Part III

‘Emotion Work’ in Criminal Justice Institutions

11

Dealing with Defiant Citizens: Building Emotional Intelligence into Police Work

BAS VAN STOKKOM

I. INTRODUCTION

SINCE 1998, AMSTERDAM'S police force has practised what is called 'Streetwise'—a policy that entails fining citizens for minor breaches of the law such as urinating in public and cycling on footpaths. The force aims to break with the soft and tolerant attitudes that characterised Dutch policing for a long time. Police officers are obliged to generate more fines and call citizens to account. This repressive policy has had great consequences for police–public interaction: more involuntary contacts with citizens evoke more conflict situations, and citizens who are forcibly stopped and fined for breaking minor rules are motivated to contest or complain about the officers' decision. Many Amsterdam citizens were, moreover, taken by surprise. They were accustomed to quasi-anarchical habits in traffic and nightlife. Many citizens, including the apparently decent ones, experience proactive stopping and fining as unacceptable attempts to curtail freedom. They thus tend to resist what they see an unwarranted police interference.

In the Netherlands, incivilities such as ignoring red lights, jumping the queue and drinking beer in parks are viewed as outcomes of increasingly assertive attitudes amongst its metropolitan citizens (Van den Brink 2001; WRR 2003: Van Stokkom 2010). Nowadays these incivilities are met with more opposition. A large part of the population is no longer prepared to tolerate loutish behaviour and is in favour of re-establishing order and tough policing. Others continue to cherish the 'do what you want' freedom.[1]

But has public–police interaction become more unruly? Why are many citizens so eager to defy officers' decisions? In this study police–citizen encounters are interpreted as a charged ritual in which both parties deploy

[1] For a wider discussion of Dutch repressive security policies, see Van Swaaningen (2005).

emotions to preserve and restore their status. In the first part, I delve more deeply into 'Streetwise' and discuss some research findings about police–public encounters in Amsterdam. I discuss the motives of citizens who were arrested for insulting police officers, as well as unprofessional police performances. It turns out that what I term 'mirroring' and 'forcing' police styles are highly problematic. 'Mirroring' leads to emotional contagion; 'forcing' to a cool and detached stance, not being accessible. The verbal aggression which attends these styles is illustrated with quotes taken from the research material.

The second part of the chapter focuses on some micro-sociological and moral-psychological issues. First I explore why exercising authority and receiving respect is so complicated nowadays. Here two tendencies are discussed: the difficulties police officers have in securing cooperation, and assertive citizens whose status expectations bring them into conflict with officers. Second, the encounter between police officer and citizen is interpreted as a 'moral contest' in which both parties seek to defend their self-worth and status. The various emotions that surface during this 'classification ritual' are briefly sketched. In the final section, I argue that better understanding of emotion management and argumentation styles may enhance professional police performance.

II. 'STREETWISE' IN AMSTERDAM

The Amsterdam 'Streetwise' policy is an explicit form of 'broken windows' policing in the Netherlands. 'Streetwise' aims to combat minor offences and annoying behaviour that irritate the public and corrode feelings of security. This entails more intensive control and maintenance of law and order: making more proactive stops in the street and addressing citizens in an active way. Many local acts have been introduced (a ban on the use of alcohol in streets and parks, and on dogs running free, for example), and traffic rules have been tightened. The police have also sought to enhance their authority. Insulting police officers is rigorously counteracted and prosecuted.

Although police managers regularly point to the achievements of New York's zero tolerance policing, the Amsterdam police does not aim to introduce unscrupulous and aggressive strategies. Streetwise does however have its repressive aspect. All officers are obliged to issue more tickets and to issue fines at least two times a day (to reach a quota of 300 fines a year). Since 1999 the police have issued more than 400,000 extra bookings each year. More than 250,000 of these bookings go hand in hand with conversations in which citizens are called to account (so that citizens are not taken by surprise when the payment request arrives). In 1998—the first 'Streetwise' year—only 55,000 citizens were fined in this way. Achieving this ambitious

target could only be carried out by mobilising more manpower.[2] In short, the police have distanced themselves from former relaxed routines and now take the lead in upholding law and order and shoring up public morality. At one time, Amsterdam's police were not really eager to book citizens; now the force leaders proudly declare that there is not a police force in Europe that issues more tickets.

Police data indicate that 'Streetwise' is a success. Most cyclists drive with lights, fewer cars are 'jumping' red lights, traffic-accidents are reduced, and urinating in public has disappeared. The public seems to approve of Streetwise, because loutish behaviour is counteracted. Street scenes are more predictable and citizens feel safer. The enforcement of 'minor norms' appears to reduce feelings of insecurity.[3]

But 'Streetwise' has its dark side. The increased number of involuntary contacts with citizens generates many potential conflict situations and moments of resistance. In many respects, police–public interaction has become more unruly, and fuelled with verbal aggression. Many Dutch research findings (Kop et al 1997; Timmer 1999) suggest that repressive performances go hand in hand with coercive and threatening attitudes that prompt citizen defiance and aggression. In the period 1994–2002 the number of citizen complaints against the Amsterdam police doubled.[4] Complaints of 'unseemly treatment' and 'disproportionate behaviour' increased most. Another problem is that the local prosecution counsel is overloaded with thousands of minor cases.[5] Streetwise transforms annoying behaviour, like pollution and verbal threats, into illegal behaviour. Some types of behaviour that involve no explicit norm transgression, such as drinking beer in public parks and playing music on the street, have also been targeted. This generates defiance and much contention. The same is true regarding certain minor traffic offences, such as 'giving signals other than allowed' and 'standing still in bicycle lanes'. When these often unintentional behaviours result in fines, citizens typically protest and dispute the officer's decision.

Of course the public has to become accustomed to a more repressive policy. When a formerly customer-friendly police switches to strict enforcement, the public becomes frustrated and irritated. Citizen expectations

[2] Since 1995 more than 1000 extra officers were assigned. The number of police officers in the Amsterdam-Amstelland district in 2004 was 5800. The district contains 900,000 inhabitants.

[3] These trends seem to validate the 'broken windows' policing paradigm (Kelling and Coles 1996; Roché 2002; Van Stokkom 2008). For critical notes on zero tolerance policing, see Harcourt (2001).

[4] The Amsterdam police force has its own complaints service. In 2002, citizens filed 633 complaints against officers.

[5] In 2002 more than 15,000 criminal cases resulted from violations of local ordinances (not including the huge amounts of traffic and public transport violations).

are thwarted. The same goes for tourists and other strangers who are not familiar with Streetwise's new moral order.

III. VERBAL AGGRESSION: SOME RESEARCH FINDINGS

But in what respects has police–public interaction become more unruly? To answer this question I analysed interrogation reports of citizens who were arrested for insulting officers in May and June 2003, and complaint letters about unseemly police treatment sent to the complaints department of the Amsterdam force in 2002.[6] The incidents selected were those which took place in public space and stemmed from proactive stops and/or fines, or direct and spontaneous encounters.[7] In addition, 15 police officers were interviewed, including officers who had attracted several complaints in one year and those who were nominated for the force-award for issuing the most Streetwise fines in one year (the 'prolific writers'). I will first go briefly into the motives of citizens who were arrested for insulting police officers, and then discuss the coercive behaviour of officers that can be inferred from complaint letters and interviews.

A. Citizens' Motives to Insult

The arrested citizens are predominantly male and younger than 40. Moroccan and Surinamese men are over-represented. Nearly half of the arrested persons had previous contact with the police (so the group is not representative of the whole population). The rebellious behaviour of many young persons can be attributed to street customs and street language and the accompanying inclination to provoke, impress and outdo. Many look down on the status of police officers. On the streets they are in charge and someone special. Police officers challenge and puncture these subcultural codes.

The interrogation reports reveal the following motives. First, it turns out that being controlled or forced to stop is experienced as unwarranted and 'bothersome' interference. This runs counter to the feeling of self-esteem or is viewed as an improper infringement of private life. For example:

> A barkeeper consumes a glass of beer on the street, in front of the pub where he works. He is addressed by two female officers who cross the street. The man says: 'I won't put up! I live here! Just fuck off!' The case escalated as the man spat in the face of one of the female officers. The man was arrested and during the

[6] The research was conducted in 2003 and published in 2005 (Van Stokkom 2005).

[7] From the 229 police reports and 178 complaint files, ultimately 106 and 77 cases were studied.

> interrogation he said: 'I tried to discuss with the officers. But I didn't succeed. The fact that those officers addressed me was terrible. Because I didn't annoy anyone. That's why I got fed up.'

Secondly, the arrested persons believe that using abusive language is expressing an opinion. They think they have the right to swear and express their irritation. Entering a discussion entails the utterance of profane words (which in many ways belongs to Amsterdam folklore). Some examples:

> A defendant says during the interrogation: 'That officer said I had to stay out. I said he was an oaf. He said that I was arrested for insulting an officer. I said it was my opinion and that I may utter that safely.' Another identical case: 'I said that the officer was a bastard. That's just giving my opinion, it's not insulting.'

A third pattern is that answering the officer back is normal, even thought of as one's duty. The arrested person wants to be treated as an equal, and rejects the roles of super- and sub-ordination.

The arrested person wishes, in other words, to speak without restrictions. This is not only typical of the arrested rebellious young man, but also of the average, 'reasonable', more law-abiding, complainant. The complaint letters show that many citizens are offended when police officers force them to stop. They object to the fact that police officers are allowed to give warnings, reprimands and commands 'just like that'. They launch a counterattack, ignore the remarks of the officer, or refuse to cooperate. These reactions are understandable when citizens want to counteract a loss of face. But the complaint letters reveal that police utterances which do not contain denigrating intentions, like refuting an assertion, are nevertheless experienced as irritating or threatening. In the same way unforced forms of communication, like requests for explanations (which are different from commands or reproaches), are experienced as intrusive.

B. Coercive Officer Behaviour

Let's turn now to police performances. The complaint letters reveal that trivial cases often escalate, for instance because officers talk down to citizens or refuse requests for reasons. Coercive and non-respectful treatment often leads to verbal aggression and resistance, especially when arrests are made and handcuffs put on. In 28 of the cases of unseemly behaviour studied (n = 77), the complainants were arrested and most were accompanied with physical resistance. In a way, issuing fines for minor offences seems to be escalating in itself, especially if citizens do not consider them as offences. Many cases have trivial causes or appear 'out of nothing'.

Fines seem to have a particular capacity to generate conflict. For instance, a citizen throws the ticket that he received just a minute ago out of the window of his car, or ostentatiously tears up that ticket. The police officer

cannot accept such behaviour and the citizen is subsequently arrested. Another example: a market vendor who was requested to move his car from the square addressed the officer in comical, assertive Amsterdam language using words such as 'oliebol' (pudding head). The result was dozens of officers and stallholders confronting each other and two arrests being made.

Being transported to a police station with handcuffs on evokes agitation and anger. Many complainants criticise that practice. Police requests for assistance are another complicating factor. When the reinforcement arrives there is no way back. Citizens who accidentally pass such a disorderly scene, are treated harshly without exception.

In sum, strictly upholding one's authority has a high price: it evokes serious conflicts and incidents. The question is in what respects police officers—by cracking down on minor misbehaviour and looking for confrontations—are bringing insults upon themselves. What is a 'laconic game' for Moroccan boys, provoking police officers without much understanding of the consequences, officers take rather seriously. So within the scope of 'Streetwise' many 'elicited' or 'fabricated' offences occur. 'Get even' strategies—such as making citizens wait for longer than is necessary—also play a dominant role. The interviews indicate that many officers cannot resist the temptation to do the 'bastards' a bad turn. Many cops evince a 'tit-for-tat' outlook that reveals their incomprehension of the behaviour of citizens, in particular juveniles and members of ethnic minorities.

In many ways officers behave unprofessionally: a lack of correct manners, giving unsatisfactory reasons for making arrests, conducting unnecessary body searches and use of handcuffs, intimidating those they have stopped, expressing value judgements too hastily, informing individuals in a pitying tone that a ticket cannot be undone and protest is futile. Based on the complaint letters and interviews, two types of unprofessional treatment can be reconstructed: displays of power, and bad-mannered behaviour. The first can be traced to a 'forcing' style, the second to a 'mirroring' style.

C. Forcing Styles

The display of power (showing dominance, imposing one's will, being rigid and dogmatic) is often accompanied with a forcing attitude that invites disproportional responses. Often officers hide behind the rules, refrain from answering questions and giving information. These responses indicate that the police are 'above' and the citizen 'beneath'. Forcing can also entail rushing through a fine, failing to notice how citizens react and displaying a 'frozen' front. In such situations, citizens are left in a state of frustration or rage. Although forcing may be professional in some circumstances, in most

cases forcing needlessly generates a hostile atmosphere. An officer reports a case in which a bus driver did not obey his orders in the heart of the city:

> I said: 'Move on, carry on with that bus.'. But contrary to my orders the driver started to load passengers. Again I commanded him to drive. One of the men interrupted me which I found extremely irritating. I said: 'Shut your face.' Meanwhile the traffic got jammed. I said to the driver he's got five seconds to move away, and if not he would be arrested for not following my commands. Indeed, I counted from five to zero but the driver did not move. I arrested him.

'Prolific writers' are a special case. Typically they do not hesitate to fine a citizen for all the offences they have committed. Many act in a rigid way without much concern for the specific context of 'offence' and 'offender'. In one case a woman threw a number on the ground that she had just before taken when she was not being served fast enough at a post office. A policewoman that passed by, coincidentally one of the force 'leaders' when it came to fining (about 1600 a year), ordered her to pick up the piece of paper. In the end the woman and her mother were arrested and at the police station the case completely escalated as both women lost their cool. During the interview the police woman said:

> Yes, that case completely kicked off. Because of something trivial. Yes. But they have to do what I say. Otherwise I am just a nobody. It's not in my character to say 'Leave it'. … Next time she would use that. ... If she had said 'Sorry', maybe … No, if I had given her more scope, she would have enjoyed that in abundance.

Some prolific writers—including this policewoman (who got eight complaints in one year)—are forced to stop by their superiors and requested to work in a more measured way.

D. Mirroring Styles

Mirroring involves officers assuming the role of the other. Police officers get carried away with the emotions of citizens. If forcing is characterised by a cool and unbending stance, mirroring implies a form of 'emotional contagion'. These officers lose their temper and poise, and run themselves down. There are all kinds of examples, ranging from childish behaviour ('Yes, I am going to enjoy giving you this fine'), to putting down ('If you call me a bastard, I'll call you asshole?'). An example from the interviews:

> Someone is spitting right in front of your feet. What do you do? I am spitting back. Because I know, when I take that lad to the office, nothing happens. Because he says: 'Just prove that that one was directed at me!' Yeh, yeh. That's contempt. Migrants do that. They pass by and spit. Then I turn round and spit back. The lad says: 'What are you doing?' I said: 'Well, I do what you do. Obviously we are greeting each other in this way.'

In these situations officers are not able or willing to control their irritation or anger, or to keep their dignity. The interviews suggest that mirroring is endemic (and all too human, one might add) and is even practised by officers who at first sight are keen not to lapse into that mistake. Often mirroring involves demonstrating streetwise attitudes: countering in assertive ways, out-bluffing and trumping the opponent.

In many ways, forcing and mirroring are the antithesis of each other—depersonalisation (suppressing emotions) versus emotional contagion (letting emotions off the leash)—but in both cases professionalism and trust are eroded. Whereas forcing seems to be a structural problem in the psychological make-up of a relative small subgroup of police officers, all officers are (now and then) prone to mirroring. Mirroring can be overcome because it is normally 'only' the result of situationally specific loss of control. There are signs that many young policemen adopt rival behaviour and swear words in a structural way. But they deal with it playfully and are not burdened with the stress, discomfort and cynical worldviews that are typical of forcing officers.

The research findings suggest that officers who use forcing and coercive styles encounter more resistance (see also Mastrofski et al 1996 2002). However, many prolific writers do not encounter defiance. This suggests that police style and resistance are highly related: officers who prefer cooperative and problem-solving approaches meet less resistance. For this reason, receiving many complaints ought not to be ascribed so much to high productivity, but to the ways citizens are addressed and treated (see Terrill and McCluskey 2002). Thus it might be rewarding for officers to develop their communicating skills.

IV. DEALING WITH ASSERTIVE CITIZENS: COMPLICATING FACTORS

Before addressing this theme, I want to discuss in more detail some factors that complicate the interactions between officer and citizen. Why is it that exercising authority and conferring respect cause so much trouble these days? The answer, at least in part, lies in some long-term changes in Dutch society.

Policing on the streets seems to be more demanding than it was some decades ago. Citizens are more assertive and stick up for themselves. Assertiveness means saying directly and spontaneously what you think and want, without considering whether the 'opponent' is offended, and without feeling guilty or responsible (Van den Brink 2001; Van Stokkom 2010; also Wilson and Gallois 1993). As mentioned, 'respectable citizens' also tend to view being addressed in public as annoying or meddlesome. There seems to be a natural tendency to resist the interference of police officers (and probably other professionals). The norms of the private sphere—the domain

that safeguards against troublesome behaviour, without the need to justify oneself—seems to penetrate public morality and public spaces. Citizens are keen to denounce incorrect treatment, and are skilled in interpreting misfortune and trouble as hindrance.[8]

We should not overstate the case of defiance among 'respectable citizens'.[9] Most citizens agree with requests for control and accept being fined. Two-thirds of Dutch citizens who come into involuntary contact with the police (and receive warnings, tickets etc) report being 'content' or 'very content' about these contacts (Politiemonitor Bevolking 2004).

A. Contentious Authority

Citizens nevertheless judge police activities differently from their predecessors of half a century ago: proactive police stops that involve questioning and controls are now considered more disrespectful. In democratic contexts, authority is granted on other grounds and takes on other forms (Warren 1996).[10] First, formal types of authority seem to give way to discursive and personal types of authority. Formal and legalistic acting is less acceptable because it means citizens being withheld the respect they count on. Within informal communication contexts, assigning authority is more and more based on trustworthiness. Public professionals do not set themselves up only as representatives of the state, but develop personal forms of persuasion which indicate integrity and build confidence (Wouters 1986).

Secondly, authority is not accepted blindly. Acting as a superior is only accepted conditionally. Citizens only accept their role of controlled or supervised person when is explained why these 'interventions' are necessary. It seems that cooperation is considered as a reward for police officers. That reward is withheld when officers give no reason for interrogation, or when these reasons do not convince (see also Tedeschi and Felson 1994; Wilson and Braithwaite 1993). For that reason authority has taken on a contingent and uncertain character, and needs to be proved and renewed again and again. Authority can thus be easily forfeited, for instance by acting in brutal ways or, conversely, in hesitant and vague ways.

[8] Compare sociological findings on 'incivilities' and over-sensitive public behaviour (Katz 1999; Miller 2001; Kowalski 2002; Phillips and Smith 2003).

[9] The situation for the many subgroups that 'have nothing to lose', like long-term jobless people, is of course completely different (see Sherman 1993).

[10] The sociologists Scheepers and Te Grotenhuis (1999) concluded that the Dutch accept authority less and less. The anti-authoritarian disposition of the Dutch increased to a large extent: from 30 per cent in 1970 to 52 per cent in 1996. That might incorrectly suggest that the anti-authoritarian Dutch reject any request from authorities and define the rules themselves. It seems more accurate to say that authority is defined as the ability to persuade people in a respectable way.

Thirdly, citizens seem to be more and more oriented towards fairness and procedural correctness. They expect equal treatment. Perceived unfairness ('Why me and not others?') creates considerable scope for potential conflicts.[11] Such fixation about being neglected or passed over might be attributed to higher social expectations and norms, or over-sensitive narcissistic reactions (Van den Brink 2001; Kowalski 2002).

These long-term changes have several implications. Exercising authority in a metropolitan milieu of short-tempered citizens has become more demanding and more vulnerable: obtaining cooperation and securing citizen compliance is 'hard work'.

B. The Shadow of Status Hierarchies

In principle the relation between police officer and citizen is asymmetrical. The citizen is assumed to show more respect than the police officer. But this disparity—including the formal and detached attitude of the officer—is now less accepted than in former days. Police officers today are expected to be more responsive and to give reasons for their actions. Citizens do not feel obliged to cooperate in every situation. But there are other factors that complicate the 'natural' dominance of police officers. Their performances are embodied in status hierarchies that contain not only formal positions but also ethnicity, gender, age and social class. These divergent forms of status disrupt a regular and smooth encounter between officer and citizen (Sykes and Clark 1975).

Ethnic minorities no longer behave submissively. In a time of multicultural emancipation, subordination and special forms of deference are condemned, while proud and militant behaviour is accorded greater weight, even celebrated. For that reason, officer dominance is considered problematic because it manifests a lack of respect for ethnic dignity. The behaviour of a fair-minded officer who expects civility from a Moroccan boy is interpreted by that boy as exhibiting ethnic superiority. The police officer interprets the attitude of the boy as a refusal to show respect for his lawful status. Both tend to reject the other, by virtue of mutually discordant expectations and appraisals of status differences. Thus it is not surprising that police officers and members of ethnic minorities rather avoid each other and restrict social contacts, because an encounter is shot through with conflicting expectations and constraints.

Persons with high social standing expect to be treated with respect by police officers. Citizens with low social status expect to be treated less

[11] See Tyler and Huo (2001). In his study on defiance Lawrence Sherman (1993) endorses this interpretation and suggests that citizens feel unfairly treated when they meet a lack of respect, notwithstanding the fact that the sanction is considered deserved.

respectfully. The lower classes have less 'status resources' at their disposal, to behave decently and with self-control (Sykes and Clark 1975). For that reason police officers take their verbal aggression less seriously. They have far more trouble in accepting the loud mouth of a well-to-do citizen. This person is supposed to have more 'status resources' at his or her disposal, but deliberately chooses not to use them. Many respondents in the research were indignant about this:

> Fining somebody in an expensive car, always evokes protest. Lower classes are more compliant. Respectable people are much more whiney and complaining. An expensive Mercedes: they are allowed to do anything.

The complaint letters from Amsterdam citizens suggest that assertive citizens have 'emancipated' themselves from these status resources, conceived as high standing or good manners. It is not respectable to be modest, because that would reveal a vulnerable and weak-minded self. Assertive behaviour has become the order of the day, signalling power and decisiveness.

In sum, the uncertainties of exchanging respect between police officers and many members of ethnic minorities, and the 'new' public morality of assertiveness, has disrupted the 'normal' interaction between 'dominant' officers and 'obedient' citizens.

V. THE 'MORAL CONTEST'

Many citizens are unwilling role players who quickly feel embarrassed and attacked. This has of course to do with the unusual character of proactive stopping or police interference. Citizens feel themselves made ridiculous and the public staging of 'being accosted' reveals that foolishness. How can we explain this defiance in social-emotional terms?

When it comes to this question, the 'loss of face' theory seems very fruitful (Brown and Levinson 1987; Tedeschi and Felson 1994; Cupach and Metts 1994). Citizens are strikingly concerned about their self-worth. A threat to their status evokes resistance, sometimes so much that they seem to be blind to the consequences of their defensive actions. They defend themselves in ways which vary from criticism of the behaviour of the police officer, to launching a counter-attack. The resistant stance confirms that they have the right to make a choice. Agreeing with the officer would accentuate their weakness and confirm their subservience. Police officers, for their part, can ill afford loss of face: they act upon a public platform where they must uphold the reputation of lawful enforcer. Condoning an insult would have a devastating effect. Officers must reply and teach resisting citizens a lesson.

A contest arises in which power, prestige and respect are at stake. It is a moral contest not only because the resilience (the morale) of the opponent is tested, but also because the combatants aim to garner a special type

of respect (Van Maanen 1978). After all, respect has many (sub)cultural meanings, ranging from uncompromising attitudes (honour) to decency (class distinction). The verbal controversy can also be described as a 'classification ritual', in which the hierarchy of respect is established (Gabriel 1998). Swear words and insults seek to establish a reversed status hierarchy. When the citizen stresses the incompetence or insignificance of the opponent, the balance of 'above' and 'beneath' is suddenly switched. In fact insults are tests to determine the pecking order and produce coalitions in the presence of bystanders and other police officers. Everyone's humour, venom and courage can be displayed and tested and the public gets the opportunity to take sides (Gabriel 1998).

Not only insults but also publicly expressed complaints and accusations may endanger the status of police officers. If bystanders witness these incidents, police officers have to protect their reputation. Moreover, to be criticised in public reduces the opportunities for effective reply, so the accused gets involved in a delicate situation. An aggressive reply discredits the public image of calmness; a defensive reply may elicit negative judgements such as 'weak' or 'lacking authority'.

Often juveniles have fun trying to draw a policeofficer out, for instance by looking amusing or laughing benignly. If they successfully elicit publicly uncontrolled emotions, they have practically won the battle. An officer who yells loses his balance and dignity. Juveniles are masters at manipulating the emotions of superior persons, exactly because they are accustomed to subservient positions. They initiate a contest because they have little to lose. Even if they come off worst eventually, they have shown courage and may gain reputation within their group. This may explain the irrational forms of defiance that are typical of many young Moroccan men in Amsterdam: insulting officers to the bitter end gains honour and standing, although they know that they cannot alter the power balance.

Police officers have their own repertoire to put down citizens. Often their responses have the elements of a degradation ceremony (Van Maanen 1978). The most frequent one in Amsterdam is to make citizens wait for nothing. However, most replies of police officers are of a more subtle nature. Many reactions occur in part unconsciously. Accusing looks, a hostile stance and an irritated voice can be taken as mild forms of rejection—just as many forms of citizen defiance and irritation are expressed indirectly. They resort to 'off-record markers', remarks that undermine normal conversation such as insinuations, sarcasm, understatements and rhetorical questions.

A. Emotions and Status Conferral

The moral contest is characterised by negative emotions such as annoyance, anger, rage, dislike, aversion and contempt. These unpleasant emotions

function as instruments to regain status, particularly because they deter and arouse fear and shame. Anger and pride are explicitly associated with higher status (Tiedens 2001). Both express dominance, transmit a latent aggressive message and function to position oneself as deserving dignity. By contrast, contempt indicates that the other is not a worthy opponent. For that reason, contempt is rather accompanied by rejecting, ignoring or avoiding rivals (Tiedens 2001; Jones 2002).[12] While anger can be used to address someone, contempt blocks communication.

Anger communicates competence and the ability to exert power. As mentioned, this only applies for anger that is controlled and well timed. Acting wildly often gives the impression that you are harmed or confused. It damages one's reputation. By contrast, a calm and imperturbable stance contributes in itself to a higher status.

Most police officers in Amsterdam know very well that such a stance upholds authority, and that convincing messages need 'controlled anger'. But it is very difficult to suppress bursts of anger: internally felt anger easily 'leaks out', especially when insults enter the person behind the uniform. Some quotes from the interviews:

> That bad-ass says: 'I am going to smash your face in, boy.' 'Just try it, and I'll make you mad.' Very simple. At that moment you downgrade yourself to his level.

> I said: 'I hope you got three cells in your brain to remember what I said.' That's not making any sense. Later on you know that she won.

These officers confirm that a 'mirroring' style damages their status. Other officers don't mind, and simply want to be superior:

> Cynicism that's the first thing I learned myself. You need it when people are smart. … Well, I start and it goes continually to a higher degree, and I hope for them that they do not go along with me.

Many 'forcing' officers resort to violence. One of them received six complaints within three months and was plainly burned out. His frustration was also directed at his colleagues and the management. He showed mainly contempt:

> It just happens. If you have the bad luck to meet six of those bumpkins than I am spoiled … They just want to screw me. If I taste that, then I'm finished with them. Totally … They don't make a fool of me. Not at all.

Embracing cynicism, these officers want to win the battle by all possible means, and do not sense that they in fact debase their public status.

[12] According to emotion-sociologist Theodore Kemper (1990), the majority of emotions stem from realistic, anticipated, recollected or imagined outcomes of power and status relations.

For respectable citizens the dominant emotion is usually embarrassment, a transient unease related to specific circumstances (in contrast with shame, which is usually focused on profound moral values and generally does not arise during minor incidents). They become aware that they are the centre of attention and are being judged. However, this discomfort easily evokes impulsive anger, especially when assertiveness 'orders' one to protest. By contrast, the sense of pride in lower-status subgroups simply demands that police officers are defied. Many Moroccan and Antillean boys show that they are 'independent' and ready for action. Their contest-behaviour is couched in what William Ian Miller has termed a 'moral economy of honour', focused on strict reciprocal norms that must prevent disgrace and cowardice (Miller 1993).

In sum, proactive stopping and fining brings forth a moral contest which forces both parties to defend their status. Both are tempted to retaliate when an attempt to degrade reveals itself. For that reason it is hardly possible to think away 'mirroring' from police work in the streets. How to prepare police officers properly for these contests without sacrificing integrity and respect? I will argue that developing emotional intelligence and affirming argumentative styles are of utmost importance.

VI. BUILDING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE INTO POLICE WORK

Arlie Hochschild (1983) has pointed out that members of specific occupational groups show emotions that meet occupational demands. Shop-workers smile and show friendliness, nurses care and show comforting feelings. Those 'display-rules' will often be at odds with the personal feelings that these workers have in the face of a customer who annoyingly criticises all the commodities you offer, or a patient who complains continuously. The shop worker and the nurse are not expected to reveal these feelings.

In the same way, police officers are expected to suppress their personal feelings. They are supposed to act properly and correctly, and look earnest, confident and in control. The public expects a self-confident and calm attitude. This 'feigned' attitude keeps private feelings of fear, revulsion or, occasionally, attraction at bay, feelings that could disrupt their professionalism. Surface feelings meet display-rules, the rules that ought to be presented during work time. Internal feelings, related to what officers 'really' feel, must be suppressed. Police officers on the beat ought to radiate attentive signs even when bored by the grind of daily work. They also must be able to sympathise with complaining victims. When they impose a fine, they must show a resolute stance. They must convey the message that any citizen would have received that fine! All unfairness and arbitrariness that might possibly attend the issue of the fine must be prevented.

Were police officers unable to control their private emotions, their authority would be compromised. The expression of too harsh or too soft emotions (infuriated or grieved) points to professional weakness (Martin 1999; Rafaeli and Sutton 1991; Sutton 1991). Hence police officers are expected to manage their irritation, dislike and amusement. At the same time they ought to manage and control the feelings of others. Police officers are, one might say, engaged in 'double-faced emotion management' (Tracy and Tracy 1998). This is for instance the case when officers give advice to agitated residents: they try to calm them down, and at the same time they reduce their own feelings of powerlessness or embarrassment. This double emotion management occurs especially in situations of high urgency or stress.

Professional police work on the streets involves adequate social-emotional competence: being in control in stressful situations, being resolute, raising oneself above conflicts and squabbles, and beaming out a relaxed stance. One might define police professionalism as a mix of sober-minded and recognisable acting (Denkers 1983). This means reacting in a more detached style than most citizens, while at the same time showing authentic and sincere feelings to build up trust. This second aspect requires 'expression in office': showing commitment and that you really mean what you say. Here, primary impulses and emotions must be suppressed, while feelings of citizens must be responded to in such a way that a sense of urgency is conveyed and the concerned parties are stimulated to take their responsibility. In the case of fining, it is a real art to perform within the confines of behaving soberly (keeping a distance) and yet being involved (point with some passion at the responsibility of booked citizens). The other way round, when police officers ignore, keep off or play down the feelings of citizens, they give the impression that nothing is at stake. But in reality trust is harmed and the interaction ends with a disturbed relation.

The second aspect of this social-emotional competence is not very well developed. Many police officers only learn to stay under control and to keep their distance. This 'stoic pose' may bring to the fore many problems. Suppressing real feelings may generate stress and become a psychic burden, particularly when distressing incidents are not coped with. That might give rise to 'emotional dissonance': officers are not capable of adapting their own feelings to public display rules and the expectations within the force. This imbalance also affects the quality of interaction with citizens (Rafaeli and Sutton 1991; Ashforth and Humphrey 1993). The forcing styles of many police officers in the context of Streetwise policing in Amsterdam reveal just such a lack of responsiveness.[13]

[13] Dutch research findings indicate that stressed and depersonalised police officers operate less responsively and more insensitively (Kop 1999).

In police organisations, the importance of understanding and expressing emotions is not very well-recognised. Discussing emotions is usually discouraged. The need to close ranks is of more importance (Martin 1999; Kop 1999). The education and training of police officers could be more attuned to emotion management: to understanding how emotions like anger and contempt are aroused, and how they can be avoided or channelled. Four principles of emotional intelligence are of major interest here (Saarni 1999; Jones 2002):

— *Emotional awareness*: the ability to detect emotional states in self and others (decoding skills).
— *Emotional perspective-taking* (or empathy): the ability to recognise and understand emotional experience from others' point of view, particularly in victims and offenders.
— *Cultural understanding*: the ability to appropriately follow display rules that prescribe emotional expression and understand that different (sub)cultures operate with different display rules, particularly minority cultures wherein respect is experienced and expressed differently.
— *Strategic expression*: the ability to regulate one's impulses and emotional experiences, particularly in conflicts and other emotion-eliciting events; the ability to respond convincingly to conflicts, calm down emotions and inspire confidence.

Next to emotional intelligence, developing argumentative skills is important. Not being able to respond adequately or offer proper arguments when you are challenged undermines the authority of police officers. The chance that they then react aggressively is increased. After all, a person who lacks argumentative abilities is tempted to attack not the position that someone takes up in a discussion, but the personality of the opponent. Thus good communication is an important pre-condition for preventing verbal aggression (Infante and Rancer 1996). Besides, it turns out that people who are able to communicate well are perceived as more sincere and trustful: they reveal aspects of themselves and invite others to cooperate.

Authority thrives on credible acting. Infante (1988) points out that credibility is an image that people have of someone in terms of three factors: expertise (possessing valuable knowledge), trustworthiness (the audience believes the person in question is reliable and feels 'safe') and dynamism (the impression that you are a forceful person with an appealing personality). This last factor seems to be the most important one: 'the more you are seen as dynamic, the more you tend to be viewed as expert and trustworthy' (1988: 126). Being perceived as dynamic means being seen as having energy, strength and vitality, which gives the impression that you are an approachable person and that you seem to know what you are talking about.

To prevent verbal aggression, it is important that rejecting messages (like cautioning or fining) are accompanied with relaxed, attentive and sincere vocal responses and facial expressions. An affirming communicative style is viewed as less threatening: it supports rather than attacks the citizen's self-identity and focuses the perception of citizens on the case itself (Infante et al 1996). Affirming styles prevent citizens feeling inferior. If they are addressed as subordinates, they adopt defensive attitudes and tend quickly to interpret 'normal' arguments as personal attacks. Thus police officers should not display explicitly superior behaviour, although they should guide the conversation with citizens. For that reason they cannot evade displaying signs of non-verbal behaviour that suggests a higher status: nodding one's head only now and then when the citizen is talking, adopting a relaxed posture and gestures, looking the citizen in the eye and not turning away (Infante 1988).

VII. CONCLUSION

'Streetwise' produces more brutal and unseemly officer behaviour. In some ways it seems to delegitimise police work. What is gained at the front door (the benefits of 'broken window' policing: more familiar and ordered street scenes, reassessment of informal social control) may be lost at the back door (loss of trust in the police; opposition and non-cooperation, especially by minorities). Repressive routines evoke many furious reactions from the public. Citizen-defiance often puts the police in an awkward position and elicits disproportionate reactions and unnecessary use of force. The relevant questions are: when stopping a citizen, how to prevent insults? How to deal with a first insult (and shift its emotional momentum)? In case of giving fines or making arrests, what space can the citizen be granted to vent his emotions? When are aggressive words supposed to be counteracted (risking escalation)?

Occupational training may draw attention to these problems and dilemmas. Next to that, officers need more knowledge of subtle and subconscious ways of 'saving face'. More insight is needed in communicative strategies to settle questions, using affirmative styles and being aware that forms of personal authority determine credibility. These recommendations are not without pertinence. Many research findings (Kop et al 1997; Wilson and Braithwaite 1993; Infante and Rancer 1996) indicate that a lack of social and communicate skills augments verbal aggression.

The pitfalls of forcing and mirroring deserve special attention. 'Mirroring' officers, who adopt the emotions of their 'adversaries', fail to keep distance (self-control) and to act responsibly, the double core of police professionalism. 'Forcing' officers generally keep a distance but fail to express a trustful and dynamic attitude. They do not supply reasons, and are not well

prepared to meet verbal attacks. Forcing points to deficient argumentative and personal forms of authority.

Reverting to formal authority does not convince in Dutch society. More and more, citizens cooperate conditionally. Conferring authority has become dependent on recognisable and sincere acting that reveals trustworthiness. Police officers have to develop more personal forms of respect capable of building citizen compliance.

REFERENCES

Ashforth, BE and Humphrey, RH (1993) 'Emotional Labour in Service Roles: the Influence of Identity' 18 (1) *Academy of Management Review* 88–115.

Brown, P and Levinson, SC (1987) *Politeness* (New York, Cambridge University Press).

Cupach, WR and Metts, S (1994) *Facework* (Thousand Oaks, Sage).

Denkers, F (1983) *'Daar pakken ze je op' Emoties tussen rechtstaat en politie* (Lelystad, Vermande).

Engel, RS (2003) 'Explaining suspects' resistance and disrespect toward police' 31 *Journal of Criminal Justice* 475–92.

Gabriel, Y (1998) 'An Introduction to the Social Psychology of Insults in Organizations' 51(11) *Human Relations* 1329–54.

Harcourt, BE (2001) *Illusion of Order: The False Promise of Broken Windows Policing* (Boston, Harvard University Press).

Hochschild, AR (1983) *The Managed Heart* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).

Infante, DA (1988) *Arguing Constructively* (Prospect Heights, Waveland Press).

—— and Rancer, AS (1996) 'Argumentativeness and Verbal Aggressiveness: A review of Recent Theory and Research' in BR Burleson (ed) *Communication Yearbook 19* (Thousand Oaks, Sage).

Infante, DA et al (1996) 'Affirming and Nonaffirming Style, Dyad Sex, and the Perception of Argumentation and Verbal Aggression in an Interpersonal Dispute' 22(3) *Human Communication Research* 315–34.

Jones, TS (2002) 'Pride and Prejudice: Considering the Role of Contempt in Community and Conflict' (unpublished manuscript).

Katz, J (1999) *How Emotions Work* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).

Kelling, G and Coles, C (1996) *Fixing Broken Windows: Restoring Order and Reducing Crime in American Cities* (New York, Free Press).

Kemper, TD (1990) 'Social Relations and Emotions: A Structural Approach', in Th Kemper (ed), *Research Agendas in the Sociology of Emotions* (Albany, State University of New York Press).

Kop, N (1999) *Blauw licht in het donker Een onderzoek naar burn-out van en conflictbehandeling door politieagenten* (Amsterdam, Thesis).

—— et al (1997) *Politie en publiek Een onderzoek naar de interactie politie-publiek tijdens de surveillancedienst* (Arnhem, Gouda Quint).

Kowalski, RM (2002) *Complaining, Teasing, and other Annoying Behaviours* (New Haven and London, Yale University Press).

Martin, SE (1999) 'Police Force or Police Service? Gender and Emotional Labour' 561(January) *The Annals of the American Academy*.

Mastrofski, SD et al (1996) 'Compliance on Demand: The Public's Response to Specific Police Requests' *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33(3) 269–305.

—— (2002) 'Police Disrespect toward the Public: An Encounter-Based Analysis' 40(3) *Criminology* 519–51.

Miller, RS (2001) 'Breaches of propriety', in RM Kowalski (ed), *Behaving Badly. Aversive Behaviors in Interpersonal Relationships* (Washington, American Psychological Association).

Miller, WI (1993) *Humiliation and Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort and Violence* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).

Phillips, T and Smith, P (2003) 'Everyday Incivility: Towards a Benchmark' 51(1) *The Sociological Review* 85–108.

Rafaeli, A and Sutton, RI (1991) 'Emotional Contrast Strategies as Means of Social Influence: Lessons from Criminal Interrogators and Bill Collectors' 34(4) *Academy of Management Journal* 775.

Roché, S (2002) *Tolérance Zéro? Incivilités et insécurité* (Paris, Odile Jacob).

Saarni, C (1999) *The Development of Emotional Competence* (New York, Guilford Press).

Scheepers, P and TE Grotenhuis, M (2000) 'Tanend gezag van autoriteiten in een individualiserende samenleving' in L Gunther Moor and K van der Vijver (eds) *Het gezag van de politie* (Dordrecht, SMVP).

Sherman, LW (1993) 'Defiance, Deterrence and Irrelevance: A Study of the Criminal Sanction' *Journal of Research in crime and Delinquency* 30 445–73.

Sutton, RI (1991) 'Maintaining Norms about Expressed Emotions: The Case of Bill Collectors' 36 *Administrative Science Quarterly* 245–68.

Sykes, RE and Clark, JP (1975) 'A Theory of Deference Exchange in Police-Civilian Encounters' 81 *American Journal of Sociology* 584–600.

Tedeschi, JT and Felson, RB (1994) *Violence, Aggression, and Coercive Actions* (Washington, American Psychological Association).

Terrill, W and McCluskey, J (2002) 'Citizen complaints and problem officers Examining officer behavior' 30 *Journal of Criminal Justice* 143–55

Tiedens, LZ (2001) 'Anger and Advancement Versus Sadness and Subjugation: The Effect of Negative Emotion Expressions on Social Status Conferral' 80(1) *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 86–94.

Timmer, J (1999) *Politiewerk in gevaarsituaties Omgaan met agressie en geweld van burgers in het basispolitiewerk* (Amsterdam, VU).

Tracy, SJ and Tracy, K (1998) 'Emotion Labor at 911: A Case Study and Theoretical Critique' 26 *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 390–411.

Tyler, T and Huo, YJ (2001) *Trust and the Rule of Law: A Law Abidingness Model of Social Control* (New York, Russel Sage).

Van den Brink, G (2001) *Geweld als uitdaging De betekenis van agressief gedrag bij Jongeren* (Utrecht, NIZW).

Van Maanen, J (1978) 'The asshole' in PK Manning and J van Maanen (eds) *Policing; A View from the Street* (New York, Random House).

Van Stokkom, B (2005) *Beledigd in Amsterdam; verbaal geweld tussen politie en publiek* (Alphen a/d Rijn: Kluwer).

Van Stokkom, B (2008) *Disorder Policing and Community Need* 'Revising' Broken Windows Theory, in M Easton et al (eds) *Reflections on reassurance policing in the Low Countries* (The Hague, Boom Juridische Uitgevers) 53–72.

Van Stokkom, B (2010) *Wat een hufter! Ergernis, lichtgeraaktheid en maatschappelijke verruwing* (Amsterdam, Boom).

Van Swaaningen, R (2005) 'Public Safety and the management of fear' 9 (August) *Theoretical Criminology* 289–305.

Warren, M (1996) 'Deliberative democracy and authority' 90(1) *American Political Science Review* 46–60.

Wilson, C and Braithwaite, H (1993) 'Police Patroling, Resistance, and Conflict Resolution' in N Brewer and C Wilson (eds) *Psychology and Policing* (LEA).

Wilson, K and Gallois, C (1993) *Assertion and Its Social Context* (Oxford, Pergamon Press).

WRR (Dutch Scientific Council) (2003) *Waarden, normen en de last van het gedrag* (Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press).

Wouters, C (1986) 'Formalization and Informalization: Changing Tension Balances in Civilizing Processes' 3(2) *Theory, Culture and Society*.