behind the computer and was on the*
> *phone all the time, talking in Turkish. He said it was work-related. But I must*
> *admit I thought, do I trust you? You can't follow his conversation so you're going*
> *to think all sorts of things. '* (Inspector, Man, Dutch)

The use of a non-native language during everyday police work conflicts with the
norm images of the *incorruptible* and *loyal* police officer. Paradoxically, when ethnic
minority police officers conform to the professional norm image of the multicultural
craftsman – regardless of their operational success – this often leads to mistrust
and suspicion among the ethnic majority.

The second situational factor is when police officers from ethnic minority groups
interact with citizens of their 'own' ethnic groups. In these situations, the percep-
tion is again that of an assumed ethnic loyalty and solidarity, which might conflict
with the dominant norms of integrity and loyalty. During a group interview, a

Moroccan-Dutch officer shares an enlightening experience on this topic. The example also clarifies how organizational normative control – exerted via norm images – imposes itself on self-images and micro-interactions between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority.

> '*At one time, I had a fine conversation and the gentleman could not speak Dutch or English, only Arabic. So I spoke in Arabic with him, and at one point, I have discretion right, and I use that in situations with native Dutch citizens and immigrants too. .. Anyway, so I decided not to fine the man, but I gave him a warning. My colleague who stood behind me said, 'Sure, you both speak Arabic and therefore you did not give him the ticket right?' So I try to explain and she keeps saying, 'I know enough, you speak the same language, so it's obvious.' Half an hour later she decided not to fine a native Dutch citizen, she only warned the person. So I said to her, 'What about this? Is this not the same?' And she says, 'Calm down, don't take everything so personal.' I thought, you know what, never mind.'* (Police officer, Man, Moroccan-Dutch)

The problematization of the integrity and neutrality of police officers from minority ethnic groups masks inequalities between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority. The implicit assumption is that white police officers are objective and neutral towards their 'own' ethnic groups while police officers from ethnic minority groups bear a burden of proof when they interact with people of their 'own' groups. Norm images of 'good' police officers are not ethnically and racially neutral because whiteness and the native Dutch ethnicity are associated with incorruptibility, objectivity and loyalty.

> '*Look, if I am with a native Dutch colleague and he is talking to a criminal who he grew up with back in the day, then I rarely interpret that as a risk. But if a Moroccan colleague does the same, I interpret it as a risk.*' (Commissioner, man, Dutch)

The cultural norm images of the *incorruptible*, *neutral* and *loyal* police officer are less neutral and objective when analysed on the analytical level of 'ethnicity', 'race' and 'culture'. Because ethnic minorities would have multiple passports and, thus, contrasting loyalties, ascriptive inequalities produce variations in the ascribed meanings. Assumptions about supposedly conflicting loyalties of ethnic minority groups on the basis of 'culture', 'religion' and 'ethnicity' create the image that they are representatives and extensions of their 'communities'. This ethnic loyalty and solidarity is then also assumed in the ties with family and friends. Fijnaut and Bovenkerk (1995) demonstrate that police officers from ethnic minority groups are overrepresented in corruption cases and particularly in relation to organized crime. They explain this phenomenon with the notion of ethnic loyalty. Huberts and Naeyé (2005, 36) indicate that there is a possibility that police officers from minority ethnic groups might be less likely to turn in acquaintances and family members to the authorities. However, they do not provide any empirical evidence to support their assertion. The possible tensions these authors describe are not

specific to police officers from minority ethnic groups. In my view, it is valid for a large and diverse group of police officers with high discretionary powers and who work out of direct sight from supervisors.

The relationship of the police organization with the nation-state emphasizes the mismatch between the ethnic backgrounds of minorities on the one hand and the dominant Dutch ethnicity on the other hand, highlighting and differentiating this category of police staff as visible ethno-cultural 'Others'. The result is that the probable conflicts of loyalty of *solely* ethnic minorities are questioned and problematized. At the level of analysis of 'ethnicity' and 'culture', the burden of proof as regards to integrity, reliability, objectivity and neutrality lies with these police officers, especially when they interact with their 'own' ethnic groups. In everyday policing, this leads to suspicion and mistrust because the dominant cultural norm images of the *incorruptible*, *neutral* and *loyal* police officer trump the marginal and relatively new norm image of the *multicultural craftsman*.

7. The 'Other body'

The business case approach to diversity has implications for the interactions of ethnic minority police officers. The cultural norm image of the multicultural craftsman defines the parameters for the organizational subjectivities and roles of ethnic minorities. In what follows I will argue that this does not only concern the 'insides' of ethnic minorities but their 'outsides' too. I refer to the commodification and operational instrumentalization of the somatic bodies of ethnic minorities with the notion of the 'Other body'.

In the following account, a police officer of Surinamese-Dutch background refers to the instrumental application of skin colour for 'good' police work. Despite the valuable police work that is effectuated, the respondent has ambiguous feelings:

> John: 'There was a black prisoner who had to bury his mother. The management asked if anyone of Surinamese descent wanted to accompany him. Actually, my boss said, 'You're going!' They did not want white colleagues to go there without uniforms, because they would stand out at the funeral. So I went, purely because I am black'.
> Sinan: 'And how did you experience that?'
> John: 'It was pleasant and sad. When something like that happens, the management suddenly finds you. And whenever there are fun things to do, then they forget me. Anyway, in this case, it was about the prisoner, so I was okay with it. But because he was black, a colleague was constantly asked to attract illegal black taxi drivers. He had some success too. Eventually, he was asked so often that with each project on illegal taxi drivers, he was asked to do the job. Look, it became overkill, it might be in the interest of the police, but this colleague was being abused'.

Many police officers from ethnic minority groups recognize the added value they may have for police work and reproduce the norm image of the multicultural

craftsman. However, the instrumentalized and commodified application of skin colour during everyday police work stabilizes the negative meanings of the somatic norm images of 'black' police officers. The racialized and/or ethnicized appearance of police officers may function as a way to 'belong' to the organization and to acquire prestige by performing 'efficiency' and 'effectiveness' towards direct colleagues. At the same time, the process of applying the somatic body for 'good' police work leads to tensions and ambivalence.

Having a different phenotype within police organizations thus becomes an explicit commodity and business issue. Undercover or civilian teams that wish to observe unobtrusively in a predominantly 'black' neighbourhood with concentrations of unemployment, crime and violence tend to choose non-white police officers for the job. As a result, the physical bodies of police officers, which are racialized, become relevant instrumental organizational capital. In addition, ethnic minority police officers are symbolically associated with the racialized and ethnicized criminal 'Other' – young, non-native males (Çankaya 2011).[3] The 'othering' of criminals consolidates boundaries of 'us' and 'them', whereby the 'Other' is identifiable and depicted as not belonging to the moral community. These categorizations reinforce representations of order, stability and cleanliness (Douglas, 2012). The similarities between the physical appearances of the *criminal* 'Other' and the racialized and ethnicized 'Other' within the police organization create an ambiguous position for the latter; ethnic minority police officers become anomalies, paradoxes and transgressions of the symbolic moral order, insiders and outsiders at the same time as they represent both the morally just and clean police organization *and* the racialized disloyal, dirty and despicable criminal 'Other'. Ethnic minority police officers are institutionally valuable for police work because of the association of their physical bodies with the dirty and immoral criminal Other's body. This results – for some ethnic minority police officers – in a conflict of interest between organizational goals and individual preferences.

During my fieldwork, I had a similar experience. In the example below, the field notes of my (native Dutch) research colleague Martijn Schippers describe a workday in the red light district of Amsterdam, where the two of us join a couple of street cops on the lookout for dealers who sell *fake* illegal substances:

> *We walk on the Oudezijds Voorburgwal in the red light district of Amsterdam with a male and female police officer in their mid twenties. Right now we are observing potential 'drugs' transactions, especially the junk dealers. The junk dealers, as they are called, sell flour, ground peppermints or aspirin as cocaine to unknowing tourists. The dealers know the police officers, so they are recognized in advance, even without their uniforms. They hope they will not be seen and that they can catch them red-handed in a drug sale to a tourist.*
> *When Sinan mentions that these guys often approach him, we are promptly asked to walk in front of the civilian cops. As a kind of bait, that is: 'As long as you do not*

---

3   This demonstrates that the norm images are gendered. The intersections of various identity variables produce differences in the processes of inclusion and exclusion (Çankaya, 2011).

ask anything, it is not a provocation, and the moment you guys are approached, we will catch them!' I am normally never asked to buy drugs, so I (MS) expect little of this experiment. But damn, not a hundred yards away it is spot on. A guy looks at us and asks, indeed in exactly the stereotypical way the police officers told us about: 'Pssst, cocaine? Hashish? XTC?' He holds a bag that seems to be full of weed and leans over to show his bag. But after his third sentence, the two civilian cops jump in and identify themselves. The dealer looks at me angrily and I grin back. I like this undercover work!

It is interesting to compare the interpretation and emotions of my colleague with my own. Although I had mentioned that 'these guys' often addressed me, my comment was not an invitation to be used as bait. At that moment, I did not really mind. However, when someone addressed us after only a hundred meters, I immediately felt uncomfortable. After the 'case' was handled by the police officers, I said that I no longer wanted to participate. Only much later did I understand the itching in my belly; the negative associations of my physical appearance (dress, hair, ethnicity, etc.) were used positively and instrumentally for effective policing. Yet, I was not undercover, and I am not working for the Observation Team of the Dutch police organization. I was dressed as 'myself'.

My colleague describes the event in a positive fashion *(I like this undercover work)*. In addition, he had, as evidenced by his own field notes, never dealt with experiences where his somatic properties (white, male, young) were coded in a negative way. In my lifetime, I encountered many occasions where, often more explicit than this example, my somatic characteristics were perceived negatively by others. All things considered, these examples show that these events take place in a larger context of previous personal experiences, time, space, ascription by others and self-ascription. The notion of the 'Other body' refers to the paradoxical 'on the fence' position that is unintentionally and intentionally created for ethnic minorities within the police organization. The marginalized and negative somatic norm images of their bodies are instrumentally valuable for everyday police work.

The situations described are not causally the result of policy measures. This would overvalue the determinacy of policy discourses on subjects. However, the ramifications are that actions, attitudes and ways of thinking in policing are legitimized and justified by policy discourses. The norm images have a structuring effect on observations and assessments of situations. The relatively new professional identity of the multicultural craftsman functions as a benchmark to evaluate one's own actions and those of others. The result is a partial exclusion, or the paradoxical position of being both insider and outsider, of being reduced to one's appearance and skin colour. By conforming to the norm image, individual members of minority groups exert agency and reproduce the ideal image of the multicultural craftsman, yet paradoxically feed into their marginalized positions in the police organization.

8. Conclusion

The framework of 'diversity' aims to open up organizational space for minorities to support and enhance their inclusion within the Dutch police organization. The differentiation and categorization in policy documents along ethnic lines inherently produces 'difference' and the focus on 'outsiders' leads to the emergence of specific professional identities through the process of 'othering' (see Butler, 1993). Within the Dutch police, the utilitarian discourse of *diversity as a business issue* forged the professional identity of the *multicultural craftsman/woman*, aiming both at accommodating ethnic minority police officers and increasing operational effectiveness. The organizational discourse on 'diversity' defines the normative and moral parameters for being a 'good' police officer while the cultural norm image of the multicultural craftsman, of which the diversity policy is the main producer, is mainly attributed to ethnic minorities.

The norm image of the multicultural craftsman contains essentialist images of ethnic minorities and reproduces assumptions of ethnic solidarity and loyalty. The consequence of this process is that they serve as legitimizing forces in everyday interactions, whereby the organizational structure impacts on the interactional structure, because members of ethnic minority groups compare their behaviour with prescriptive organizational norms. The norm image of the multicultural craftsman, therefore, exerts normative control on ethnic minority police officers by legitimizing and justifying certain interaction patterns; yet, in this process, it sustains a specific ethnicized and racialized division of labour. A second implication of this policy practice is that it constrains the agentive space for manoeuvrability by imposing preferred organizational identities and roles through ethnic categorization. As a result, policy processes are co-producers of the inclusion and exclusion of ethnic minority police officers.

The situational factors of (1) speaking a non-Dutch language and (2) interacting with one's 'own' ethnic group' are constitutive of the norm image of the multicultural craftsman. Ironically, conforming to precisely these two organizational norms, which often *does* lead to effective and efficient policing, activates the dominant norm images of the incorruptible, neutral and loyal police officer. When ethnic minorities perform and embody the norm image of the multicultural craftsman, this paradoxically leads to suspicion and mistrust among the ethnic majority because of an assumed clash between the norm image of the multicultural craftsman and the norms of incorruptibility, neutrality and loyalty. Diversity programs reproduce images of ethnic solidarity and loyalty that are perceived as being competitive with the coercive demand of full loyalty to the police organization and direct colleagues. The well-intentioned attempt to accommodate ethnic minorities through the invention of the *multicultural craftsman* in diversity programs thus perpetuates power inequalities between ethnic groups and contributes to the marginalization of ethnic minorities within police organizations.

However, there is a risk here of overvaluing the role of policy processes on normative control and the regulation of organizational identities and roles. I have demonstrated that the internal and external contexts of police organizations, as

well as the occupational culture within the police force, determine the unequal interactional and organizational opportunities of ethnic minorities. Further research is needed on (1) the resistance of ethnic minorities toward policy processes and (2) the variations and intersections within and between ethnic minority groups as regards to processes of inclusion and exclusion in organizations.

Ethnic minority police officers' 'insides' and 'outsides' can 'belong' to the organization because they are thought to be valuable for street-level policing. Consequently, diversity policies discipline and normalize the 'insides' and 'outsides' of ethnic minorities; they are expected to conform to the desired organizational roles. In some settings, meeting the norm of the 'good' police officer for ethnic minorities becomes the application of the negative associations of their appearances for 'effective' and 'efficient' policing. One response is that ethnic minorities cultivate their 'special status' and the assumption of 'added value' to create positive organizational self-images. Yet the instrumentalist interpretation of the cultural norm image of the multicultural craftsman also leads to emotions of being 'used' or even 'abused'. This feeling arises mainly because these police officers believe that their ethnic and racial identities are tolerated within the police organization on the condition that they are operationally instrumental.

Policing is connected to the body of those policing. The physical bodies of police officers are not neutral, underlining both the instrumental and symbolic value of diversifying the body within the police organization. Even if ethnic minority policing styles are similar to those of ethnic majority officers, so-called 'window-dressing' (Cashmore, 2002) is, nevertheless, with its limitations, symbolically and instrumentally valuable in interactions between the police and citizens.

Bibliography

Alvesson, M. & Wilmott, H. (2002). Identity regulation as organizational control: producing the appropriate individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(5), 619-644.

Andersson, T. (2012). Normative identity processes in managers' personal development training. *Personnel Review, 41*(5), 572-589.

Bader, V.M. & Benschop, A. (1988). *Ongelijk-heden*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.

Barker, J. (1999). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38,* 408-37.

Barth, F. (ed.) (1969). *Ethnic groups and boundaries: The social organisation of culture difference*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Benschop, Y., Halsema, L. & Schreurs, P. (2001). The division of labour and inequalities between the sexes: An ideological dilemma. *Gender, Work and Organization, 8*(1), 1-18.

Bourdieu, P. (1985). The social space and the genesis of groups. *Theory and Society, 14*(6), 723-744.

Bovenkerk, F., San, M. van & Vries, S. de (1999). *Politiewerk in de multiculturele samenleving*. Apeldoorn: LSOP.

Broekhuizen, J., Raven, J. & Driessen, F.M.H.M. (2007). *Politie en expertise van allochtone politiemedewerker. Op weg naar een volwaardige plaats*. Apeldoorn: Politie & Wetenschap.

Brown, A.D. (2001). Organization studies and identity: Towards a research agenda. *Human Relations, 54*(1), 113-121.

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. London: Routledge.

Çankaya, S. (2011).*Buiten veiliger dan binnen: In- en uitsluiting van etnische minderheden binnen de politieorganisatie*. Delft: Academische Uitgeverij Eburon.

Cashmore, E. (2002). Behind the window dressing: Ethnic minority police perspectives on cultural diversity. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 28*(2), 327-341.

Codrington, J. (2014). Allochtoon heeft het lastig bij politie. *Het Parool*.

Collinson, D.L. (2003).Identities and insecurities: Selves at work. *Organization, 10*(3), 527-547.

Deetz, S. (1995). *Transforming communication, transforming business: Building responsive and responsible workplaces*. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Dickens, L. (1994).The business case for women's equality: Is the carrot better than the stick? *Employee Relations, 16*, 5-18.

Douglas, M. (2012).*Purity and danger*. London: Routledge.

Ewijk, A.R. van (2011).Diversity and diversity policy: Diving into fundamental differences. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24*(5), 680-694.

Fairclough, N. (1998).*Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fijnaut, C.J.C.F. & Bovenkerk, F. (1995). Deelonderzoek IV, Lokale onderzoeken Amsterdam, Arnhem, Nijmegen en Enschede. *Inzake Opsporing, Enquêtecommissie Opsporingsmethoden, Bijlage XI, Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal*, 24072, 20, 1-160.

Flentrop, L. & Vries, S. de (2010).*Vakmanschap met een plus*. Apeldoorn: Politie-academie.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1988).*Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. (H. Martin, H. Gutman & P.H. Hutton, eds.). Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Press.

Foucault, M. (2004). De orde van het spreken. In M. Foucault (ed.), *Breekbare Vrijheid*. Amsterdam: Boom, 39-81.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population.* Lecture at the Collège de France 1977–1978. New York: Picador.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* London: Penguin Books.

Gowricharn, R.S. (1992). *Tegen beter weten in: een kritiek op de economie en sociologie van de 'onderklasse'.* Leuven: Garant.

Gowricharn, R.S. (2005). Normbeelden als structuurprincipe. *Tijdschrift voor Surinamistiek, 24*(1), 66-81.

Graaff, M. de & Wal, R. van der (2011). *On the shoulders of their predecessors: Striving for diversity in the Dutch police.* Den Haag: Politietop Divers.

Hart-Kemper, R. & Nas, J. (1998). *Exit. Een Onderzoek naar de Vertrekredenen van ex-politiemedewerkers van het Regiokorps Amsterdam-Amstelland.* Projectbureau Diversiteit en Emancipatie.

Hoetink, H. (1967). *The two variants of Caribbean race relations: A contribution to the sociology of segmented societies.* London: Oxford University Press.

Hoetink, H. (1973). *Slavery and race relations in the Americas: Comparative notes on their nature and nexus.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Holdaway, S. (1991). Race relations and police recruitment. *British Journal of Criminology, 31*(4), 365-382.

Holdaway, S. (1997).Constructing and sustaining 'race' within the police workforce. *British Journal of Sociology, 48*(1), 18-34.

Holdaway, S. & O'Neill, M. (2007). Where has all the racism gone? Views of racism within constabularies after Macpherson. *Ethnic and racial Studies, 30*(3), 397-415.

Hollinger, D. (1995). *Postethnic America: Beyond multiculturalism.* New York: Basic Books.

Huberts, L.W.J.C. & Naeyé, J. (2005). *Integriteit van de politie: Wat we weten op basis van Nederlands onderzoek.* Amsterdam: Politie en Wetenschap.

Humphreys, M. & Brown, A.D. (2002). Narratives of organizational identity and identification: A case study of hegemony and resistance. *Organization Studies, 23*(3), 421-47.

Iverson, S.V. (2012).Constructing outsiders: The discursive framing of access in university diversity policies. *The Review of Higher Education, 35*(2), 149-177.

Kleijer-Kool, K. (2013). *Multicultureel politiewerk.* Den Haag: Boom Lemma.

Kondo, D. (1990). *Crafting selves: Power, gender and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

LECD (Landelijk ExpertiseCentrum Diversiteit)(2009). *Politie voor EEN IEDER*. Apeldoorn.

Leinen, S. (1978). *Black police, white society*. New York: NYU Press.

Liff, S. (1997). Two routes to managing diversity: Individual differences or social group characteristics. *Employee Relations, 19*(1), 11-25.

Litvin, D. (1997).The discourse of diversity: From biology to management. *Organization, 4*, 187-209.

Loftus, B. (2008). Dominant Culture Interrupted Recognition, Resentment and the Politics of Change in an English Police Force. *British journal of criminology, 48*(6), 756-777.

Manning, P.K. (1977). *Police work: The social organization of policing*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Mason, D. & Dandeker, C. (2009). Evolving UK policy on diversity in the armed services: Multiculturalism and its discontents. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics, 47*(4), 393-410.

Moskos, P. (2008). *Cop in the hood: My year policing Baltimore's eastern district*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Motion, J. & Leitch, S. (2009). The transformational potential of public policy discourse. *Organization Studies, 30*(10), 1045-1061.

Moskos, P. (2008). Two shades of blue: Black and white in the blue brotherhood. *Law Enforcement Executive Forum, 8*, 57-86.

Mutsaers, P. (2014). 'All of me': Psychologizing Turkish Dutch police officers in the Netherlands. *Anthropology of Work Review, 35*(2), 72-83.

Ogbonna, E. & Harris, L.C. (2006). The dynamics of employee relationships in an ethnically diverse workforce. *Human Relations, 59*(3), 379-407.

Paoline, E.A. (2003).Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 31*, 199-214.

Paulle, B. & Kalir, B. (2014). The integration matrix reloaded: from ethnic fixations to established versus outsiders dynamics in the Netherlands. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 40*(9), 1354-1374.

Perlmutter, D.D. (2000).*Policing the media: Street cops and public perceptions of law enforcement*. London: Sage Publication.

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

Poelert, B. (2006).Van diversiteit als social issue naar multiculturele competenties. *Het Tijdschrift voor de Politie, 68*(19), 25-29.

Punch, M., Tieleman, P. & Berg, A. van den (1999). Politiecultuur. In C.J.C.F. Fijnaut, E.R. Muller & U. Rosenthal (eds.), *Politie: Studies over haar werking en organisatie.* Alphen aan den Rijn: Samsom, 263-281.

Reiner, R. (1992). *Politics of the police* (2nd). London: Wheatsheaf.

Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983). *Two cultures of policing: Street cops and management cops.* London: Transaction.

Rubinstein, J. (1973). *City police.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Ruijter, A. de, N. Le Grand, M.J. & Üstüner, Y. (1998). *Pluriform in uniform: Diversiteit bij de Politie Amsterdam-Amstelland, een overzicht van 1987–1998.* Leiden: Stichting IVIO.

Sackmann, S.A. (1991).*Cultural knowledge in organizations.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Siebers, H. & Mutsaers P. (2009). *Towards a contextual understanding of ethnic and racial boundaries in organizations: The case of Dutch police officers.* Paper presented at the 6th International Critical Management Studies Conference, Warwick, UK.

Skolnick, J. (1966). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society.* New York: Wiley.

Skolnick, J. & Fyfe, J. (1993). *Above the law: Police excessive use of force.* New York: The Free Press.

Sveningsson, S. & Alvesson, M. (2003). Managing managerial identities: Organizational fragmentation, discourse and identity struggle. *Human Relations, 56*(10), 1163-93.

Tankeren, M.H.M. van (2007). *Het preventieve integriteitsbeleid van de politie Amsterdam-Amstelland.* Politie Amsterdam-Amstelland/Vrije Universiteit.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024-1054.

Watson, T. (1994). *In search of management.* London: Routledge.

Watson, T. (2008). Managing identity: Identity work, personal predicaments and structural Circumstances. *Organization, 15*(1), 121-43.

Weitzer, R. (2000). White, black, or blue cops? Race and citizen assessments of police officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*, 313-324.

Wekker, G. & Lutz, H. (2001). Een hoogvlakte met koude winden: Een geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland. In M. Botman, N. Jouwe & G. Wekker (eds.), *Caleidoscopische visies: de zwarte, migranten- en vluchtelingen vrouwenbeweging in Nederland.* Amsterdam: KIT Publishers, 25-49.

Westley, W. (1970).*Violence and the police.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Wrench, J. (2007). *Diversity management and discrimination: Immigrants and ethnic minorities in the EU.* Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Woodward, K. (2007). On and off the pitch. *Cultural Studies, 21*(4), 758-778.

Zanoni, P. & Janssens, M. (2007). Minority employees engaging with (diversity) management: Analyses of control, agency & micro- emancipation. *Journal of Management Studies, 44*(8), 1371-1397.

Zauberman, R. & Lévy, R. (2003). Police minorities and the French Republic ideal. *Criminology, 41*(4), 1065-1100.