



university of
 groningen

university college
 groningen

Implicit Knowledge Disrupting Moral in Evaluations of Police Officers

A qualitative research on public perceptions of female contra male police officers
in Norway and The Netherlands

Maria Magdalena Pedersen

S3166333

Bachelor Thesis

University College Groningen

Date: 10/06/19

Supervisor: Dr. Marian Counihan

Co-Assessor: Prof. Dr. Barend van Heusden

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my supervisor Dr. Marian Counihan and advisor/co-supervisor Prof. Dr. Barend van Heusden, your support and guidance have been very helpful in conducting and framing this dissertation, this has been invaluable to me.

Thank you, Dr. Bettina van Hoven, for your time and consultation, and for putting me in contact with Prof. Dr. Sabine Otten and Dr. Janine Janssen.

I would further like to thank Prof. Dr. Otten, for enlightening me with your knowledge on implicit knowledge and stereotyping.

And, Dr. Jansen, thank you for conversing with me on the topic of this research, and for sharing some of your experiences in police. For this I am very grateful.

Thank you, Dr. Ferdinand Lewis for your advice and for helping me gather my thoughts and make them graspable.

Abstract

Stereotyping leave women in various professions stagnating. Preferences of masculine and agentic characteristics in leaders and authoritarian professions are prominent. Thus, renders females whom are commonly affiliated with femininity and communality, socially ‘unqualified’ for certain positions, and even fields. Police in the past consisted of only men, however with modern attitudes and emergence of egalitarian values, women are no longer alien to the profession. Still, women in the police encounter prejudice and attitudes that keep them from realising professional elevation and symmetrical power dynamics with men. This issue is not merely internal, rather, has intrinsic ties with social constructions that frame women and their roles accordingly.

My research findings suggest that men are more commonly associated with police, which affiliation influences expectations of police being men. Men and women are perceived as having specific characteristics, whereas men are more physical and women more emotional. Despite idealising of communal, and female characteristics, men and agentic characteristics are favoured in situations or affairs that projects a need for certain roles. Such as in police.

For my research I have collected 30 respondents to represent the public from Norway and the Netherlands. The countries are relatively similar and have imposed equal measures of symmetrising gender representation in police. By investigating people’s tendencies of characterising male and female difference, I was able to gain insight to attitudes and perceptions that influence women in police.

The results of this research are interesting, and novel because respondents’ responses yielded contradicting. Respondents’ showed tendencies of idealising women and communal characteristics, however later favoured agentic and male characteristics. Thus, moral attitudes were overruled by implicit knowledge when evaluating police and potential situations. Which results points to; context dependency; fear; and expectations of constructed roles, as influential and determining factors. The interview design prompted respondents to not only contradict themselves but to a realisation of their own implicit knowledge. My research signifies a necessity of gender awareness training.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Abstract	3
Table of Contents	4
List of Tables and Figures	5
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Sub-Questions	7
1.2 Empirical Examples	7
2. Theoretical Framework	9
2.1 Masculine and Feminine Affiliations: Signifiers of Gender and Roles	9
2.2 Essentialism and Natural Kind Inferences	11
2.3 Communal versus Agency in Authoritarian Positions; Police	13
2.4 Underrepresentation of Women in Leader/Authoritative Roles	14
3. Methods	16
3.1 Data Collection	16
3.2 Analysis Method	20
3.3 Ethical Considerations	21
4. Analysis	22
4.1 Main Findings	24
4.1.1 Implicit Ideas: Descriptive Indicatives	24
4.1.2 The Ideal police officer	24
4.1.3 Male and Female Affiliations	26
4.1.4 Physical Attributions: Agentic versus Communal	28
4.1.5 Hypothetical Scenario's - Who is't shalt beest thy saviour?	32
4.1.6 The Contradiction - Agentic Efficiency contra Communal Uncertainty	36
4.1.7 A Point of Realisation	37
4.1.8 The Impact of a Uniform; Baby or Badass?	39
4.2 Discussion	40
5. Conclusion	43
References	45
Appendix 1. Interview Schedule	50

List of Tables and Figures

Table 1: Category Descriptions	23
Table 2: Preference Descriptions Scenario 2	34
Figure 1: Detectable patterns realisation process	38

1. Introduction

Imagine a police officer.

Who do you see? Probably not a woman. If I am wrong, congratulation, you have conquered the knowledge of social construct. Think about how often you judge people on basis of their physical appearance? Most likely, it is several times a day, even if you are aware of it or not. This is normally how we evaluate people we first meet; on basis of physical attributes. This is a regular process of making sense and evaluating our environment and the people in it. However, in our environment we are not only surrounded by other people, but of cultures and narratives which contents frame ideas of our own roles and expectations of others accordingly. These social constructions thus play a big part in how we live our lives and can in many ways be seen as the guidelines of how to efficiently understand and engage with others. However, what if the set of guidelines that dictate roles and expectations do not reflect on who we really are? You – may be a woman, a man, a cancer survivor, a professor at a university – a police officer? But you are also more than the role you are assigned from the social categories you belong. Man and woman; probably the most prevalent and defining categories we encounter in our lives. From the moment gender is revealed at birth humans become protégés of the categories *boy* or *girl*, a role we are imposed to embrace. Expectations vary with different categories, in which case belonging to one category while trying to pursue another renders strenuous. Women and police are examples of categories that characteristically (stereotypically) deviate from each other. This means that women are less likely affiliated with police. People not *seeing* females as police or as having the skills police require, can be detrimental for their position and progress.

Perhaps evidently, it is not merely recent incidents that prevails problems facing female police officers, both in the field and amongst fellow professionals. Despite demographic differences, cultures across the world have deeply entrenched gender roles and gender stereotypes that in one way or another have accumulated systematic trends and behavioural tendencies of female oppression that have manifested in societies to variable forms and extents (Frevert and Walker 2014). In this research I have conducted 30 interviews with representatives of the public from

Norway and The Netherlands. Both these countries are known for being liberal and for embodying egalitarian values, which makes this inquiry especially intriguing. In egalitarian societies that constantly work towards gender symmetry, how are women perceived in untraditional roles such as police? In this research I set out to investigate:

How does implicit knowledge; derived from social constructions of gender and roles, influence public perceptions and expectations of female police officers in contrast to male police officers?

Sub-questions:

- What are/are there tendencies that reveal implicit knowledge/ideas of police and police officers?
- What are public ideas about necessary or ideal characteristics of police? And do these ideas match with people's evaluations of police officers?
- How does physical attributions (femininity and masculinity) manifest in how the public evaluate other types of characteristics?
- If there is a perceived difference between female and male police officers- does those constitute for any substantial impacts?
- How can awareness of implicit knowledge influence positive change in attitudes and perceptions of gender and roles with reference to police?

1.1 Empirical Examples

“My daughter once came home and told me she did not want to be a police officer like me. Good, I said, neither should you”.

Britt Isaksen, a former police officer from a northern police district in Norway said she only first realised she did not want her daughters to pursue careers as police officers after a conversation with her young one prompted her to say, ‘*neither should you*’. Isaksen reflects on the hardship of being a female police officer in a male-dominated institution, as the reason why so many women chose to leave the profession. Being put aside for male colleagues, underestimated and ignored are only a few of the things Isaksen have encountered in her career as a police officer.

She says that despite being the eldest and one with greater seniority; males of lower ranking and with as much as fifteen years less experience, was prioritised or consulted with before her. When Isaksen applied for a leader-position, she was turned down for a younger male. The chief constable said she ‘*lacked personal abilities*’, without further ado. She experienced that her (and other female colleagues’) position and progression stagnated, while younger, less experienced male officers surpassed her on every account; salary or career wise (Isaksen 2015).

In 2017, a Swedish police despatch consisting of three female police officers was overpowered by an aggressive man during an arrest. The three officers received help from a nearby civilian, but asked him to step back, as to preserve his safety. The failed arrest sparked a myriad of debates as the video from a surveillance camera went viral on social media. Dagbladet (Norwegian online news-paper) interviewed constable Svein Engen in lieu of what had happened, where Engen expressed a personal concern regarding not only girls in the police force, but what he referred to as “*frail boys*” impeding the quality of the Norwegian police force. The women were also conformed with not accepting the civilian man’s help (Cogorno 2017).

Former head of section, Hanne Kristin Rhode commented that the shift to knowledge-based focus that has been undergoing Norwegian police does not always produce the best in-field-police. She said that as a woman in the police, she has been referred to as “*little friend*” and “*young lady*” but had to work past that, if it so means working harder for her position. Nonetheless, she continues; “*if women believe that the police have a macho culture, it is their responsibility to work and make a change*” (Cogorno 2017).

“*Men are pronounced, women are bitchy*”: are the words of police officer Anne B. Ulvin. In other words, women are bypassed, and are perceived in a different light than male colleagues (Larsen 2018). Ulvin, having obtained education in leadership and in the police was disparaged for a leader-position that was given to a less qualified male colleague. Ulvin sued the state and got reimbursed for the wrongdoing (Wikan 2018).

In 2017, a football supporter grabs a female police officer on duty on more than one occasion. The police finally respond with removing the man from the premises, without further consequences. The operational leader said that “*If the grabbing had been more serious, he would have gotten a red card and a trip to the arrest, he should be happy he was only guided away from the premises*” (Johnsen 2017).

According to official reports presented by the Norwegian police union, internal discrimination and sexual harassment of females in the police force are ongoing problems. Leader of the

equality and diversity committee in the police union, Nasim Karim says it is time to scrutinise the framework which has been tailored to men through generations, until then, equality remains an illusion (Hultgreen 2016). Furthermore, Labour-inspections affirms that the police-force is one of the institutions with most reported cases of sexual harassment, both in the internal and external environment (Arbeidstilsynet, 2019).

With reference to these empirical examples derived primarily from Norwegian media there are three separate women from three separate districts that have encountered different situations of mergeable types of professional impasse's when working in the police-force that may have directly hindered them from pursuing higher positions. The above-mentioned examples demonstrate that the profession may prompt women having to compensate for being; women. Further documentation of sexual harassment within and outside police walls strengthen the indicative that it is difficult to navigate and find the right course as a woman in male-dominant (with reference to a higher ratio of men in the work-place) professions. Having established internal professional issues concerning women in the police, we face the more intrinsic question of underlying social constructions and manifestations of stereotyping. Thus, which substance extends far beyond in-work relations, with reference to that of general perception of women – and men respectively. The examples above primarily derive from issues surrounding in-work relations, interestingly, there is lacking literature on how women police are perceived by the public, and whether struggles of women police have more intrinsic ties with general perceptions of female, and gender in general. These are also underlying motives that have prompted the investigation of public perceptions of police in relation to gender.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Masculine and Feminine Affiliations: Signifiers of Gender and Roles

Theoretically, masculinity and femininity are androgynes. However, specific traits affiliated with gender have accumulated into gender specific expectations. Attractiveness is commonly measured through masculine and/or feminine attributes respectively in males and females. Male

attractiveness is measured in masculine traits, otherwise conceptualised as agentic traits. While Female attractiveness is measured in feminine traits, otherwise conceptualised as communal traits (Frevert and Walker 2014). Agentic instrumental traits are associated with *power, leadership, authority, dominance, arrogance, success orientation* and *decisiveness*. Communal traits are associated as more expressive which generates social conceptions of showing and/or *being emotional, supportive, loving, conforming, agreeable, accommodating* and *purpose oriented*. These social conceptions of agentic (versus) communal attributes and affiliation with gender, manifests as deep-rooting conventional stereotypicals (Trapnell and Paulhus 2012).

Moreover, in terms of physical appearance, the conceptual linkage between femininity and the female suggest; femininity being female and vice versa, thus female attractiveness signifies femininity and femininity female attractiveness or characteristics respectively. Similarly, deems the case for masculinity. Furthermore, depending on gender and sexuality, traits that signify masculinity and/or femininity have a functionality to attract, thus gender conformity is appraised attractive. A research with a goal to find the dimensions of beauty in females concluded that symmetry, big eyes, small nose, full lips and soft facial features are perceived as positive, thus renders socially applicable measurements of beauty for a feminine or female perspective (BBC, 2009). Investigation of masculine attractive features revealed how facial symmetry, and marked features are highly attractive. Other attributions that are perceivably masculine are; height, high body mass index proportions, facial hair and deep vocals. Interestingly, facial hair also signifies aggression and maturity, and correlates with general ideas and the manifested features of masculinity – as male attributes (Dixson and Brooks 2013).

Physical attractiveness attributions are generally perceived as positive, henceforth has a positive affiliation in various social settings and interactions. Studies indicate that people with conforming – or that fit the quintessential form(s) of attractiveness, do indeed benefit more than their deviating counter-parts, so to speak. Let me underline that I am speaking from a point of objectivity here. Nonetheless, in settings and/or workplaces that involve stereotypically entangled situations, tasks or requirements that violate elementary gender norms; attractiveness, especially for females can render detrimental consequences. Women showing authority or acting with dominance or in other words agentively, may therefore experience hindrance in form of judgement from her internal and external environment(s). On the account of physical appearance concessions, its measure surpasses that of mere physicality, rather converts to ideas of *status characteristics* and *expectation states*. The former referring to “*any characteristics which evaluations of and beliefs about them come to be organised*” (i.e. gender, ethnicity, age), each

state holds different beliefs about them. Beliefs accommodates expectations of behaviour or characteristics for the latter accordingly, which with thousand-and-one, incommensurable biases, penalises women in pursuing certain professions that are traditionally perceived as masculine or that are idolising masculine idioms that are commonly – or at least culturally recognised in men (Frevert and Walker 2014, pp.314-315). Think about physical attractiveness as a denominator for perceived characteristics and functioning. This notion of physical attractiveness is also how I intend to investigate objectives of this research; however, I will also be referring to it as physical attributes in relation to attractiveness to stipulate the correlation between attributes and attractiveness.

Furthermore, femininity in contrast to masculinity is considered less attractive for the labour market, whereas masculine traits affiliates with leadership and competence, and men notwithstanding. Hence femininity being considered a female attribute, this deems detrimental for women in the market. A logical indication of asymmetrical gender distribution in certain professions, and leadership respectively. Consequently, females who deviate from feminine personality traits and/or are perceived more within the social frame of masculine personal traits are said to have an extended 4,3 percent likelihood to achieve their goals in traditional masculine professions (Drydakis et al 2018).

2.2 Essentialism and Natural Kind Inferences

A study from 2006 investigated social categorisations and representations as perceivable attributes with deep ties to essentialism. Different categories, such as male and female have different essences and connotational value that generates implicit knowledge in people. Categories represents properties that “*make category members the kinds of things they are*” (Prentice and Miller 2006, p.312). Humans typically, and mechanically make inductive inferences from their essentialist viewpoint; hence properties of categories have intrinsic natural-kind representational structures. Despite, gender, femininity and masculinity are not natural kind representations, rather culturally perceived as such, they are being conceptualised on basis of generalisations withdrawn from observations (and other factors, i.e. religion, experience, dominant discourses of kind, etc.) and not from absolute facts. Essentialism implies that characteristics and traits attach as early as birth and the reveal of a child’s sex i.e. a female infant is ascribed certain characteristics derived from past general experiences of what female entails, what they look like and how they dress. Essences, which derive from general affiliation may have elemental determinacies that

influence not only what members of a category are per se, but their development and what they *can* become respectively. The study showed that respondents made stronger inductive arguments when presented with different social categories (i.e. male and female), that indicated people's perception about these natural kind representations. Respondents in the study showed tendencies of essentialising gender (as a category) and that they formed opinions about the opposite sex that derived from gender affiliation and socially generalised attributes (Prentice and Miller 2006).

Consequently, essentialist assumptions about categories like male, female, masculine and feminine generates, as previously pointed out; generalisations about them that have manifested and become entrenched in culture and discourse. A question arises, whether or not these generalisations connote to reality or if there are any truth to them. Naturally, to establish any strong factual truths about communal and/or agentic belonging to respective genders can prove quite ambivalent. First, observations of female or feminine traits and likings, such as being emotional and liking chick-flicks or dolls while growing up, it is not uniformly so. But presumptions feeds into theories of cultural constructions of genders and conformity.

Gender is a social institution. Physical and psychological differences, how we perceive masculinity and femininity as male and female conventions are vastly culturally constructed. Human need for '*texture and order in social life*' is what prompts constant categorisation of gender. Who we are, is the result of gendering norms, values and expectations, of which we are imposed. Who we are at work, as a parent, a child, a partner is shaped through processes of fulfilling societies' gender-determined expectations that prompt great divide between the experiences of the two. Remark that there are *only two* genders, however it is not my intention to discuss gender fluidity and categorisation in this paper, it is significant to emphasise societies strict organisation of such and conservative ideals on sexual variables. Anyhow, expectations and the experiences they culminate produce ideas of feminine and masculine in a socially constructed scale. The organisation and selection that takes place in a society happens largely on the basis of skills, motivations and competence, secondly; on gender, ethnicity and race which are all categorisations that render expectations and experiences alike. The life-experiences that yield from these, embody categories accordingly. All societies have in common this organisation of gender, although roles and affiliation vary and render different kind of people by categorisation and typecasting respectively. Men and women are ascribed certain roles that are interrelated with fields and professions. Consequently, women often appear within the frames and fields of communal or feminine mechanisms, while men in agentic and masculine (Lorber 1994).

2.3 Communality versus Agency in Authoritarian Positions; Police

A two-part study by Vial and Napier, that was published in 2018, reveal a high preference for positive agentic traits in leaders. The research consists of two studies that aimed to map; perceived ideal leadership characteristics, secondly; necessary characteristics to succeed as a leader. Characteristics were measured in accordance with agentic and communal traits. Consequently, positivity and negativity of traits were measured in terms of positive and negative connotation or affiliation of the words, i.e. arrogant, is an agentic negative trait. Participants were asked to describe the 'ideal' leader, which results yielded quite uniform. Positive agentic characteristics such as; assertiveness and competence were categorised as not only the most attractive, but necessary to achieve success. Communal traits such as; kindness, goodness and trustworthiness were considered good yet superfluous and not necessary to achieve success in leadership-roles and tasks. In general, people were willing to accept absence of communal traits in favour for agentic ones, of which the researchers conclude might be detrimental for women, hence agentic traits are primarily perceived as masculine and stereotypically; male characteristics. Moreover, male respondents were more in favour of agentic traits, while females and some males indicated higher tolerance and liking of communal traits. Correspondingly, the latter group expressed less tolerance for negative agentic traits such as stubbornness and arrogance. Nonetheless, both men and women signified agentic traits as the emblem of successful leadership.

The study further disclosed deviating perceptions about dominance in males and females. While dominant females are associated as being controlling, male dominance have ties with leadership and status. Agentic and communal affiliation to masculinity and femininity; men and women accordingly, suggest that men are more attractive leader-personas from a public's perspective. The concentration of men in leader-positions and decision- making roles maintains its structure, hence men value agentic- type leaderships than they do communal and therefore function as 'gatekeepers' of the masculine environment (Vial and Napier 2018). For this research, I will extend the meaning of leadership as referred to in this study. Leadership and the notion of authority as mentioned earlier, share similar attributions and affiliations to agential and masculine traits that can apply for various settings, such as the police; that embody specific ideas of authority and power. Hence, police quite frankly are authority.

A study led by doctorate K.L. Badura investigated aggregated results from almost 60 years of data, of collectively 19 000 respondents. The study shows that in general, men are preferred in leadership roles before women, hence men stimulates social ideas surrounding masculinity, authority and leadership. But also because of perceived general trustworthiness, which may or may not be a direct correlate to perceived authority and confidence. Femininity and communality are appreciated features, but not associated with leadership. Because of this there is often misjudgement in good leader-qualities. The study revealed that confidence and loudness was considered attractive in a leader, however concluded that these qualities often overshadowed other important qualities. Thus, persons that were hired on basis of those qualities later rendered unfit for the leadership role for lacking important competence. By that, one can also conclude that perceived 'masculine' traits are, although preferred not always the best or efficient of choices (Badura et al 2018). General literature on women and leadership focus on how women should adjust for leadership jobs, and how women can act more dominant and become more confident. Little about facilitating or adjusting the environment itself. Moreover, women who voice the matter are often socially sanctioned, and their opinion discarded before that of male personas (Lenkic 2019).

2.4 Underrepresentation of Women in Leader/Authoritative Roles

Women are with less likelihood associated as authoritative due to the aforementioned aspects of essentialism and categorisation in the social institution of gender and are as a result underrepresented in certain fields and professions. That accounts for all professions and fields, however, the number of female leaders vary from specific fields, those being perceived as more masculine respectively. Although this is the case for men as well, what makes professional struggles for females inherently more conflicting is the nature of restrictions they face. History of female exclusion from various fields, professions, education and public spheres explains some of the asymmetrical relations between men and women. Thus, some of the attractiveness of masculine traits that are culturally not recognised in the 'average' woman. In Norway, there has been a rapid expansion of women entering leaderships. 38% of leaders are women, which is an adjustment from 32% in 2011. However, the Norwegian statistical bureau calculated that 69% were within the public sector which also explains a remaining wage-gap between men and women (Statistics Norway 2019). Whereas women earn 86% of what men does (Statistics Norway 2017).

The police directorate in Norway launched a plan in 2016 that sought to enforce women in the police force and create a symmetrical percentage balance between genders in leader positions (Brunmark 2018). By 2019, women in the Norwegian police has made a big power leap and are currently occupying 34% of leader-positions within the police. There are more female applicants and students than ever recorded in the past, and it is estimated that roughly 50% of all applicants are women. Interestingly, despite an increasing symmetrical balance of genders in the police force, competent and eligible women, are allegedly not applying for leader-positions. The reason for that still being undiscovered (Politidirektoratet 2019). Furthermore, statistics provided by the Norwegian police academy show that 46% of admissions are women, which is a contrast from 2006 and 32%. Police in Norway have, according to the information they provide, realised that variety within the force contribute to not only diversity, but is complimentary and constitute varied competence (PHS 2019). The police in Norway have since 2014 implemented some new standards for police education which revolves heavily around theory and knowledge (PHS 2014). Norwegian police are known world-wide for being non-violent, and for not carrying weapons (Weller 2015).

In the Netherlands, the case is not too different from that of Norway. The goal of the Dutch emancipation policies per 2016 were to further accommodate equal gender opportunities, liberties and shared responsibilities. That also entails recruiting more women for leadership positions. According to Statistics Netherlands, women occupy 25% of leader-positions in the country, and still has a long way to go to reach their goals. Like Norway, despite women pursuing higher education, statistics show that women do not have high ambitions as men and therefore also tend not to pursue higher/leader-positions. Which main reasons allegedly root in women's priorities to stay home and take care of children, and women decreased professional value after birthing, among other things (SCP 2018). This statement is rather trivialising. Since women's roles such as caring for children are also, at least in part, product of social construction. I would like to acknowledge that employee rate, and other dimensions constituting gender gaps has deep rooted complexities, of which I do not intend to unveil in this paper.

Per the latest accessible reports from 2016, 22% of leader-positions in the Dutch police force are occupied by women, which in contrast to Norway seems rather asymmetrical (Winterman 2016). Nevertheless, numbers are on the rise and women continue to make professional progress in the police. Accordingly, women in the Dutch police force constitute 32% of positions, while men still have an upper hand with 68% (Jaarverantwoording 2016). Like police in Norway, the Dutch police has implemented knowledge-based strategies in their educational programme

(Politieacademie 2019). The public generally trust police and authorities in the Netherlands, tolls says (Statistics Netherlands 2016). The population of both Norway and the Netherlands has high trust in police, more than what they do in other governing institutions. Per 2014, 68% of Norwegians and 79% of Netherlands claimed their trust in police. The reason being that corruption in police is minimal, and the function and reputation of police remains intact (Schaap and Scheepers 2014).

Although Norway and the Netherlands come across as fairly similar, the World Economic Forum's 2018 'Gender Gap Index Report' suggest a significant gap. The gender gap of a country is measured through observed deviations between genders in; education and skills, healthy life expectancies, seats in the parliament, work participation, leadership etc. (World Economic Forum 2018, pp. 6-11). The Netherlands ranks 27 and is among the lowest ranking West-European countries, nevertheless has made progress in closing its gender gap since the previous year. Specifically, with regards to minimising gender wage-gap. Norway on the other hand are among the top ranked countries in the world and rank number two, just beneath Iceland. Norway defends its position with continuous progression and sustenance of economic participation, political empowerment, opportunities, etc. yet, just like the Netherlands, Norway have to make greater efforts to close its *wage gender-gap* which is per this date, the primary hold-back of gender equality, or rather symmetry (Ibid, WEF, 2018, p.26-29). In other words, Norway and the Netherlands render relatively equal in terms of police and gender distribution, however the Netherlands generally have a bigger gender-gap than Norway. Which might have impacts of public perceptions of traditional roles of genders.

3. Methodology

The strategies that was applied for this research was conducted within the framework of qualitative methodologies.

3.1 Data Collection

A brief case study on Norwegian empirical examples of female personal encounters with working in the police force was conducted with the purpose to add some contextual background to the

topic. This section has a purpose to function as grounding theory, along with the framework that aids in understanding the phenomenon of investigation and to shed light on surrounding problematics.

In order to gain in-depth information about people's perception about female police officers contra male police officers, interviews deemed the most applicable method. Data for this research was extracted using a structured interview schedule (see Appendix 1.), with a mix of short-and open-ended questions. All participants were asked the same questions as structured in the format, however more flexibility was adapted for the probing questions. The purpose of this was first, to ensure certain answers to specific questions that could both; contribute to more accessible data that are easily compiled in an analysis as to uncover specific objectives relevant for this inquiry. Moreover, the flexible probing questions enabled more personalised interviews, that was framed to participant's responses suitably. In terms of the interview structure and ordering of questions, I used a *hybrid* question-ordering method. This structure enabled more lenience in ordering of specific and general and/or abstract questions (Dunn 2016).

As a strategy to enhance participant engagement and connectedness to the topic, photographic elicitation was incorporated in interviews. According to sociologist and photographer Douglas A. Harper, photo elicitation is a method of using photographs in interviewing as a strategy to evoke different responses than mere words can do:

"The difference between interviews using images and text, and interviews using words alone lies in the ways we respond to these two forms of symbolic representation. This has a physical basis: the parts of the brain that process visual information are evolutionarily older than the parts that process verbal information. Thus images evoke deeper elements of human consciousness than do words; exchanges based on words alone utilize less of the brain's capacity than do exchanges in which the brain is processing images as well as words" (p.13).

Harper thus favours the use of photography in research interviews because they function as a stimulus to other senses that may produce more, or other types of information. Information that might be prompted by feelings, emotions or memories elicited by the photograph(s) presented (Harper 2002, p.13-15).

The specific objectives were not given to participants beforehand with the intention to not cloud or influence participant's responses. The goal with the types of interviews was to gain knowledge and insight about respondent's first and initial ideas concerning what type of person do they first and foremost associate as a police officer – without any contextual information or influences of

what that is, per se. Therefore, the hybrid structure seemed a strategically good choice as to maintain specific objectives relatively hidden, so to speak.

Process

Personal information about participants are treated as confidential, and respondents are referred to with their respondent code (country, gender, occupation; students or working, and respondent nr. e.g. NOFSR7). Respondents were provided an informed consent form to sign, to ensure their anonymity before the start of the interview. The consent form stated that the interview was about their perception of the police, and that the specific objectives of the research would be revealed to them at the end of the interview. Consequently, participants had the choice to discard of their information and interview once the specific objectives were revealed to them (or whenever they would wish to withdraw). None of the respondents choose to end the interview or discard of their information. I will, however discuss some reactions I got from participants later in this paper.

The interview was structured as having two main parts (see Appendix 1). The first part involved general questions that was constructed to uncover respondents' initial ideas about police; characteristics, roles, and personal affiliations. Respondents were asked to; imagine a police officer, and then explain what that police officer looked like, and to explain ideal or necessary characteristics of a police officer.

In the first part, respondents were also introduced to five visual elements. The first four were introduced simultaneously. Respondents were asked to describe the person in each picture using as few words as possible. Each person fit within a certain frame of feminine or masculine traits, as derived from the conceptual framework:

- **Picture number 1;** depicts a **female** police officer whose **physical** characteristics corresponds with measurable dimensions of '**feminine**' perceived features such as symmetrical facial features, big eyes, small nose, full lips and soft facial features (BBC, 2019).
- **Picture number 2;** depicts a **male** police officer whose **physical** characteristics corresponds with measurable dimensions of '**feminine**' perceived features such as symmetrical facial features, big eyes, small nose, full lips and soft facial features (ibid).
- **Picture number 3;** depicts a **female** police officer whose **physical** characteristics corresponds with measurable dimensions of '**masculine**' perceived features such as symmetrical facial features, height, relatively high body mass index proportions and distinct jaws/hard facial features (Dixon and Brooks 2019).

- **Picture number 4;** depicts a **male** police officer whose **physical** characteristics corresponds with measurable dimensions of ‘**masculine**’ perceived features such as symmetrical facial features, height, relatively high body mass index proportions and distinct jaws/hard facial features (ibid).

(Picture 1,2,3, and 4, depicts Norwegian police officers and were originally supposed to be given only to the Norwegian respondents. Dutch examples were to be given to the Dutch respondents. Once interviews with the Norwegian group was initiated, some respondents took note of police uniforms. Therefore, the same photo examples were provided for both groups, as to investigate whether there was any noticeable difference in how people perceived the uniforms (especially on basis of personal affiliation, hence Norwegian respondents are familiar with Norwegian uniforms).

Furthermore, respondents were asked to imagine two scenarios, one accompanied by a photograph, one only verbally. The purpose of the scenarios was to map potential contradictions in responses and choices.

- **Picture 5, scenario 1;** depicts a female police officer restraining a visibly larger male (there is also a male police officer in the background-out of focus. He is also not presented). Respondents were presented the situation: *Here is a picture of a police officer arresting a male subject. Imagine that the man in this picture refuses arrest and starts to act violently.* They were then asked to describe the hypothetical scenario of: *What happens next?*²
- **Scenario 2;** *Imagine yourself in a dangerous situation- you’re getting robbed by two large-looking men. You have no way of defending yourself and they both look and seem hostile. You call the police and ask for help. Let us assume for the sake of this question that you are presented with a choice; which one of these police officers (1,2,3,4) would you have responded to the scene? And why? Assuming police is unarmed.*

The second part of the interview was compiled of more specific questions intended for the respondent to reflect on his/her descriptions of the first four visual elements. Moreover, on differences between men and women, masculinity and femininity, and variable attributions of men and women. The final two questions are the *Devil’s advocate* perspectives, prompting respondents to reflect on the controversiality of prospective implementations/solutions in form of restrictions for female police officers (Dunn 2016, p.155). To conclude the interview,

respondents were asked if they had any further questions or comments before revealing the specific objectives of the interview.

Participants

The sample groups are relatively homogenous, considering respondents were picked on basis of being Dutch and/or Norwegian citizens (or having lived in the respective countries for longer than 10 years). However, with some variety in the respondents, it generated three main sample groups: 10 Dutch students, 10, Norwegian students, 10 Norwegian working group (above 40 years of age). Additionally, there is a 50% ratio of males and females in every sample group.

Because of my ties to Norway and the Netherlands, it made sense to narrow my research to those areas accordingly. Participants were selected as to fit the aforementioned criteria, but also because of being *typical*, hence their being a part of Norwegian or Dutch society (Stratford and Bradshaw 2016, p124). Interviews took place in Norway for Norwegian respondents and in the Netherlands for Dutch respondents. They were all conducted in person, at various locations that deemed convenient for the respondents, i.e. at their work or home.

3.2 Analysis Method

Qualitative content analysis techniques were performed as a method of extrapolating meaningful content with contextual importance. A qualitative content analysis is an empirical, controlled methodology which by systematising text (audio and interview summaries), specifically that of communication; endeavours rigorous analysis of content and meaning (Mayring 2000). Thus, meaning is detected through a coding process where relevant text is categorised using codes that help systematise data. The purpose of coding was to be able to infer potential correlations between the grounded theory and the collected data, prospectively; expand on existing theory (Drisko and Maschi 2015). Creating categorical codes is a way of summing data that simplifies revision and validation of findings, which deems useful during and after the research.

The process of the analysis is therefore quite straight forward; audio is revised and summarised for encapsulating relevant material in a meaningful manner; which entails that the summarised content must be explanatory of code(s), and vice versa. More detailed transcripts are provided where deemed necessary, and when directly referenced. Codes facilitate for processability of data that can easily be translated into meaningful textual representation of findings (Drisko and Maschi 2015).

3.3 Ethical considerations

The main ethical issue in this research revolve around the withholding of specific objectives before the interview was completed. As mentioned, none of the respondents chose to withdraw their information from the research, but multiple people had noteworthy reactions which I intend to discuss more in-depth later. Some expressed that they felt their responses were unsatisfactory, so to speak, however when specific objectives were explained, respective respondents found the study interesting. As a result, discussions and conversations about it continued after the recording had been switched off, which in hindsight could have benefited from further recording. For instance, a feedback survey could have helped track respondents' experience and afterthoughts. I will discuss some of the thoughts that was shared with me to shed light on respondents' experience of the interview, and topic itself. Some of which was shared while the recording was still on, others where recordings had been switched off, in normal conversation. For the latter situation, respondents were consulted with and asked if afterthoughts they shared could be discussed. In which case the respondents that were asked did consent, however was never provided new consent agreements. Because of this, these respondents will not be directly referred to. I am aware that this might influence the value of data that derives from it, although I intend to use this information as a base of reflection, thus focus primarily on information that is verifiable in recordings.

Moreover, the sample groups were relatively homogenous, whereas there was little ethnic variation. This was not an explicit choice; regardless, the focus of this research is to investigate female and male variance. Ethnicity is a complex issue, with definite ties with physical attributes and categorisation, no doubt. However, would render a far more complex investigation than what this research could possibly include in a fruitful manner. Ethnic categorisation in relation to police could on the other hand inspire a new investigation.

Positionality

The situatedness and differences between men and women, and femininity and masculinity accordingly, can be interpreted as topics of controversy. Thus, can also be sensitive or difficult themes to discuss, especially with entrenched stereotypes. These are things I, as a researcher needed to be aware of, both during and after interviews when interpreting data. Especially considering my positionality as a female, which affiliations are discussed throughout this research and by interviewees. Furthermore, my personal experiences as a woman, which may or may not

relate to objectives that are being discussed or communicated might be influenced by information bias, that needs to be approached with reflexivity. It is important that this critical reflexivity is sustained throughout and that respondents do not feel uncomfortable or exposed for judgement (Downing 2016). As an effort to ensure the well-being of respondents, conversations or discussions were maintained after the end of the interviews, where I also expressed some personal thoughts about the topic as to continue good rapport and reflection.

4. Analysis

The interview data coding process yielded a few distinct categories which I have used as points of reference throughout this analysis. Below, is the list of codes/categories that rendered most relevant for this analysis. The list consists of both *analytical* and *descriptive codes*, the former developed through analysis and interpretation (often with reference to the conceptual framework), whilst the latter represents information that is relatively obvious (and does not require much analytic interpretation). The latter categories were predetermined (*initial codes; Agentic, Communal, Implicit ideas, physical attribution/attraction*) as to map potential, yet specific themes derived directly from the framework in interview data (Cope, 2016).

Table 1. Category Description

<i>Code</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Example</i>
	<i>(Analytical)</i>	
<i>Implicit Knowledge</i>	Language/phrasings that indicates implicit knowledge and natural kind inferences of respondent	Use of ‘ <i>he</i> ’, ‘ <i>man</i> ’, ‘ <i>typical</i> ’/‘ <i>normal</i> ’, i.e. when asked about ideal characteristics of a police officer the respondent says; ‘ <i>he</i> needs to be...’, or ‘ <i>he looks like typical police</i> ’
<i>Reflection</i>	Reflection on specific ideas or topics by respondent	Reflection about stereotypes, gender-roles, etc.
<i>Realisation</i>	Signs that the respondent has come to a realisation of specific research objectives and/or contradictions in own responses	Body-language (observed), verbal expressions, i.e. excusing/apologetic of own responses and/or attitudes
<i>Agentic / Agentic Negatives</i>	Specific words/descriptions that are compatible with theory on agentic traits and/or affiliation. These might be used in positive or negative terms	e.g. ‘authoritative’, ‘leader/boss’, ‘decisive’. Negative; ‘arrogant’, ‘dominant’
<i>Communal/ Communal Negatives</i>	Specific words/descriptions that are compatible with theory on communal traits and/or affiliation. These might be used in positive or negative terms	e.g. ‘caring’, ‘accommodating’. Negative; ‘too kind’
	<i>(Descriptive)</i>	
<i>Neutral</i>	Words/descriptions that are relatively neutral; by itself does not (directly) affiliate with agency/communality, etc.	e.g. ‘experience’, ‘age’, etc.
<i>Uniform</i>	Specific observations of uniform(s) made by respondent	Remarks of uniform colour such as ‘baby-blue’, ‘black-leather’
<i>Observation/Affiliation</i>	Observations, experiences, affiliations, made explicit by respondent	Notes of situatedness, picture setting, own ideas (own experience), or other circumstantial elements
<i>Physical Attribution</i>	Respondent observations and descriptions of physical capacity and/or attributes (especially during photo elicitation)	Use of words/descriptions that signify positive and/or negative physical capacities, i.e. ‘weak’, ‘strong’ therefore ‘capable’, ‘too small’, etc.

4.1 Main Findings

(Sub-headings are informative of general/specific observations derived from analysis and function to guide the reader in locating specific ideas or prominent findings. Categories and findings may overlap, and objectives might not appear chronologically.)

4.1.1 Implicit ideas: Descriptive Indicatives

How do we think about police in terms of *who* they are, *what* they are, and *how* they are? When asked to imagine a police officer, who, what, and how, constitutes people's initial, implicit ideas? The findings suggest, first and foremost; male.

14 of 30 respondents specified that the police officer in their imagination was a 'man' and/or 'male' in conversation, without further reflection of gender. An additional 7 respondents referred to a 'he', such as in; '*he is...*', '*he should be...*', while 8 specified that the person in their imagination had both, or either; 'short hair' and 'beard'/'stubble'. The frequent use of '*man*', '*male*', and other specifications that are primarily detectable in men (i.e. '*cut short hair*' and '*beard*'), indicates that the majority have specific ideas about police being men, may it be conscious or not. Interestingly, the reoccurrence of 'he' reveals that at least 7 respondents have implicit, intuitive ideas about police being male persona. It is not certain where the implicit correlation between male and police derive, although potentially due to police has long been a male dominated profession. Therefore, men are more commonly observed as police, which naturally induce the essence of police, and the police officer respectively as such (Prentice and Miller 2006). Further, this imply that perhaps women are not as commonly in the field as men, and therefore not visible for the public either. Regarding the empirical examples, where women were obstructed from certain positions and missions, this prompts a speculation of potential manifestations - or continuance rather; police are perceived as men. Consequently, obstruct women to pursue certain roles (e.g. Isaksen 2015).

4.1.2 The Ideal police officer

So, police are men. But what characteristics are most appreciated in police? Respondents were asked to describe ideal or necessary characteristics or traits of a police officer. Nine respondents

(Dutch respondents in majority), listed only agentic characteristics as ideal characteristics. ‘Confident’, ‘decisive’, ‘strict’, ‘power’, ‘control’, ‘tough’ and ‘authoritative’ were prominent and reoccurring words and descriptions of ideal characteristics among the nine. ‘Strong’, were mentioned on 7 different occasions, often together with words such as ‘authority’, ‘built’, and other agentic characteristics, thus rendering ‘strong’ as affiliating with agency. Moreover, physical strength is instrumental, and consequently presents itself as agentic. However, strong being uninformedly agentic is not something we can conclude at this point, we may therefore assume for the sake of ‘strong’ being applicable to both sexes, that it is in its essence a mere signification of muscular/bodily physical power; neutral.

4 respondents used ‘he’ when reflecting about the ideal police officer. It is not my intention to assume the four believes ideal or necessary characteristics implies that being a male is ideal or a necessity, rather it further signifies aforementioned implicit knowledge. Therefore, it is natural to assume people merely implicitly and unconsciously see or imagine a male persona and not due to specific conscious attitudes towards gender. Furthermore, 4 respondents described the ideal officer using neutral (see table 1 for definition) words and descriptions. ‘Honest’, ‘good morals’, ‘good ethics’, ‘just’ and ‘teamwork-skills’, were prominent and reoccurring in their responses. Other respondents did also mention these, however in combination with agentic and/or communal characteristics. The general respondent (minus the aforementioned 9) described the ideal police officer as having agentic, communal and neutral characteristics, which indicates a general appreciation and perceived necessity of mixed character-palettes. It is not to conclude that the nine that listed agentic traits as not tolerating character diversity. As mentioned, these responses might as well derive from respondents’ implicit ideas of a persona that radiates those characteristics.

Notwithstanding, ‘nice’, ‘friendly’ and ‘kind’ (treated as synonymous) was mentioned by respondents 13 times; ‘helpful’, ‘understanding’, and similar versions of the two, was mentioned 10 times; ‘caring’ and ‘empathy’ 6 times; ‘communication skills’ and ‘people skills’ 8 times, and together constitute the most prominent and reoccurring words and descriptions that coincide with communality. Respondents that preferred a mixed character palette did not deviate from agency, which means that they also preferred characteristics such as ‘confidence’, ‘power’, ‘decisiveness’, ‘strictness’, ‘strength’ and ‘authority’. With all responses compiled; agentic, communal and neutral characteristics, gender and tacit knowledge aside, we can infer that the ideal police officer would be a person that is confident, strong, has an aura that signifies authority

and power, but at the same time possess communicative capacities which makes her/him approachable, kind and friendly.

People does seemingly appreciate a set of complex characteristics in police that enables them to take appropriate measures for various situations. For instance, he/she needs to be authoritative and show strength where needed but must also adapt to other situations where a calm, friendly approach is the necessary *modus operandi*. Although there were some implications of respondents describing characteristics to that of a male persona (hence reference to 'he'), it deemed necessary to investigate affiliations of male and female as separate entities, and whether respondents have ideas about differences in male and female capacities. Moreover, how ideal characteristics manifest in persons.

4.1.3 Male and Female Affiliations

In my inquiry, I found it necessary to distinguish between male and masculinity, and female and femininity accordingly. Hence, they are not the same, although often interpreted as such (Lorber 1994). Agency and communality are essentially measured through masculinity and femininity, their affiliation with specific traits or characteristics (both visual and non-visual) often merges them into a singular interpretation (Trapnell and Paulhus 2012). Hence, female and male attractiveness is measured through perceived ideas of masculinity and femininity, there emerges a possible contingency of respondents' use of agentic and communal character descriptions – and gender indication (may it be conscious or unconscious). The question is a complex one and could prompt a full-fledged investigation on its own. The goal here however, is to get an overview of how people affiliate specific traits with these categories.

The answer is that it is quite conforming to stereotypical ideas. Apart from 5 respondents, all respective respondents recognised femininity as female and masculinity as male. This was clear because of direct referencing to men and women, instead of masculinity and femininity (e.g. 'males are more...' instead of; *masculinity is*). This specific finding is very clear and concise, and indicates strong tendencies of categorising femininity and female, masculinity and male as having singular meanings (Lorber 1994).

When asked about differences between men and women, respondents were quite clear. Females are better at communicating, more respectful of others, and not afraid to express their emotions. In which case, either one or both were emphasised as many by 22 respondents. 'Better at

listening', 'better problem-solvers', 'better at multitasking', 'caring', 'creative' and 'inductive' are other comments that was made on female characteristics. 10 respondents recognised that there is a biological, physical difference between men and women, whereas men are naturally stronger and have denser body mass than females. However, respondents did not imply that this was a detrimental factor, rather, acknowledged a biological factor of which females must work harder to achieve, e.g.

NLMSR30: *"On average, men are taller, and stronger I guess. They mostly share the same capabilities when well trained. I guess to be stronger might come easier and natural to guys, but that does not mean that it is unachievable for women."*

NOMWR11: *"Approximately same. If you see in sports, men run faster, they shoot harder. Whereas women are more elegant. In gymnastics, women are more elegant, but the men jump higher. It is different, and you can't compare it, because they are two different genders. But if it is work-related, they of course share the same capabilities"*

Some argued that men are more likely to handle violence or physical restraint better, (with reference to police), but also that males are more responsive to physical altercation, thus more often tend to handle situations by means of physical force, e.g.

NOFWR19: *"Men are more strong and can handle conflicts with violence better because they are stronger."*

NOFSR6: *"I also think there is a biological difference, whereas it falls more naturally for men to be more physical, both in problem solving and in daily life. So, carrying heavy things, and wanting to protect physically."*

Other than having a physical advantage and being prone to physical solutions, men were described as more 'decisive', 'confident', and 'rational', however these descriptions did not occur more than once or twice. There was also a noticeable change of undertone in describing male characteristics. Whereas already mentioned, there were some negative attitudes towards men and responsiveness to physical handling of problems. Additionally, use of agentic negatives (see table

1 for definition) were reoccurring in descriptions of men (in contrast to women), i.e. ‘arrogance’, ‘loudness’, ‘impulsion’, and not thinking before acting are some of them. Interestingly, women were described in a noticeably more positive light in contrast to men. As more adaptable, better at communicating, and although with a biological physical disadvantage; not incapable of achieving physical strength at the level of males. Women were more often described as smarter and more understanding of various situations. Language use such as women are ‘better at...’ further implied a sense of preference and even advocacy of female, and communal characteristics (hence described communal characteristics; singular interpretation) both in general terms and with reference to police, e.g.

NOMWR7: *“Women are better solving things by talking, things women do is more... they have thought things better through before they are doing things in action. Men are more impulsive and take problems as they come.”*

The general preference of communality as revealed in this section also matches with emphasis on communicative skills and friendly tone that was established as ideal and even necessary in police officers. As respondents describe female (and feminine; singular interpretation) capacities, as communal; it logically concurred that they will not only describe the feminine police officers (nr.1&2) as having communal traits, but also favour them. This was however, not the case.

4.1.4 Physical Attributions: Agentic versus Communal

Respondents’ categorisation of female and communal, male and agentic correspond with their descriptions of the four police officers, likewise, we can establish a clear tendency of merging the categories as addressed above (Lorber 1994). Regardless of female and male differences, respondents’ attitudes appeared more advocating for communal characteristics. However, when asked to describe the four officers in the visual elicitation, there appears to be a sudden shift of attitudes.

Generally, respondents described the officers in clusters of two, whereas nr.1 and 2 (feminine) constituted one cluster and nr.3 and 4 (masculine) the other. Which tendency implies respondents’ disposition of categorisation and unconscious recognition of same-category personas (Prentice and Miller 2006). Interestingly, 6 respondents described the masculine male

police (nr.4) as looking like a; ‘typical police officer’. Concurrently, 2 of these 6 respondents described the persons in picture nr. 1 and 2; whose characteristic corresponds with femininity, as ‘*not typical*’ police officers, e.g.

NLMSR27: *“She (nr.1) looks not so scary, she wouldn’t really be authority. Friendly conversation, but... same with this guy (nr.2), he looks nice, but doesn’t look like typical police officer to me. And the fourth one would for me be the typical police officer, like a beard, kind of tough, you can see he works out”.*

NLFSR29: *“This one (nr.4), he looks very strong, he is for me the typical idea as a police officer. He is also standing closed. He seems dominant and pursuing what he wants. And he is also very, kind of... not muscular but broad, so that means strong. He (nr.2) looks cute, and like a nice guy but I would not think of him as a police man”.*

As ‘typical’ and ‘non-typical’ were applied with such consistency throughout the photo elicitation by numerous respondents (nr.4; typical and nr.1,2; non-typical), it deemed logical to compare it with respondent’s descriptions of the two opposites.

‘Typical’ connotes a relation between the depiction and what is normally observed, and thus implies ‘police officer’ as being embodied by an idea of typical. In this case, with reference to respondent descriptions of nr.4; ‘typical’ renders a masculine and male persona. Henceforth, the police officer in image nr.4 was generally described with similar or relatively similar connotational words and descriptions by respondents. Apart from ‘typical’; ‘confident’, ‘decisive’, ‘powerful’, ‘strong’, ‘strict’, ‘authoritative’, and ‘boss’/‘leader’, were reoccurring and prominent in respondent descriptions of the police officer in image nr.4. Thus, respondents ascribed officer nr.4 as having primarily instrumental, agentic traits and characteristics (Trapnell and Paulhus 2012). Which findings further implies that ‘typicality’ of police officers stem from (visually) recognisable – or affiliated agentic characteristics and traits.

The police officer depicted in image nr. 3; a female whose characteristics corresponds with ideas of masculinity, did also elicit agentic character descriptions by respondents. ‘Confident’, ‘strict’, ‘frightening’, ‘powerful’, ‘capable’, ‘tough’, ‘serious’ and ‘secure’, were reoccurring words and descriptions by respondents. Descriptions of the masculine, female officer (nr.3) correlates to those of the masculine, male (nr.4), which parallels implies respondents’ expectations and/or affiliations of masculinity (Trapnell and Paulhus 2012). That is further indicated by respondents’

noticing of masculine physical traits, such as the aforementioned ‘cut short hair’ and ‘beard’ in nr. 4, and the attention to ‘strictness’ (facial expression), ‘jaw’, and other facial features in nr. 3 (BBC 2009; Dixon and Brooks 2013), e.g.

NOFSR6: *“She (nr.3) looks tough, masculine”.*

NLFSR22: *“She also has a square face and cheek-bones. You can see this with models as well, that gives a serious look”*

NLFSR24: *“Her chin, she has a sharp chin”.*

Additionally, the masculine officers (nr.3 and 4) were described as having control, or able to handle situations, for instance:

NLMSR30: *“He (nr.4) is like a commander type, he has seen bad guys before, he knows how to handle it. He is still approachable, I’m unsure how much he would help, it looks like he is doing more important stuff”.*

NLFSR26: *“She has a serious face, she looks like she can handle it”.*

Leadership and power counts as instrumental agentic traits, which according to theory on ‘physical attractiveness’; is measured through masculinity. The clustering of masculinity and agency and the regular affiliation to men, manifests as stereotypes and thus sets the bar of who ‘leaders’ are, so to speak (Frevort and Walker 2014; Trapnell and Paulhus 2012). In other words, leaders are expected to acquire agentic traits that are expressed in certain ways, which deviation sends a message of not being ‘leader’- material. If femininity or communal traits are being considered a deviation from ‘leader’, and females being categorised together with those terms, it suggests females having more problems achieving these roles (Ibid 2012).

Furthermore, this would not be a problem for just women, but for people who deviate from traditional ideas of agency and masculinity – although women are more exposed. Interestingly, the feminine police officers (nr.1 and 2) were described not only as having communal

characteristics and traits, but as having *communal negatives* (see table 1), whereas their function is negative or have negative impact. For instance, phrasings such as ‘too nice’, ‘too kind’, and ‘too smiley’, occurred more than once in respondents’ descriptions of feminine police. Some other examples:

NLMSR30: *“This person (nr.2) looks like he just started, he looks like a nice bloke, probably will listen if you have a problem, I don’t know how good he would be in action?”*

NLFSR26: *“Nr.4 looks strong and capable of being aggressive if needed. 1 and 2 looks too nice”*

NOFWR1: *“Kind, friendly, but not the most safe, maybe too friendly?”*

Accordingly, agentic negatives (see table 1 for definition) such as ‘not authority’, ‘not scary’, ‘not power’ (as in not projecting authority or power), were also common to describe the feminine officers. Some agentic negatives were also mentioned in descriptions of nr. 3 and 4, although not as prominently as the communal negatives – that proclaimed highly problematic, i.e. nice; connotes prone to manipulation. ‘Arrogant’ and ‘dominant’ were the most prominent agentic negatives, yet, were described more as inconveniences, or inconsequential rather than a problem, e.g.

NLFSR29: *“He is also standing closed. He seems dominant and pursuing what he wants”.*

The general descriptions of the feminine officers (nr.1 and 2) were uninformedly communal. Words and descriptions such as ‘kind’, ‘nice’ ‘helpful’, ‘listening’, ‘accommodating’, ‘caring’ and ‘good communication skills’, were reoccurring and prevalent responses. This postulate non-typical police; is communal. When respondents were asked to reflect about why they used the particular words they had used to describe respective police officers, the responses were quite uniform. First, respondents emphasised an age difference between police officers nr.1,2 and nr.3,4, often accompanied with suggestions that nr.1 and 2 were less experienced. Most explained their responses as derived from observations of physical strength, ‘muscles’, ‘strictness’, ‘capability’, and ‘authority’ of the police officer in image nr. 3 and 4. Some also responded that

nr. 3, looked like she was on a specific mission, which similarly to aforementioned presumptions about nr.4 being a 'boss' or 'leader', implies a situational character of subjects that denotes experience derived from training or seniority. Hints of specific capacities or skills may therefore postulate nr. 3 and 4's capacities and experience accordingly.

These findings indicate a contradiction in opinions of respondents, who both appreciate and devalue communal characteristics (even the same characteristics), whereas 'friendly'; previously a communal necessity, transformed; 'too friendly'. It is crucial to understand, first; what prompted a shift in attitudes, secondly; what are the underlying reasons of both sentiments.

4.1.5 Hypothetical Scenario's - Who is't shalt beest thy saviour?

To understand the shift, it is valuable to investigate the process of which the contradictions accumulated. In the first hypothetical scenario respondents were presented a picture of a female police officer in the process of detaining a male subject. Behind the woman in the picture, there is a part visible male police officer (see image 5, Appendix 1.). 10 respondents hypothesised there would be a problem. 5 problems were related to a perceived difference of physical strength that could result in problems for her; need for help, or the male subjects' escape. The other 5 thought that the woman would encounter problems relating to attitudes, whereas the male police officer would underestimate the female officer's abilities and take control of the situation, for instance:

NOFWR16: *"I see a guy behind the woman, he will underestimate her. The man next to her will show muscles."*

NOFSR17: *"I think the guy over there (male police officer) will act and try to show his muscles".*

The latter 5 centralises an important point, which correspondingly to the empirical examples, suggests a potentiality of in-professional attitudes towards women that can be detrimental. By that I am referring to respondents elicited responses of the male taking control and underestimating his female companion. Respondents' anticipation of such, implies affiliation, exposure, prior experiences, or observations that have led them to it. Although, this remains an open claim that

would require more extensive investigation of the specific topic, thus not something I have the capacity of inferring here. Further, 2 respondents emphasised that the male officer should in fact take control:

NOMWR18: *“He will hit back to the girl, and the man (in the background) will take control and arrest the man. He should do it.”*

NLMSR29: *“The guy police man would immediately grab the other guy, the criminal. And she would give him space to let this happen, because he is physically stronger.”*

Although merely two respondents specifically claimed that this was a situation where the man *should* take control, we can establish existing attitudes regarding not only manifestation of social gender construction and expectations, but a direct preference of roles (Lorber 1994). Which attitudes may have implications on females pursuing professions where they to a greater extent, must violate predetermined expectations and roles that do not just that derive from implicit knowledge, but direct preferences (Frevert and Walker 2014).

In the second hypothetical scenario, respondents were asked to make a choice between the four police officers from the previous exercise to respond to a home-robbery (assuming police were unarmed). An overview of respondents’ preferences of police officers is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Preference Description Scenario 2

Officer nr.	Preference	Example Descriptive of Preference
1 (feminine female)	-	NLFSR24: <i>"With her body-weight it is impossible to intervene"</i> NOFWR5: <i>"She looks weaker and is small"</i> NLFSR26: <i>"1 and 2 looks too nice"</i>
2 (feminine male)	1	NOMWR3: <i>"I think he could handle a difficult situation... I don't know him but he has the looks"</i>
3 (masculine female)	5	NOFSR4: <i>"Feminist me want to pick one of the women... her, she looks more badass"</i> NOFSR8: <i>"She looks fierce and tougher"</i> NLFSR28: <i>"She looks strong, and stern. I would not want another man into that equation-he would maybe not understand my position as a woman, I think she would"</i> NLMSR25: <i>"she looks like she knows what she's doing and would not respond too aggressively. She would probably be verbal, and if they do not respond, she will use the baton"</i>
4 (masculine male)	15	NOFWR1: <i>"Nr 4, he seem strong and safe, looks like he can handle violence"</i> NLFSR26: <i>"him, looks strong and capable of being aggressive if needed"</i> NOMSR2: <i>"he looks most experienced, normal height, normal built, around 180, strong, older"</i>
2 or 3	-	
2 or 4	4	NOMWR18: <i>"I think this, him (4). He sticks out. If they go on the police, I think he would cope best. Don't set she (1) in situation. I think he (2) seem like nice person that can communicate well"</i> NOFWR16: <i>"Maybe I am old fashioned, but I would feel more safe with boys. Sad, but feel more protected. Think females are better to talk"</i> NOMSR14: <i>"one of the males, because they are stronger"</i>
3 or 4	4	NLMSR23: <i>"Either her or him, they look like they catch bad guys"</i> NOFWR4: <i>"Of course I would look more for the masculine guys. He (4) has muscles, strong shoulders. She (3) looks a little bit scary, looks like she knows how to do her job"</i>
Not applicable (any)	2	NOMWR11: <i>"Any uniform is a big sign of power, it might not matter who comes. If drugs involved, situation unsure, it is equally dangerous for him (4) as for her (1). I would be happy anyone came"</i> NOMSR15: <i>"Anyone would be better than no-one"</i>

50% of respondents picked the masculine, male, police officer to respond to the scene. Which ratiocination primarily derived from respondents' perceptions of 'strength', 'confidence', 'experience', and 'capability' to handle violent situations. The 4 who wanted either of the men (2,4) to respond to the scene, distinguished the two as having different capabilities that would lead to, or be more applicable for different situations. For instance, respondent NOFWR1 said:

"I'm thinking I would choose nr.2, smart to be not provocative, he looks kind, maybe he could talk without using violence. And while I am saying that, suddenly maybe I would prefer nr 4, because he looks strong and safe, and looks like a man who can handle violence."

This and other analogous responses coincide with respondents' previous descriptions of the two, as having agentic (4) and communal (2) characteristics. It becomes clearer that these characteristics also encompasses predetermining factors that dictates roles and expectations (Trapnell and Paulhus 2012). Hence, respondents' inferences of 'kind' with communicative action, and 'strong', 'confident', 'strict', with physical action. 'Strong', accordingly reveal conformity to agency. The majority preference of the masculine man, followed by the masculine woman indicates tendencies of evaluating masculine, and/or agency (per descriptions) as preferable characteristics in police (Vial and Napier 2018). However, a few respondents described the masculine officers as looking 'experienced', some postulating age as a contributor while others were more vague in their descriptions, e.g.

NOFWR5: *"She looks a little bit scary, it looks like she knows how to do her job."*

NOMWR7: *"His appearance tells me that he's experienced, he looks like he believe in himself. He has probably worked in the police a lot of years and experienced much. (...) I think he would be able to handle these two robbers."*

Being able to 'handle', 'take care' or 'has control' were also mentioned in descriptions and descriptions of preference in the masculine police officers, which can be interpreted as perceptions of competence and capability. Similarly, that may also translate as experience, hence competence and capability normally signify a state or a set of skills that have been obtained

through different measures, i.e. experience. Although this was something that was emphasised by respondents after the contradiction had occurred.

4.1.6 The Contradiction – Agentic Efficiency contra Communal Uncertainty

Respondents' initial preference for communal characteristics and communal descriptions of the feminine officers (nr.1 and 2) logically implied that respondents would also pick police officers who corresponds (also with reference to respondents' descriptions) with femininity, and resultingly communality, to respond to the scene. Contrariwise, respondents picked the masculine officers, on basis of the agency they portrayed. This of course, prompted a question of potential motives, and whether implicit ideas of police (male and agentic) had interfered with their choice and preferences in the hypothetical scenario. An interesting remark, which is mentioned in NOFWR1's response (among others) above; is the respondent(s)' impression that the masculine man and woman projects 'safe', or rather a feeling of safety. The reoccurring use of 'safe' indicates respondents' inherent feelings underlying their choices, namely, an urge to feel safe in a threatening situation. Naturally, in anticipation of violence or physical altercation, people will evaluate by means they are able – which in this case was visually; the physical attributes and capacities that signify physical capabilities. That most naturally correlate with that of physical strength, thus attribution is more likely to provide safety in threatening situations. The respondent continued:

“Maybe also because of her size (nr.1) ... and that was stupid said, but... Picture nr.2 the same as number 1. I do not get a feeling of safe. When I compare to the other picture (nr.4) I see maybe the difference, and who I would feel as safe”.

The contradiction in responses therefore indicates a context dependence, in which case respondents were presented with a scenario that triggered a sense of threat, prompted a desire to minimize potential harm. Previous respondent descriptions revealed a general tendency of wanting to avoid violence, which was also one of the reasons 'communication' was considered necessary in police. Nevertheless, findings signify that in anticipation of violence or threat that could have direct impacts on own well-being, respondents strategize to utilise utmost feeling of safety. Thereby, provides an explanation of why people choose the masculine officers, hence

visible strength and authority is more prominent (in correlation with how respondents described masculine; agentic). In terms of implicit knowledge and the potentiality of interference with respondents' preference of police officer in threatening situations; might go hand in hand with implicit knowledge about strength and experience. Strength as already mentioned, is instrumental and most commonly interpreted as agentic, the correspondence and tendencies of same/cluster-categorisation of agency and masculinity (and often male) thus suggest why respondents picked the masculine officers. Thereby, instincts to maximise safety and choice of the officers that reflect traditional ideas of e.g. 'strength', also indicate essentialist induction by respondents, and categorisation (Prentice and Miller 2006).

4.1.7 *A Point of Realisation*

As discussed in previous sections, multiple respondents claimed men and women were equal and as having equal capacities. Despite men having a biological advantage in building muscle, this was not considered detrimental to women. After having been asked to describe the four police officers and hypothetical scenarios, respondents were 'confronted' (this probably felt like a confrontation) with more specific, gender-related questions. Several respondents then realised own responses as contradicting. Some verbally expressed so (may I also inform that I did not interfere or comment on respondents' contradictions to make them aware), e.g.

NLFSR29: *"When I continue thinking, I am thinking why do I have this prejudice? It is maybe possible that they also do it together (ref. scenario 1), but that is my second thought after thinking about my idea. Because I am thinking that is sexism. Why do I think it is not possible? But I won't image her doing it alone, so that's also something. Not reversed, maybe together, but not alone."*

Respondents also showed tendencies of wanting to cover up or make sense of own contradiction, which was detectable in responses. Interestingly, the same strategy, or rather pattern of sense-making are shared by several. The steps that constitute this pattern can be recognised as; a point of realisation, which was either expressed or experienced that; prompted efforts of making sense (i.e. why and how) that generated specific responses; excuses. Which in the end; did or did not result in vocal realisation, where respondents express specific thoughts or ideas surrounding own

contradiction(s). For instance, when asked about restrictions as solutions, NOFWR1 responded with the following, of which pattern has been demonstrated (fig.1):

Figure 1. Detectable patterns realisation process

<i>Pattern</i>	
Point of Realisation (Respondent is thoughtful, realises question opposes previous statements)	<i>“It is a hard question because I know what they mean.</i>
Making sense→Excuses (Process of generating meaning, excuses)	<i>And I know if I was in a situation with violence, and there would come a young, with no experience... I say young, because it could also be men. I think it is age, or experience. I have said the word woman, but I think maybe it is age. I would prefer it come someone with experience. And of course, if I felt threatened, I would prefer, that maybe this person (nr.4) is big.</i>
Realisation Expressed (Apologises for poor responses; excuses, with reference to contradiction)	<i>Maybe that is wrong. It should be, because I am small woman, and I can solve problems that other men can't. (Norwegian: These are really bad responses, I am sorry). I think I can see why you have these questions. It is good questions, I see at the end of the interview, I speak towards myself. I have a mind of something, but at the same time I answer the opposite somewhere. I think I am unfair to women and smaller and younger people, because I know in the end, you solve problem the way you meet, and how you treat people. And that does not depend on the size, or the attitude. So, you got me there.”</i>

Making excuses seemed a natural part of respondents' process of making sense of own contradiction, regardless of pointing them out or not. Perhaps it seems unfair to categorise respondents' explanations as excuses, however, the responses are evaluated as such on basis of earlier responses that were strong, contradicting responses. Some other examples:

NLFSR29: *“If there is fighting, women should not be there-for the safety of the women. So, when there becomes dangerous, like murders, or there is possibility that you have to fight, then women should not be there I really think. That is better for everything, for the safety of the women... Now I am also thinking about something, you could do a certain test, and if people pass that test, regardless if you are male or female, that you can do it. My point was not that you are male or female, but if your physical is less developed. So, if you pass the test, done every half a year; if you as a female or male pass that test, then you can do risky situations that has violence”*

NLFSR22: *“I hope I wasn’t too stereotyping in the pictures. I find it hard to judge people based on pictures, because if you see, you see their body, how they move, how they fill up the space so to say, so that might have impacted my answers”.*

Some did not verbally express contradiction but showed observable signs of being uncomfortable (e.g. increased movements, slight change of vocal tone, etc.), and others expressed their thoughts after the interview had ended. They will therefore not be directly referenced, albeit having verbally consented to their information being included.

4.1.8 *The Impact of a Uniform; Baby or Badass?*

There were quite substantial comments on police uniforms. The comments centred primarily around the colour of uniforms. Generally, respondents expressed that the black uniforms came across as more ‘intimidating’ and ‘scary’, for instance:

NLMSR30: *“The fact that she is wearing a leather jacket, she, that is sort of a power-thing. Like, it is better than the baby-blue. It is less baby-like and more intimidating. I think that it also helps out this guy (nr. 4) as well. The black does help. The cap does not look intimidating, but the way it sort of hides her eyes makes it a bit intimidating. The shadow of the cap is on her eyes, so you don’t really see her eyes”*

NOMWR3: *“Maybe it’s the uniform also, its black. They (1 and 2) have blue shirts. These two (3 and 4) looks more like military. I think she looks scary because of uniform”*

NLFSR22: *“Maybe it also has to do with the cap actually, because it gives a shadow to her face and, it is already serious. Her whole silhouette is altered by the uniform, and it makes her look less... or more square in a sense, rounded. And the material is firm. She is also not posing, she is doing her job, and is serious. I think if you swap this person (nr.1) in that uniform, the face would be different but if face was also similar, not that big of a difference”.*

NLFSR24: *“Maybe it is the uniform too, and the cap. With the cap you can’t really tell whether she is a man or a woman. And the outfit looks more professional.”.*

This implies the potentiality of clothing functioning as to remove specific ideas affiliated with femininity, and female features that signify communality (Trapnell and Paulhus 2012). Thus, implies that the leather jacket can enhance a sense of visual agency, perceptible to others. Hiding features could make it easier for women to adapt in professions such as police, that are affiliated with agency, such as authority (Frevert and Walker 2014). Not to say that this is favourable, hence women will perhaps still need to adjust to seem more masculine than what they themselves (potentially) desire (Lenkic 2019). And in the end, despite that the feminine police officers happened to wear ‘baby-blue’ in the images, does not explain why women have a difficult time climbing the latter, or getting respect from colleagues. May I also just emphasise that there are no formal specific seniority or hierarchy signified by the uniforms in the pictures (except for male in nr.4; has two stars; chief constable. This is however barely visible. Only one respondent, NOMWR11, who interact with police in his profession and daily life specifically looked for it and were able to see two stars).

5. Discussion

It is not controversial that people prefer certain skills for different contexts. However, the contradiction that accumulated from the majority responses has yielded intriguing result; of which indicates a stark contrast between moral ideas and implicit knowledge. The former deriving from will and consciousness to do good, the latter from social construct and essentialist inductions. Arguably, also from instinct. Hence people generally have moral ideas surrounding that of female and male capacities as being relatively equal, regardless of possessing (per descriptions) different

skills and characteristics. However, which differences later rendered less equalised than first indicated, whereas moral were superseded by implicit knowledge regarding roles and expectations, and corresponding measures to maximise safety. This suggests that *agency*, play with more flexible rules than *communal*, so to speak. Whereas communal characteristics such as good communication skills are vetoed by physical strength, authority and power. Perhaps, due to uncertainty of communal efficiency in given situations, whereas agentic render useful even where communal does not suffice (Vial and Napier 2018). For instance, let us say hypothetically, one of the officers who were described as having communal characteristics (feminine) responded to the home-robbery. Worst case scenario, the robbers would not be responsive to communication and initiate violent behaviour. In which case, being kind and a good communicator would not suffice to detain the robbers, which naturally evokes people to maximise safety. Nonetheless, the presupposition that those who do not visibly radiate agency cannot acquire agentic characteristics can be more detrimental than what is the likelihood of violent encounters. It became clear by the end of the analysis, and as already mentioned, people wish to be moral, yet choices they make are heavily weighted by context dependency. Which means that if people experience a sense of threat, moral is surpassed. Hence also explains respondents idealising of communal characteristics but favouring of agentic characteristics. Communal characteristics are considered good, however not necessary – or in this case; not applicable for every situation, which renders agency more attractive (Vial and Napier 2018).

Moreover, stereotyping can also be detrimental to men, in the police as in any other profession or setting. The masculine police officer was almost consistently described as having agentic characteristics on basis on his masculine appearance. This postulates how prone humans are of reasoning on basis of implicit knowledge that derive from social constructs and perceived ideas of physical attributions (Prentice and Miller 2006). The majority of respondents described the police officers with characteristics that are not necessarily visible such as; ‘she looks like she has good communication skills’, ‘looks like he would listen’, ‘looks like a social person’, etc. Regardless of the limited information one receives about a person by looking at a photograph, people tend to ascribe specific characteristics. Not to mention, judging people on basis of physical appearance, can be detrimental for persons who possess other capabilities than what is physically projected. Thus, may also render damaging for the person who judges, hence attractiveness does not always mirror the capacities it displays (Vial and Napier 2018).

At the point of realisation respondents had certain reactions. In hindsight, these reactions appear to me as a sense of shame. Meaning, respondents showed attitudes of guilt, embarrassment and

perhaps some irritation. Some respondents told me after the interview that they almost felt a little tricked and emphasised that if they had known about the main objectives beforehand they would have responded differently. Some also expressed that they felt a little unsatisfied with their responses, and frustrated that they had responded the way they did. It is of course in my intention to value respondents' best interests, which is why most interviews yielded long and fruitful conversations after the end of the interview. After some reflection and discussion of the topic, all respective respondents expressed interest in the topic, and the way the interview questions had triggered them to think about the complexity of own reason-making.

It is not my intention to label anyone as immoral or weak. On the contrary, I wish these results will function as to guide awareness, and to help contextualise why we choose what we do and think what we think, especially about people. And more importantly, shed light on the potential harms that comes of it. I believe that the research has not only signified the importance of such awareness training but shown how asking the right questions at the right time can trigger responses that accumulate discussions and reactions where people are able to actively engage with a complex issue such as social constructs of gender, and own bias.

Furthermore, although this research has generated specific data and inferences, it does not have in its power to make concluding remarks. Respondents might have responded differently if the structure of this interview had been different, which in hindsight informs ways the interviews could have been structured differently. For instance, in scenario 2; the home-robbery, respondents were confronted with which officer they would have respond knowing there were two men in their house. This of course is a rather leading question and might unintentionally prompt participants to make specific choices. If this research were to be repeated, I would have changed the situation as being either uncertain of who broke in the house, or there being one person whose gender is unknown. Prospectively, also add multiple different police officers (with more fluid contrasts) and scenarios with different genders and situations, as to better evaluate specific reasons behind choices. This I believe would trigger different thoughts in respondents.

There were no specific differences of tendencies between sample groups that render noteworthy in this discussion, although the consistency between the groups of essentialising gender and expectations emphasises an overall human need for structure. That transcends from categorisation, and natural kind ideas from elemental determinacies (Lorber 1994). Which correlation thus renders this study important for generating awareness of potential detrimental attitudes in public perceptions. And not to mention, of cultures and discourses that fuels them.

An interesting finding to further investigate would be uniforms. Different uniforms yielded different experiences of police officers, even in terms of body size. The women in the elicitation are not very different in size, but the black leather jacket on the masculine female (nr.3) seemed to enhance respondents' perceptions of agency. This implies the significance of a uniform, and the *right* uniform accordingly. Moreover, regarding police and affiliation with men, uniforms and equipment in police are only recently starting to adjust to women. Whereas before, and probably still some places, uniforms were designed for men. This of course have impacted women and their security as well, whereas Kevlar vest were to big, etc. Notwithstanding, this could also add to in-professional asymmetries as previously mentioned.

6. Conclusion

The results confirm that people's knowledge and ideas of female and male conforms to social constructions and stereotypes. Women and femininity affiliates with communal traits and characteristics, while men and masculinity with agentic. This entailed that feminine police officers were prescribed different roles than the masculine ones; as communicative and caring, rather than tough and authoritative.

People generally appeared as having moral ideas of women being as capable as men. Regardless of men having physical advantages, women were not portrayed as unable to achieve physical necessities that are required in police. Fascinatingly, women and communal characteristics were described as more idealistic than men and agentic characteristics. Nevertheless, despite of these moral attitudes and idealising of women and communal characteristics, implicit knowledge tended to be more dominant in the way people deliberate about police and situations where assistance of police are necessary. In other words, people have moral attitudes, however are steered by context dependence, *fear* and implicit knowledge in making decisions, i.e. people generally have moral ideas that men and women are equal, despite possessing different qualities. However, in situations that trigger for instance fear and desire for safety, or rather desire to minimize threat; implicit knowledge overrun moral. Hence, due to visually perceived agentic characteristics such as strength that accumulates implicit knowledge. Therefore, not only women, but people whose physical attributions corresponds with predetermined; socially constructed

ideas of femininity and communality are likely to experience detrimental judgements by others. Because police is inherently entrenched with authority and agency alike. This creates what we can refer to as a mismatch of visual attributes and expectancies which does not naturally match without disruption of natural kind inferences. Which this research managed to do with several respondents; who when confronted with own implicit knowledge and reasoning, became aware of their own moralistic discontinuance. Concurrently, these results ultimately render this research a potential tool of disrupting implicit knowledge in overrunning moral that allow for categories and expectancies of roles to be more lenient. In authoritative professions such as the police respectively. The way to hinder moral disruption in evaluations of women and especially the communal, must be the obstruction of implicit knowledge, and implementation of ideas that women can be heroes too. For, which stereotypical continuance will hinder especially women, but also those who do not visually match with agency to professionally progress in police.

References:

Arbeidstilsynet (2019), «Seksuell trakassering», Arbeidstilsynet, retrieved april 29th from: <https://www.arbeidstilsynet.no/tema/trakassering/seksuell-trakassering/>

Badura, K.L. et al. (2018) "Gender and leadership emergence: A meta-analysis and explanatory model", *Personell Psychology*, 71:3, pp.345-365, Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12266>

BBC (2009) "Perfect face dimensions measured", BBC, retrieved April 24th from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/8421076.stm>

Brunmark, K. (2018), «Politiet skal ansette over 100 kvinnelige ledere på fire år: – Det er realistisk», abc nyheter, retrieved April 27th from: <https://www.abcnyheter.no/nyheter/norge/2018/03/08/195378284/politiet-skal-ansette-over-100-kvinnelige-ledere-pa-fire-ar-det-er-realistisk>

Cogorno, I. (2017) "Kvinner i politiet: -Man trenger ikke å være to meter høy og robust for å jobbe i politiet», *Dagbladet*, Retrieved December 7th from: <https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/man-trenger-ikke-a-vaere-to-meter-hoy-og-robust-for-a-jobbe-i-politiet/67477499>

Cope, M. (2016) 'Organizing and Analyzing Qualitative Data' In; Hay, I. (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. 4th edn. Oxford University Press. pp.375-386

Dixon, B.J. and Brooks, R.C. (2013), "The role of facial hair in women's perceptions of men's attractiveness, health, masculinity and parenting", *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34:3, Elsevier pp. 236-241, retrieved December 8th from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.02.003>

Downing, R. (2016) 'Power, Subjectivity, and Ethics in Qualitative Research' In; Hay, I. (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. 4th edn. Oxford University Press. pp.30-39

Drisko, J. and Maschi, T. (2015) *Content Analysis*, Oxford Scholarship Online, pp. 83-91, retrieved 21 may 2019

<https://www-oxfordscholarship-com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190215491.001.0001/acprof-9780190215491-chapter-4?print=pdf>

Drydakis, N. et al. (2018) "Masculine vs feminine personality traits and women's employment outcomes in Britain: A field experiment", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 39 Issue: 4, pp.621-630, retrieved April 24th from:
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-09-2017-0255>

Dunn, K. (2016) 'Interviewing' In; Hay, I. (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. 4th edn. Hay, I. (ed.) Oxford University Press. pp.154-158

Frevert, T.K. and Walker, L.S. (2014) "Physical Attractiveness and Social Status", *Sociology Compass*, retrieved December 3rd, 2018
<https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/doi/full/10.1111/soc4.12132>

Harper, D.A. (2002) Talking about pictures: a case for photo elicitation, In; *Visual studies* 17:1, pp.13-15, retrieved March 4th from:
<https://www.nyu.edu/classes/bkg/methods/harper.pdf>

Hultgreen, G. (2016), «Kvinner i politiet trakasseres seksuelt», *Dagbladet*, retrieved april 28th from:
<https://www.dagbladet.no/nyheter/kvinner-i-politiet-trakasseres-seksuelt/60401019>

Isaksen, B. (2015), «Refleksjon over det å være kvinne i politiet», *Politiforum*, retrieved December 7th from:
<https://www.politiforum.no/artikler/refleksjon-over-det-a-vaere-kvinne-i-politiet/386891>

Jaarverantwoording (2016), "Het jaar in vogelvlucht", In: Jaarverantwoording 2016, Politie
<https://www.politie.nl/binaries/content/assets/politie/jaarverslag/2016/politie-jaarverantwoording-flyer-2016.pdf>

Johnsen, L. (2017) «Fotballsupporter klådde på kvinnelige politibetjenter – ble bortvist», SA, retrieved December 8th from:
<https://www.sa.no/sarpsborg-08/fotball/supportere/fotballsupporter-kladde-pa-kvinnelige-politibetjenter-ble-bortvist/s/5-46-389438>

Larsen, S. (2018), «Anne ble forbigått til toppjobb i politiet», Dagbladet, Retrieved December 8th from:

<https://www.dagbladet.no/magasinet/menn-er-tydelige-kvinner-er-bitchy/70501017>

Lenkic, P. (2019) “Men versus women: Why comparing leadership according to gender is harmful”, Smart Company, retrieved April 27th from:

<https://www.smartcompany.com.au/people-human-resources/leadership/comparing-leadership-gender-harmful/>

Lorber, J. (1994) *Paradoxes of Gender*, “The Social construction of Gender”, New Haven, Yale University Press, pp. 141-143

Mayring, P. (2000) “Qualitative Content Analysis”, Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1:20. retrieved 21 may 2019 from:

<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385>

PHS (2019), “Admission statistics”, Police academy statistics, retrieved April 27th from:

<https://www.phs.no/om-phs/fakta-og-tal/opptakstatistikk/>

PHS (2014), «Forskningsbasert kunnskap skal løfte politiet», Police Academy statistics, retrieved April 27th from:

<https://www.phs.no/om-phs/sjefsbloggen/forskningsbasert-kunnskap-skal-lofte-politiet/>

Politidirektoratet (2019) «Flere kvinnelige ledere i politiet», Official police website, retrieved April 30th from;

<https://www.politiet.no/aktuelt-tall-og-fakta/aktuelt/nyheter/2019/03/08/flere-kvinnelige-ledere-i-politiet/>

Politieacademie (2019) “Police Training”, Politie, Politieacademie, retrieved Aril 27th from:

<https://www.politieacademie.nl/en/Pages/policetraining.aspx>

Prentice, D.A. and Miller, D.T. (2006) “Essentializing Differences Between Women and Men”, Psychological Science v17 n2, pp. 129-135, retrieved April 24th from:

<https://journals-sagepub-com.proxy-ub.rug.nl/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01675.x>

Schaap, D. and Sheepers, P. (2014) ‘Comparing Citizens’ Trust in the Police Across European Countries: An Assessment of Cross-Country Measurement Equivalence’ In; *International*

Criminal Justice Review. 24:1. pp.82-98. Retrieved 5 June 2019 from:
DOI: 10.1177/1057567714524055

SCP/Statistics Netherlands (2018), Emancipation Monitor 2018, SCP, pp. 8-18, Retrieved April 28th from:
<https://digital.scp.nl/emancipatiemonitor2018/komen-er-meer-vrouwen-in-topfuncties/>

Statistics Netherlands (2016), “The Netherlands on the European scale 2016”, Statistics Netherlands, pp. 9, retrieved April 28th from:
<https://download.cbs.nl/pdf/2016-the-netherlands-on-the-european-scale-2016.pdf>

Statistics Norway/Statistisk sentralbyrå (2017), «Lønnsforskjellene mellom kvinner og menn vedvarer», Statistics Norway, Retrieved April 27th from:
<https://www.ssb.no/arbeid-og-lonn/artikler-og-publikasjoner/lonnsforskjellene-mellom-kvinner-og-menn-vedvarer--331542>

Statistics Norway/Statistisk sentralbyrå (2019), «Kjønnforskjeller i utdanning og arbeid», Statistisk sentralbyrå, Retrieved April 27th from:
<https://www.ssb.no/befolkning/artikler-og-publikasjoner/likestilling>

Stratford, E. and Bradshaw, B. (2016) ‘Qualitative Research design and Rigour’ In; Hay, I. (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*. 4th edn. Oxford University Press. p.124

Trapnell, P.D. and Paulhus D.L. (2012) “Agentic and Communal Values: Their Scope and Measurement”, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 94(1), pp. 39–52, Routledge, retrieved April 8th from:
<http://www2.psych.ubc.ca/~dpaulhus/research/CIRCUMPLEX/JPA%202012%20Trapnell&Paulhus.pdf>

Vial, A.C. and Napier, J.L. (2018) “Unnecessary Frills: Communalism as a Nice (But Expendable) Trait in Leaders” In, *Journal Frontiers in Psychology* 9, Retrieved April 28th from:
<https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01866/full>

Weller, C. (2015), “American cops can't go a day without a gun death — here's how Norway went 10 years without one”, *Business Insider*, Retrieved April 28th from:
<https://www.businessinsider.com/norway-america-police-killing-comparison?international=true&r=US&IR=T>

Wikan, K. (2018) «Anne fikk ikke jobben hun var best kvalifisert for – nå må staten betale millionerstatning», Nrk, retrieved December 9th from:
<https://www.nrk.no/trondelag/anne-fikk-ikke-jobben-hun-var-best-kvalifisert-for- -na-ma-staten-betale-millionerstatning-1.14114114>

Winterman, P. (2016), “Aantal vrouwen in leiding politie neemt toe”, AD, Retrieved from:
<https://www.ad.nl/den-haag/aantal-vrouwen-in-leiding-politie-neemt-toe~ade51cb8/>

World Economic Forum (2018) *Gender Gap Report 2018*, WEF, pp. 6-11, 26-29, retrieved April 27th from:
http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf

Appendix 1.

Interview schedule

This interview scheme introduces interview questions and strategies that will be practiced during interviews with respondents. Furthermore, the intention and purpose of each question.

1st part – Visual experiment

The first part of the interview is a visual task. The respondent is presented with number visual elements. The respondent will be provided with 5 pictures, each in the following order. The first four pictures depict two male and two female characters (one person per picture), each representing traditional stereotypes of masculinity or femininity (further explanation underneath each picture). It is expected that each picture will require 1-2 minutes of reflection time. Respondents will not be granted much more time than this, with the intention to trigger them to respond on their first and initial thought(s). They will be asked to describe each person (in the pictures) with as few words as possible.

The fifth picture represents a ‘potential situation’. The respondent will be asked to imagine and reflect on potential scenario(s), which she/he finds to be the most likely to happen.

List of Images (see images below):

Visual image 1: Female police officer that corresponds with/ or can be affiliated with traditional or stereotypical ideas of femininity.

Visual image 2: Female police officer that deviate from traditional or stereotypical ideas of femininity.

Visual image 3: Male police officer that deviate from traditional or stereotypical ideas of masculinity.

Visual image 4: Male police officer that corresponds with/ or can be affiliated with traditional or stereotypical ideas of femininity.

Visual image 5: Depiction of female officer ‘in the field’.

2nd part – Reflective questions/discussion

The second part will be in form of specific questions. This part will aim to gain specific answers to specific questions regarding the respondent’s perception of female and male police officers, and their differences. Prospectively, get an idea of the respondents’ feelings and attitudes towards a hypothetical situation(s), and police in general.

PHASE 1: Discourse about police officers		GOAL: map possible association	OUTLOOK: 'Femininity'/ 'masculinity'. Ideal character.
Question	Follow-up /Probing	Question Type/Purpose	
1.What is your name, how old are you and where are you from?	What do you do for work/study?	Establish Rapport and clarify demographics	
2. Please imagine a police officer. Can you please describe to me what that police officer looks like?	Clarification: Any special traits, characteristics or details that you particularly associate with a police officer?	Opinion (map potential associations to 'masculinity' and/or 'femininity')	
3. What would you say are necessary or ideal characteristics of a police officer?		Opinion: Impressions (map potential associations to 'masculinity' and/or 'femininity')	
4. Have you ever experienced a situation or had an encounter(s) with police?	Do you have any specific associations of the police/police officers? Have this situation/encounter had any noticeable impact on how you view or perceive the police?	Structural; specific experience Opinion; affiliation or thoughts due to experience	
(Presented with four first pictures) 5. Can you describe each of these people in front of you with 1 or 2 words only?		Opinion: First impressions and assertions about positionality and/or characteristics of male and female police officer examples.	
PHASE 2: Ideology		GOAL: Reflexive responses on own expectations or opinions	OUTLOOK: Influences and contrasts on social expectations or opinions
(Picture 5- scenario) 6. In this situation, imagine that the man being restrained in the picture chooses to refuse arrest and start to act violently. Explain what happens next.		Scenario/Hypothetical: Map expectations of female officer	

7. Imagine yourself in a dangerous situation- you're getting robbed by two large-looking men. You have no way of defending yourself and they both look and seem hostile. You call the police and ask for help. Let us assume for the sake of this question that you are presented with a choice; which one of these police officers would you have respond to the scene? (assuming police unarmed)	Can you explain why you chose him/her. - <i>If any:</i> Explain why you think all police officers are equally capable of responding to the scene.	Structural: Aims to uncover respondents' innate perspectives surrounding the role/perception of female and male police officers. (Are respondents more likely to pick 'masculine' over feminine and male over female?)
8. (Connected to question 3) Can you explain why, or what made you chose these specific words?		Structural/contrast: Prompt reflection on 'why' she/he used specific words that entail meaning. Related to social expectations and assumptions made on physical appearance.
<div>PHASE 3: Reflection</div> <div>GOAL: Specifics</div> <div>OUTLOOK: Particular opinions, impressions, assertions, etc.</div>		
9. What do you believe (if you believe-) are some of the main differences between men and women?		Contrast/Opinion: Reflection on (dis)advantages and reflection on own expectations and opinions
10. Do you believe that men and women share the same capabilities, or do you believe that there are things/tasks that women can potentially tackle better than men- and vice versa?		Contrast: hypothetical reflection on two contrasting states
11. Are there any characteristics or traits you would consider to be specifically feminine or masculine?		Contrast/Opinion
12. Some say that physical strength is a necessity when working as a police officer (because one can encounter dangerous situations that may require physical strength), and that because of the physical difference between men and women; that women are less capable to certain tasks/missions. What are your thoughts on this aspect?		Devil's advocate
13. Moreover, some believe that men and women should-as a consequence of this factor; be assigned/ or not-certain tasks/missions (as to hinder potential situations where physical strength of female officers do not	(May use example from Sweden where three police women were unable to arrest one reluctant man-that have	Devil's advocate

suffice). What do you think about this possible 'solution'/implementation?	prompted discussions about female positionality in the police) - some argue women are not fit to perform all tasks.	
14. Do you have any additional remarks or comments?		

Photo Elicitation images

Image 1. 'Feminine' female



Image 2. 'Feminine' male



Image 3. 'Masculine' female



Image 4. 'Masculine' male



Image 5. (Situational image)

