



UWL REPOSITORY

repository.uwl.ac.uk

The role of prejudicial stereotypes in the formation of suspicion: an examination of operational procedures in stop and search practices

Minhas, Rashid ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1479-0985> and Walsh, Dave (2021) The role of prejudicial stereotypes in the formation of suspicion: an examination of operational procedures in stop and search practices. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 23 (3). pp. 293-305. ISSN 1461-3557

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/14613557211016499>

This is the Accepted Version of the final output.

UWL repository link: <https://repository.uwl.ac.uk/id/eprint/7837/>

Alternative formats: If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact: open.research@uwl.ac.uk

Copyright: Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy: If you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact us at open.research@uwl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**The role of prejudicial stereotypes in the formation of suspicion: an examination of
operational procedures into stop and search practices**

Rashid Minhas and Dave Walsh

Dr Rashid Minhas

Lecturer in Criminal Psychology, School of Human and Social Sciences

University of West London [\[1\]](#)

Rashid.minhas@uwl.ac.uk

Prof. Dave Walsh

Professor of Criminal Investigation and Criminal Justice

De Montfort Law School

De Montfort University, Leicester, UK.

Dave.walsh@dmu.ac.uk

***Corresponding author**

Dr Rashid Minhas

School of Human and Social Sciences

Paragon House, Brentford

London TW8 9GA

Rashid.minhas@uwl.ac.uk

0044(0)208 231 2438

Abstract

One of the current and visible controversies in the UK policing that challenges the heart and foundation of the principle of law is arguably the apparent disproportionate use of stop and search powers involving ethnic minority communities. Differential exposure to certain types of suspected offenders can lead to the development of cognitive scripts that operate as stereotypes which may play a role in informing suspicions concerning police stops and searches. Focussing on whether police officers use negative stereotypes to inform suspicions when conducting stops and searches, the present study examined more than 2,100 stop and search records held by a police force in England, as well as conducting 20 semi-structured interviews with frontline serving police officers from the same force. It was found that the use of stop and search powers is consistent with (i) the use of stereotypes with respect to age, appearance, and social class; and (ii) the disproportionate recorded use of stop and search powers involving Black, Asian and Mixed communities. The implications of these findings are discussed.

Keywords: stereotyping; suspicion; stop and search; policing; decision-making

Introduction

The use of stop and search powers by the police has been one of the most controversial issues in debates concerning policing ethnic minority communities (Bowling & Weber 2011; Quinton, 2011; Phillips & Bowling, 2012; Shiner & Delsol 2015; Bradford, 2017). The delivery of policing should not be greatly inferior to some social groups than others (Bowling & Weber, 2011). In the UK, several research studies have reported findings apparently showing disparities in police treatment between ethnic minority citizens and White citizens (Graham & Lowery, 2004; Parmar, 2011). Studies of stop and search indicate that the required reasonable grounds for suspicion were often not adhered to by the police (Jefferson & Walker, 1993; Bowling & Phillips, 2007), with stereotypes possibly playing a role in informing their suspicions (Smith & Gray, 1985; Quinton & Packham, 2016). Previous research studies have also found that certain stereotypes are commonly used by police officers to classify people based on their ethnic origin and social class (e.g. Cain, 1973; Graef, 1989; Young 1994; Jefferson & Walker, 1993; Bowling & Phillips, 2007; Quinton, 2011).

Although, there is a significant volume of literature on the formation of racial and prejudicial stereotypes (e.g. Correll et al., 2007; Graham & Lowery, 2004; Walther et al., 2005), there remains a negligible amount of research concerning the relationship between prejudicial stereotypes and police officers' decision-making process when informing their suspicions to initiate a stop and search encounter. **Therefore, the present study focuses on whether police officers use stereotypes to inform suspicions when conducting stops and searches (rather than on the broader debates concerning the matter of policing BAME communities in the UK).** Drawing upon strands of literature from cognitive social psychology, this study examines how officers; (i) may develop suspicions of people; and (ii) decide whether to initiate a stop and search encounter.

Background

Following the Home Office¹ Action Plan (1999) in response to the Macpherson Report, a number of studies were conducted to examine police use of stop and search powers (e.g. Bland, Miller, & Quinton, 2000; Stone & Pettigrew, 2000; Home Office, 2003; Delsol & Shiner, 2006; Home Office, 2006; Bowling & Phillips, 2007; Miller, 2010; Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System, 2012; HMIC, 2013; HMIC, 2015). Each subsequent study indicated that aggregate disparities showed no improvements following reforms (HMIC, 2013). However, the police have tended to explain the question of disproportionality away with reference to a number of possible suggestions, such as biased police recording and differential offending rates (Shiner, 2010; Shiner & Delsol, 2015). The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) (2010) report found that the stop and search powers had been used in a discriminatory manner. This report argues that various explanations have been put forward as to why the police use stop and search powers disproportionately against certain ethnic groups. These explanations include: (i) BAME people may be more often involved in crime; (ii) stop and searches play a role in preventing and detecting crime; and (iii) certain ethnic minorities' greater presence on the streets. The EHRC (2010) report emphasise that the evidence points to racial discrimination being a significant factor as to why Black and Asian people are more likely to be stopped and searched than White people. Further, this report maintained that stop and search powers might well be used in a discriminatory and unlawful way. The other criterion which compares numbers of stop and searches is the population among different ethnic groups 'available' to be stopped. This thesis acknowledges that some demographic groups are 'unavailable' (because they spend most of their time at home, at work or are otherwise in private spaces) to be stopped by the police, while others, on the contrary, are more likely to be

¹ The Home Office is a ministerial department of Her Majesty's Government of the United Kingdom, responsible for immigration, security and law and order.

‘available’ by virtue of their demographic characteristics and lifestyle. However, MVA and Miller (2000) investigating this comparator concluded that resident populations give a poor indication of the populations available to be searched. Even taken together, all these explanations have been argued not to provide justification for the extent and persistence of the problem (Weber & Bowling, 2014).

Studies of stop and search practice, conducted after the introduction of the PACE² Act (1984), indicate that the reasonable grounds for suspicion were often not adhered to (Quinton et al., 2000; Quinton, 2011), with negative stereotypes potentially playing a role to inform suspicions (Brown, 1997; Dixon et al., 1989; Smith & Gray, 1985; Quinton, 2011; Young, 1994). Such stereotypes can be activated in the officers’ decision-making process. Once activated, these stereotypes influence relevant decisions concerning a suspect’s perceived culpability (Minhas & Walsh, 2018). Thus, such prejudicial stereotypes activation does not appear to require a perceiver to overtly endorse the stereotype (Correll et al. 2007).

Dixon et al. (1989) noted, a man who fits a stereotype just ends up noticeably suspicious in a stop and search context. Quinton (2011) quoted a statement by an officer, who revealed that the connotation of young people wearing tracksuits and hooded tops were not respectable: “you develop the stereotypes through experience, the people you see are involved in crime. In this area, its people in sports gear” (2011, p. 364). Quinton also cites a statement from another officer, who said, “whenever a robbery comes in, 90% you will be thinking it’s a Black male because of the description and because you know who does a robbery in the past” (Quinton, 2011, p.364). Arguably, it may be inescapable that such focus on particular groups of a

² The Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 is an Act of Parliament which instituted a legislative framework for the powers of police officers in England and Wales to combat crime, and provided codes of practice for the exercise of those powers.

community would have resulted in youngsters from deprived backgrounds and ethnic minorities being targeted.

PACE (1984) states that reasonable grounds of suspicion cannot be based on stereotypes or individual qualities (including previous criminal record). However, Dixon et al. (1989) noted that the formation of reasonable suspicion is viewed as a rational process which includes officers looking over the material facts around them and weighing-up the probability of finding a prohibited item. Kleining (1996, p.83) observed that police discretion was deemed to be “a permission, privilege or prerogative to use one’s own judgment about how to make a practical determination”. However, “the absence of a clear statutory penalty for unlawful stops and searches allows the police discretion to act without adequate accountability” (Bowling & Phillips, 2007, p. 939). As such, unrestricted practices regarding stop and search might provide the opportunity for police officers to exercise their discretionary powers based more upon their prejudices than justified suspicions (Kleining, 1996). For instance, if a traffic officer decides to stop a speeding driver, they are given a number of possible actions that will decide the outcome. If a violation was noted, the officer can decide whether to offer a greater or lesser charge (i.e. speeding rather than reckless driving). In other situations, the officer can decide on delivering a formal warning or making a custodial arrest. Another alternative is that the police officer could permit them to continue with or without a warning. Additionally, officers can also make choices concerning other decisions, for example, checking computer records to search evidence, or conducting stops and searches, all of which reflect the level of discretion that lies with police officers (Smith et al., 2006).

The police are aware of the general trends in street crime. From this awareness, officers tend to form impressions of the likelihood that individuals belonging to specific racial groups will perpetuate certain types of crimes (Smith et al., 2006). Such perceptions may lead to officers undertaking racial profiling, which has the effect of creating a cycle of profiling of

suspected offenders (irrespective of the accuracy of these negative perceptions) (Delsol, 2015). These cycles of profiling are results of negative stereotypes (Minhas & Walsh, 2018). Research studies have found that negative stereotypes (based on a suspect's race) may influence officers' investigative decision-making which could contribute to a different outcome of a criminal investigation when investigating a similar crime (when suspects are from different ethnic groups) (Minhas & Walsh, 2018). This finding suggests that negative stereotypes might well be a potential key contributing factor in the overall disproportionate number of BAME communities involved in being stopped and searched (and in turn those charged, convicted, and imprisoned). As such, a review published by the UK Ministry of Justice found that BAME communities make up 14% of the population of England and Wales, but 25% of adult prisoners and 41% of under 18s in custody (The Lammy Review, 2017).

The impact of negative stereotypes, as such, is to mark out the limits amongst 'them' and 'us' (Tajfel, 2010). The social identity theory offers a powerful explanation for the social foundation of in-group and out-group biases. Social identity theory asserts that group membership serves to bolster self-esteem, and thus, individuals have an incentive to favour in-group members over out-group members (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The use of negative stereotypes may have adverse effects on the criminal investigative processes as these stereotypes could have a more negative effect when investigating suspects from out-group communities (Tajfel, 2010). In the context of the criminal justice system, certain ethnic minorities are frequently negatively stereotyped to have characteristics that make them more inclined to take part in criminal behaviour (Correll et al., 2007). For example, Ware (2007) argues that the stereotyping of young black men as dangerous criminals is embedded within police culture.

The roots of prejudicial stereotypes are deeply embedded in the police culture (Yesufu, 2013). The disproportional use of stop and search powers are a reflection of a collective pattern

of police culture and practice (MPA, 2004). The use of prejudicial stereotypes against certain ethnic groups can be seen in processes, attitudes, and beliefs within the police culture (Yesufu, 2013). Such negative stereotypes operate unwittingly and can be directives of actions since they work at the level of discernment and desire (Hall, McLaughlin, & Lewis, 1998). Hall et al. (1998) found that stereotypes were remarkably stable over time, being transmitted and maintained through informal work routines. If police officers maintain negative stereotypes towards specific groups, this can shape how they behave towards them, resulting in officers displaying a discriminatory and hostile behaviour towards suspects (Minhas, Walsh, & Bull, 2017). It appears that police subcultures can be problematic if they reinforce the view that certain groups are involved in specific crimes, as these findings suggest, which may hamper effective police interpersonal and communication skills used to develop suspicion and conduct a stop and search (Loftus, 2010).

Minhas et al. (2017) developed a measure to identify indicators of prejudicial stereotyping within the police investigations. That tool was designed to identify prejudicial stereotypes based on the race and ethnicity of the suspect. This tool maintains that if a police officer has any perceived prejudicial stereotypes towards the suspects, this could result in guilt presumption and self-fulfilling prophecies. Consequently, any prejudicial stereotypes may lead (at its more extreme) to the police officer demonstrating hostility toward suspects. Research conducted on stop and search has consistently found that the long-observed ethnic disproportionality can be partially attributed to racialisation and discrimination by individual police officers on the streets (Phillips, 2011) and the decisions to conduct stop and searches are carried out guided by prejudicial stereotypes (Stone & Pettigrew, 2000). It is, therefore, essential to improve our understanding of the processes by which police officers inform suspicion or anticipate wrong-doing and decide to conduct a stop and search (Quinton, 2011). As such, in the present study, we hypothesised that officers use stereotypes to inform suspicions

and initiate a stop and search encounter. Further, we hypothesised that stereotypes based on a suspect's race and ethnicity could be a contributing factor in negative searches and disproportionality.

Methods

The present study used a mixed-methods approach. It has consisted of two phases: (i) an examination of 2,118 individual search records provided by an English police force (a shire force that covers both urban and rural areas); and (ii) a thematic analysis of 20 semi-structured interviews, which were conducted with serving patrol officers of the same force. This sequential method was devised first to determine what might be the possible factors which may lead an officer to stop and search encounter followed by the exploration and explanation of the findings from the search records analysis by conducting interviews with serving police officers. This purpose of this approach was to explore whether the factors identified by officers in the dataset to develop suspicion and initiate a stop and search encounter triangulate with factors they identified during the semi-structured interviews.

Phase I

The phase I of analysis examines

1. What are the grounds for searches reported by the police officers to inform suspicion?
2. Whether a relationship exists between those belonging to Black, Asian, and Mixed ethnicity group and the greater rate of their being searched?

Data collection and procedures

Following the completion of the first author's Non-Police Personnel (NPP) Level One³ vetting procedure (the police constabulary carried out checks on national Police computer systems, local systems and requests checks from Forces that cover any addresses quoted in the author's application), and ethical approval by the police force and authors' then home University, a dataset was sent to the first author via a secure email within an Excel spreadsheet containing a record of 2,118 searches. This dataset included information regarding who was searched, when, what powers were used to search, and on what grounds. The dataset also contained information concerning the gender, ethnicity, the age of the individual when s/he was searched, whether that person was arrested or not and (if so) the reasons for their arrest. The database was compiled from documentary records of searches which were conducted from the period of 1st July 2014 to 31st December 2014 covering the whole area of a single police force in England and Wales.

Results

The first stage involved the examination of these data to identify what factors might have aroused officers' suspicions. Thus, 'grounds of search' were examined for each recorded search using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; [see phase two for further details on thematic analysis](#)). As a result, eight common factors were identified by which officers inform suspicions about people and decide whether or not a formal stop and search is necessary (for details see results section phase 1). Following this, the dataset was coded on the basis of (i)

³ Non-Police Personnel (NPP) Level 1 Vetting: Confidential security vetting checks are carried out on all applicants for posts working for or with Constabulary. The checks comply with the standards laid out by Association of Chief Police Officers National Vetting Policy and Home Office guidelines to determine whether the candidate represents a risk to the assets of the Force or the Police Service as a whole.

grounds of search; (ii) what powers were exercised by police officer; (iii) gender; (iv) age; (v) ethnicity; (vi) whether arrest was made following a search and; (vii) reasons for arrest. As such, the ‘grounds of search’ were examined of each recorded search, which provided information about the officers’ origins of suspicion. As a result of thematic analysis of the stop and search records dataset, eight common factors (see Table 1) were found. The coded data were then imported into SPSS software to conduct statistical analyses.

[Insert Table 1 here]

It was found that nearly half (49.6%) of the searches were conducted with individuals aged between 18 to 30 years old – for individuals aged between 12 to 17 (20.3%), 31 to 40 (22.5%), and 41 to 70 (7.5%). As a result of the 2,118 searches, 288 (13.6%) arrests were made. Where arrests took place, the dataset did not provide any subsequent details of the outcomes of these arrests (such as the number resulting in charges, cautions or no further action).

In order to determine whether a relationship exists between those belonging to Black, Asian, and Mixed ethnicity group and the greater rate of their being searched, we examined the coefficient of the confidence level (both the lower and upper bound value) and the f-test (wald test) as presented in Table 2. Starting from the confidence interval (CI) coefficient, the ethnicity values (0.48:3.04) revealed that ethnicity has a considerable influence on stop and search exercises. Overall, using the Wald (f-test) as seen in Table 2 to determine whether gender, age, grounds of search, and ethnicity jointly predict whether an individual can be stopped and searched. It was revealed that these variables jointly have substantial influence on the exercises of stop and search, which implies that BAME individuals have the tendencies of being stopped and searched when compared to White people.

[Insert Table 2 here]

Further, to test whether ethnicity plays any influence on the likelihood of an individual being stopped and searched a Chi-Square test of independence was performed, to obtain whether there is a statistically significant association between being (i) a member of Black, Asians and Mixed communities and (ii) being searched by police. Where the degree of freedom was one with $\alpha = 0.01$, the null hypothesis is that search rates are independent of race and the alternative hypothesis is that search rates are not independent of race. It was revealed that $p < 0.05$ indicating there is a relationship between belonging to the Black, Asian, and Mixed communities and the likelihood of their being searched.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Further, the search rates were compared to population statistics (obtained via the Office for National Statistics, 2011). Table 4 shows that those belonging to Black, Asians, and Mixed communities were likely to be searched 2.12 times more compared to the rest of the population of the area covered by the Constabulary.

[Insert Table 4 here]

Phase II

The purpose of phase II was to explore the officers' views to answer the following questions

1. What constitutes an effective stop and search encounter?
2. What is the basis for suspicion and factors that make officers decide who to stop and search?
3. To what extent officers use of stereotypes to develop suspicion in stops and searches decision making?

Participants and procedures

In the present study, the researcher employed semi-structured interviews that allowed the officers to develop and qualify their ideas. The open-ended nature of the questions allowed

officers to discuss issues tangential to the questions asked, and these diversions often proved informative and encouraged rapport. The first author interviewed a range of police officers from each division of the police force, concentrating mainly on patrol officers. These interviews include a wide variety of ages, backgrounds, and lengths of service, in order to cover a variety of police tasks and experience. During September-December 2015, the researcher undertook interviews with 20 officers (17 of which were males). The police designated responsibility for providing officers for interviews to one of the sergeants on duty. The sergeant had randomly pre-selected police officers from all the divisions across the police force and provided a timetable for them to be interviewed. All the participants were frontline patrolling officers and had experience in conducting stops and searches. Their experience ranged from one to 22 years ($M=8.88$ years, $SD = 4.96$ years). Participants' ages ranged from 23 to 56 years ($M = 36.47$, $SD = 8.68$).

The interviews were conducted in the most private available space in the police station. Each interview lasted approximately 40 minutes. The researcher began all interviews by asking demographic information such as age, sex, self-defined ethnicity, rank, and length of time in the force. Each officer was asked the same standard set of questions, though where necessary, elaboration and clarification were provided. The anonymity of all the participants was protected by numerically coding each interview and responses were always kept confidential. The officers' names and badge numbers were not taken to keep anonymity. The researcher also provided this information in letter form for officers to take away if they so wished. All the officers provided consent to record interviews. Transcripts were prepared for each interview, and these formed the basis for examination and analysis of the data.

Qualitative Data Analysis

In order to examine the semi-structured interviews, the present study employed a thematic analysis of the interview transcripts. The thematic analysis also gives a platform for the clear and straightforward definition of the theoretical position a study adopts in its approach to analysing its data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The method of analysis chosen for present study was inductive thematic analysis (data-driven) (Boyatzis, 1998). Inductive analysis is a procedure of coding the data without trying to fit it into a pre-existing coding frame (Boyatzis, 1998). In the present study, the codes were accordingly inductive, originating from the participants' understandings concerning stop and search practices (Miles & Huberman, 1994). By conducting inductive thematic analysis, the authors were not only able to determine what constitutes an effective stop and search encounter, but also what factors may have influenced officers' decisions to stop and search. Accordingly, in the present research, inductive analysis took a semantic or explicit approach (Boyatzis, 1998). That is, the themes were identified from the "explicit or surface meaning of data" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 84).

In the present study, in order to code the data, the guidelines for conducting inductive thematic analysis developed by Braun and Clarke (2006) were followed. The first step of the analysis included an initial reading of the interview transcriptions to gain familiarisation with them. In the second reading, a line-by-line coding was undertaken to ascribe each sentence a code that described the main essence of the sentence. All the data were coded, and codes were merged into larger units organising those that seemed similar in meaning content. This was followed by sorting the different codes into potential themes and collating all the relevant coded

data extracts within the identified themes and sub-themes for each interview transcription. In the present research, a theme was defined as the smallest unit that in a meaningful way could express the codes that were included in it. From the individual summary sheets, an overall list of themes was constructed. Themes were refined and grouped into clusters to form super-ordinate themes.

Limitations: The matter that it was the police themselves that acted as gatekeepers for this convenience sample of police officers who were interviewed for the study was not ideal, but given the general difficulties in accessing police officers, this was unavoidable. Nevertheless, the interviews were conducted with police officers from across this police force. While the findings may not provide a complete picture, they may provide a useful insight into decision-making by police officers as they conduct stop and search, and the contexts in which these decisions take place. The findings (related to both searches dataset and interviews analyses) may also be affected by the researcher's unconscious biases either against the police or other ethnicities. Police officers' responses during the interviews we conducted with them may have been affected by their training and their awareness regarding the highly sensitive issue of disproportionality in stop and search figures. As a result, their responses might well be a case of their attempting either 'impression management', (Schoderbek & Deshpande, 1996) or social desirability (Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987). Recognising the importance of accurate and reliable information concerning the description of a reported offender, future studies should be conducted to examine whether vague or inaccurate descriptions of a reported person play a role in disproportionality in stop and search figures.

Results

Thematic analysis of the twenty interview transcripts was conducted to identify themes emerging from the answers to questions and subsequent contributions made by officers. The findings are discussed and presented under these main themes:

- (i) What constitutes an effective stop and search encounter;
- (ii) The basis for suspicion;
- (iii) The use of stereotypes (generalisations) in stops and searches decision making;
- (iv) The possible factors playing any role in disproportionality.

An analytical narrative was constructed and extracts from the transcripts are now presented to illustrate each of the four themes.

What constitutes an effective stop and search encounter?

Participants were asked what is an effective stop and search encounter in the light of their experience. According to their views, a stop and search encounter is effective when it meets these criteria:

- a) *Definable suspicious behaviour*. Ninety percent of participants (n=18) reported that their decision to stop and search is more effective when based on definable suspicious behaviour, as outlined in the PACE Act (1984) Code A.
- b) *Guided by up-to-date operational intelligence* (e.g. focused on active and more serious offenders, local crime trends, and specific crime hotspots). Ninety percent of participants (n=18) reported up-to-date operational intelligence as their grounds for a stop and search encounter.

- c) *Carried out in a respectable manner.* All twenty participants reported that a stop and search encounter which is carried out in a respectable manner with a clear explanation of the reason for a stop and search would enhance public confidence.
- d) *Carried out in the context of police-community relations and cooperation.* Eighty-five percent of participants (n=17) reported that an effective stop and search encounter is one which is carried out in the context of police-community relations and cooperation.

The basis for suspicion

Officers stated they generally stop and search someone whom they suspect of committing or being likely to commit a crime. In this regard, three factors were identified by the police officers as those that would arouse their suspicion and may lead to a stop and search encounter. These factors are (i) appearance; (ii) behaviour; and (iii) time and place. Each of these factors will now be examined.

Appearance

During the interviews, fifteen of the participants (75%) stated that their suspicion might be prompted if a person appears to be of a young (adult) age. For example, the participant (20) stated it as,

"I would say its white males from 17 to 30-ish. I would say 99% are in that age group because they're the ones that are committing, from where I work, the drug offences, the shoplifting offences."

Thirteen (65%) participants mentioned that individuals wearing a baseball cap or going 'hooded-up' or wearing two sets of dark clothes at night might also attract their attention. There was a sense among these participants that young people wearing dark clothes during the night could be trying to make them harder to see. For example, the participant (09) described,

“I have had instances before where you’ve got youths, about 16, 17-year-olds that are wearing two sets of clothing one over the other, dark clothes, dead at night, the only reason why they are doing that is so they can discard that top clothing and having different clothing underneath”.

Twelve participants (60%) stated that they would stop and search an individual, who is previously known to the police, if they located him in a crime hotspot. For example, the participant (17) stated,

“Previously known to me... if it’s a drug hotspot then it gives me more grounds to actually go and speak to the person and also carry out a search to see whether that person is actually carrying drugs...”

However, in contrast, eight participants (40%) indicated that they would need reasonable suspicion to act at that moment such as observed offending or fresh and up-to-date intelligence. For example, the participant (15) described,

“Previously known to me or police wouldn’t make any difference to me, just because they’re known and they’re on a crime hotspot that wouldn’t be enough for me to have reasonable grounds to suspect. I would need more information than that”.

Behaviour

During the interviews, fourteen participants stated that the behaviour of an individual is the primary reason in their decision making to stop and search someone. These participants stated that they might stop and search people who are seen ‘loitering’ ‘looking into cars’, ‘looking into gardens’, or ‘checking locks’. Participant (11) stated,

“if they are like going up and down people’s driveways at that time in the morning or they are looking in people’s cars, or they are going along trying car door handles and that sort of thing to me that’s suspicious”.

Participants also referred to “suspicious behaviour” as “furtive” or “elusive” behaviour and described it in a number of ways such as; (i) avoiding being seen (“hiding face, looking away, driving off”); (ii) running away on seeing officers; and (iii) attempting to hide objects in the surrounding area or throwing away something. Participant (19) stated,

“If I was to see somebody loitering, looking like they were doing something and they were hiding something as they see me approach, you know, then that could arouse my suspicions. Turning their back towards me could arouse my suspicions”.

However, the other six participants stated that ‘suspicious behaviour’ as ‘furtive’ or ‘elusive’ behaviour is irrelevant in their decision to stop and search someone. For instance, the participant (07) stated,

“If you looked away why would I consider that to be suspicious because you may not like police, you know, you may be looking round to catch the bus. I wouldn’t say that’s suspicious. I wouldn’t stop someone on such basis”.

Ten participants (50%) stated that the official form is insufficient to describe the reasons for the stop and search in full details. For example, the participant (05) stated,

“Part of our issue is we have a very small form to write the details on...When you have got two lines you can literally write seen acting suspiciously”.

Time and Place

Fifteen participants (75%) relied on their knowledge of a particular location and what activities should or should not be expected there, after a particular time to form a suspicion. For instance, participant (13) stated,

“If it’s a notorious place in the city that it’s just known for drug use or drug possession, somebody’s there, three o’clock in the morning on their own to me, yes, I’ve got reasonable suspicion that you may have something on you and to me, I would search you”.

Another participant (15) stated

“I think if it was somebody that was known and they weren’t near to their home address at three o’clock in the morning I think they would be at the very least asked to account for why they were where...”

However, for the other five participants time and place were irrelevant in their decision making to stop someone. For instance, the participant (10) stated,

“No, not because of a particular time or location, because he’s not doing anything, you know, unfortunately, people do walk around...I wouldn’t feel comfortable to search him. It’s quite difficult because I tend to find reasonable suspicion to be quite a high threshold test”.

Use of stereotypes in stop and search decision making

Thirteen participants (65%) described a number of generalisations (stereotypes) they use when making a decision who to stop and search such as dress, age, known unemployed, and is located in a known crime hotspot. For example, the participant (19) described,

“They are usually the ones that really...because they are the ones that will come in or they are the ones that will try and float it a bit because they have got this sort of mentality that they can

get away with anything. The older you get the more, sort of, cautious you are being and stuff like that. So, yes, I would say 16 to 20.”

Another participant (02) described it as,

“The main people that I would stop and searching out at night are going to probably be white, the early twenties, early thirties, unemployed, usually people of substance abuse that are out stealing for a reason, to fund their other problems”.

Furthermore, another participant (12) stated it as,

“If you are looking at people that are unemployed, sort of, career criminals, the ones that are known to us, the ones that may potentially be stopped more often because they are out there”.

Possible factors playing a role in disproportionality

Twelve participants indicated that a description of a suspected offender should not be treated as a straightforward form of information. More importantly, four of these participants stated that poor or vague information concerning an offender’s description could be attributed to the possible causes of disproportionality, as these communicated descriptions tended to focus on their ethnicity and clothing. Participant (07) stated it as,

“Yes, it’s a very, very, very white area and so, for example, if I have a report where they say a Black male has burgled a property or a Black male has drugs on him and I, for example, two minutes later find a Black person around the corner I’m going to search that Black person and I’ll tell him why he’s being searched and what have you. Whereas, obviously if it’s a white person and that’s all I’ve got it’s more difficult for me to pinpoint the white person and it’s almost like a...whether it’s right or wrong it’s almost like scale, the scale of the population if you know what I mean in the area, so...”.

Furthermore, another participant (18) described it as,

“for example, if it was reported it was a large white male and I drive past three large white males I’m less likely to stop those three large white males before I get to the home address. If I see a large Black male, they’ve reported a large Black male and it’s the only one I see I’m likely to stop him. That might be why they are disproportionately stopped, particularly if they’re in sort of predominantly white areas”.

Twelve participants (60%) stated that they would not target people from ethnic minorities. On the other hand, one other participant (20) believed that Black ethnic minorities are perceived to be involved in drug use and drug dealing, suggesting, however, such notion did inform his judgment and decision-making.

“I would suggest that predominantly drug use and drug dealing is part of the Black minority. It’s just how...it’s how it’s perceived in society. I would say so, yes, because like I say it’s predominantly Black ethnic minorities that will be drug dealers... I think that just gets into your mind. It gets into other people’s minds as well”.

Discussion

The present study sought to examine whether police officers use stereotypes to inform suspicions when conducting stop and searches. The analyses of recorded stop and search dataset revealed that stop and search powers are disproportionality weighted against Black, Asian and Mixed communities. Further, it was revealed in the dataset of stop and search records that officers use generalisations to inform their suspicions (e.g., their being previously known to the police, or their being in a known crime hotspot). The analyses of research interviews indicated that people’s age, appearance, being know to the police, location, and their social class play a role when officers make decisions whom to stop and search. The generalisations identified in the analysis of the interviews we conducted triangulated with the grounds for

searches reported in the dataset by officers. These findings suggest a relationship between specific stereotypes (i.e. young people on the street in deprived areas as potential criminals) and the formation of suspicion (being seen in a particular location at a particular time). These findings are consistent with the previous research (e.g., Quinton, 2011), where it was found that stereotypes are central to decision-making which result in police focussing more towards those socially marginalised.

In the interviews we undertook in Phase II of the present study, a quarter of our participants indicated that they would need reasonable suspicions before stopping anyone (such as either observed offending or possessing up-to-date intelligence on the individual, rather than relying on stereotypes based, say, on someone's age, employment status, or location). This finding implies that among these officers reasonable suspicion requires a high threshold test (which is also in line with the PACE legislation in England and Wales, concerning when to conduct stop and searches). Nevertheless, in instances where officers were found to heavily rely on stereotypes to inform suspicions, they appeared to be using their powers under this legislation in ways that could be deemed unlawful and discriminatory. That is, according to PACE (Code of Practice A, 1984), individual officers and their supervisors are legally obliged to base their decision to stop and search on reasonable suspicion that the concerned individual has committed or is about to commit, a particular offence. Hence, it is unlawful to target people based on officers' generalised beliefs alone. In the dataset of documented records 367 searches appeared to be conducted on the grounds of 'an individual being previously known to the police' (n = 198) or 'being in a known crime hotspot' (n=169). This was consistent with the officers' views during the interviews we conducted with them where they professed that such generalisations are vital to their decision making concerning whom to stop and search. While stereotypes which link crime with age, location, time, and appearance may sometimes provide useful grounds to stop someone, there is a potential risk

that people will also be identified by the police as suspicious when they do not warrant such police attention. This can be a major cause of public resentment towards the police (Quinton, 2011).

On the other hand, one quarter of police officers stated that suspicious behaviour or elusive behaviour is irrelevant in their decision to stop and search someone. These officers reported that they would need a reasonable suspicion (such as observed offending) to initiate a stop, rather than just perceived suspicious behaviour. This finding suggests that these officers are making decisions to inform suspicions as outlined in the PACE guidelines. **Conversely, three quarters of those police officers we interviewed said that people's suspicious behaviour were the grounds to conduct stop and searches. More than two-thirds of these officers described suspicious behaviour in a number of different ways (e.g. running away or hiding their face after seeing officers).** These findings are also triangulated with the dataset of documented records of stop and search, 310 searches were stated as being conducted when a 'suspicious activity' appeared to have been observed. Similarly, once an officer developed cues of suspicion on the basis of 'schemas' about actions or people they do not believe fit the environment or situation, they may act upon them and stop the individual. While in many circumstances such cues may well be reasonable, they have been often found tied to issues of ethnicity (Alpert et al., 2005). As such, suspicions developed from a cognitive schema may be more ones of supposition, but not necessarily ones of concerning the actual behaviours or actions of people. Such perceptions may lead to officers undertaking racial profiling, which has the effect of creating a cycle of profiling of suspected offenders (irrespective of the accuracy of these negative perceptions) (Delsol, 2015).

Further, it was found that the recorded grounds for stop and search in the documentary records we examined in the present study were lacking in detail, concerning information that would have been known to police officers. For instance, more than 75% of police officers

reported that that the place of stop (being known as a crime hot spot) the time of day or night it occurred, or the age of the person stopped as their justification for grounds of search, but these criteria were only found cited in 9% of the documentary dataset. Similarly, 75% of police officers advised us that people's suspicious behaviour would prompt a stop and search, yet these reasons were cited in just fifteen percent as grounds for searches in the documented dataset.

This latter finding suggests that officers might well be using stereotypes to a greater extent than they realise. Such a situation, may well mean that the searches that have been conducted by the police were based either on insufficient grounds (where grounds are limited and questionable in legal terms), or alternatively there is a tendency to record fewer details concerning the grounds for their stop and search than were actually present at the time (which indicates that an inadequate explanation of the reasons for a search is being recorded). Either explanation reflects a most unsatisfactory situation. When we ask for clarity concerning the documentary data lacking details of stop and searches grounds during interviews we undertook in Phase II of the present study, more than half of the officers highlighted that the stop and search form (that is needed to be manually completed at the time of the stop and search) is too small in size and does not allow them adequate space to fully detail the grounds for the search. Nevertheless, officers did not offer (what is thought as) rather simple solutions to this problem, such as turning the form over to record full details on its other (blank) side (or to enter such information in their pocketbooks). This might reflect a malaise concerning the lack of necessary attention to maintaining comprehensive records. Regardless, failure to record specific details and refer to all the available direct and indirect evidence poses risks to legality (PACE Code A, 1984), the effectiveness of searches and, in turn, to public confidence in policing (Quinton et al., 2000). Furthermore, these findings suggest that reasonable grounds for suspicion were often not adhered to with evidence pointing towards an over- reliance on

the use of stereotypes (that has been previously found in the literature, i.e. Quinton et al., 2000; Quinton, 2011).

The analyses of both the documentary datasets and the interviews revealed that officers also relied on their knowledge of specific locations (what activities should or should not be expected there, at a particular time of day) to form their suspicions. Officers' perceptions concerning crime hotspots may lead them to believe that people in that particular area are engaged in criminal activity, which may pose a threat to police-community relations (Weisburd et al., 2011). By deploying police resources in hotspot areas, criminal activity can be disrupted to a certain extent. However, such deployments may affect how police officers interact with the members of that area, threatening police-community relations and thus the effectiveness of community policing strategies (Quinton, 2011). Chainey and Macdonald (2012) found that stop and searches conducted in crime hotspots made police officers more suspicious of people, generally, in that area, whilst also prompting police officers to take action (such as stop and search). At the same time, a benefit that emerges from the policing of crime hotspots is that it can provide the police with important contextual information that might help them develop enhanced justifications for a search. Further, by continuously reminding the officers at daily briefings that hotspot policing must not affect how they behave and interact with the members of that particular area may well help to reduce negative stop and searches.

One of the interesting findings of the present study was police officers' perceptions concerning the association between the issue of disproportionality and the descriptions of reported offenders. Officers highlighted that the issue of disproportionality might be related to insufficient and inaccurate information concerning such descriptions because these details mainly focused on ethnicity and clothing. The majority of the officers suggested that they felt a need to clarify the necessary elements of a description of 'suspected offender' for operational use. A description fitting that of a reported offender can inform direct evidence (Quinton,

2011). However, if the suspected offender's description is vague or inaccurate or has come from an unreliable source, suspicions may be based on tenuous grounds (which may result in the stop and search of innocent people) (Bowling & Phillips, 2007). For example, when there is insufficient and inaccurate information concerning the description of a reported offender, which mainly focused on ethnicity and clothing (when combined with an officer's pre-existing cues of suspicion on the basis of generalised beliefs), this may arguably result in people being stopped and searched on the basis of their social class and ethnicity. During the interviews, officers reported that when they receive insufficient information concerning a reported offender, they indeed combine such information with their pre-existing cues on the basis of suspect's ethnicity and generalised beliefs. Such generalised beliefs (based on suspect's ethnicity) can be activated in officers' decision-making process. Once activated, these stereotypes influence relevant decisions concerning suspects' perceived culpability (Minhas & Walsh, 2018). This finding suggests it may be inescapable that such focus on ethnicity, when combined with pre-existing generalised beliefs, results in young people both from deprived backgrounds and ethnic minority community being targeted by the police for stop and search.

These negative stereotypes were found present either within both the stop and search dataset and also during our interviews when officers carry out searches. **Previous research studies (e.g., Hall et al., 1998; Loftus, 2010) found that stereotypes (suspicion on the basis of age, location, social class) transmitted and maintained through informal work routines which can be problematic as such they reinforce the view that certain groups are involved in specific crimes.** Only those stereotypes which are associated with a suspect's race, however, has been consistently mentioned in all prior studies within the context of stop and search (e.g., Young, 1994; Bowling & Phillips, 2007; Quinton, 2011; Shiner & Delsol, 2015; Bradford, 2017). If such stereotypes are accepted as consistent indicators of disproportionality in stop and search

figures, racial stereotypes may only need to be present to influence officer's decision-making process.

In conclusion, the present study found that the police officers use negative stereotypes to inform their suspicions (people's age, appearance, being know to the police, location, and their social class) suggesting a relationship between prejudicial stereotypes and the formation of suspicion. The use of prejudicial stereotypes by the police officers is, undoubtedly, of a concern, because this may lead police officers to believe that people from a particular area or a certain ethnicity are engaged in a particular criminal activity, which may pose a threat to police-community relations (Weisburd et al., 2011). The impact of stereotypes, as such, is to mark out the limits amongst 'them' and 'us' (Tajfel, 2010). The disproportional use of stop and search powers are a reflection of a collective pattern of police culture and practice (MPA, 2004; Reiner, 2010). The present study identifies that the use of prejudicial stereotypes to inform suspension could be seen in processes, attitudes, and beliefs within the police culture. As such, these negative stereotypes operate unwittingly, yet remain stable over time, being transmitted and maintained through informal work routines (Hall et al., 1998). Research studies (e.g., Graham & Lowery, 2004; Minhas & Walsh, 2018) have found that negative stereotypes (based on a suspect's race) may influence officers' investigative decision-making which could contribute to a different outcome of a criminal investigation when investigating a similar crime (when suspects are from different ethnic groups). Both the findings from the present study and those prior ones (e.g., Young, 1994; Bowling & Phillips, 2007; Quinton, 2011; Shiner & Delsol, 2015; Bradford, 2017) suggest that negative stereotypes might well be a potential key contributing factor in overall disproportionate number of Black, Asian and Mixed communities in stop and search figures. The findings of the present study suggest that there is still much work to be done in ensuring fairness and reducing disproportionality in stop and search practices. Recognising the influence of prejudicial stereotypes within the context of

disproportionality in stop and searches might well be a starting point for a more transparent and effective policing.

References

- Alpert, G.P., MacDonald, J.M. & Dunham, R.G. (2005). Police suspicion and discretionary decision making during citizen stops. *Criminology*, 43(2), pp. 407-434.
- Baldwin, R. & Kinsey, R. (1982). *Police powers and politics*. UK: Quartet Books.
- Bland, N., Miller, J. & Quinton, P. (2000). *Upping the PACE?: An Evaluation of the Recommendations of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry on Stops and Searches*. London: Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Bowling, B. & Phillips, C. (2007). Disproportionate and discriminatory: reviewing the evidence on police stop and search. *The Modern Law Review*, 70(6), pp.936-961.
- Boyatzis, R.E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative information: Thematic analysis and code development*. California: Sage Publications
- Bradford, B. (2017). *Stop and Search and Police Legitimacy* (Vol. 42). Taylor & Francis.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), pp.77-101.
- Cain, M.E. (2015). *Society and the Policeman's Role*. London: Routledge.
- Chainey, S., & Macdonald, I. (2012). *Stop and search, the use of intelligence and geographic targeting: Findings from case study research*. London: National Policing Improvement Agency.
- Crabtree, B.F. & Miller, W.L. eds. (1999). *Doing qualitative research*. California: Sage publications.
- De Gobineau, A. (1853). *Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races. The Idea of Race*. Hackett, Indianapolis.
- Delsol, R., & Shiner, M. (2006). Regulating stop and search: a challenge for police and community relations in England and Wales. *Critical criminology*, 14, 241-263.
- Delsol, R. (2015). Racial profiling. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 101, 34-35.
- Dixon, D., Bottomley, K., Coleman, C., Gill, M. & Wall, D., (1990). Safeguarding the rights of suspects in police custody. *Policing and Society: An International Journal*, 1(2), pp.115-140.
- Dixon, D. (1997). *Law in policing: legal regulation and police practices*. Oxford: Clarendon
- Dixon, D., Bottomley, A.K., Coleman, C.A., Gill, M. & Wall, D. (1989). Reality and rules in the construction and regulation of police suspicion. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 17: pp. 185–206.
- Dixon, D., Bottomley, K., Coleman, C., Gill, M. & Wall, D. (1990). Safeguarding the rights of suspects in police custody. *Policing and Society: An International Journal*, 1(2), pp.115-140.
- Equality and Human Rights Commission, (2010). *Stop and think: A critical review of the use of stop and search powers in England and Wales*. London: EHRC.
- FitzGerald, M. (1999). *Final report into stop and search*. London: Home Office.

- Fleiss, J.L. (1981). Balanced incomplete block designs for inter-rater reliability studies. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 5(1), pp.105-112.
- Graef, R. (1989). *Talking blues: the police in their own words*. Collins Harvill.
- Graham, S. & Lowery, B.S. (2004). Priming unconscious racial stereotypes about adolescent offenders. *Law and Human Behavior*, 28(5), pp. 483.
- Hall, S., McLaughlin, E. & Lewis, G. (1998). *Racial stereotyping in the police: statement on research on racial attitudes and stereotyping*, Report prepared for Deighton Guedalla Solicitors. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- HMIC. (2013). Stop and search powers: Are the police using them effectively and fairly? London: HMIC.
- HMIC. (2015). Stop and search powers 2: Are the police using them effectively and fairly? London: HMIC.
- Home Office. (1999). *Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Home Secretary's action plan*. London: Home Office
- Home Office. (2003). *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2002: A Home Office Publication under Section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 1991*. London: Home Office.
- Home Office. (2006). *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System 2005: A Home Office Publication under Section 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 1991*. London: Home Office.
- James, L.R., Demaree, R.G. & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(1), p.85.
- Jefferson, T. & Walker, M.A. (1993). Attitudes to the police of ethnic minorities in a provincial city. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 33(2), pp. 251-266.
- Kleinig, J. (1996). *The ethics of policing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loftus, B. (2009). *Police culture in a changing world*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Macpherson, C. (1999.) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: report of an inquiry*. London: Stationary Office.
- McCandless, R., Feist, A., Allan, J. and Morgan, N. (2016). *Do initiatives involving substantial increases in stop and search reduce crime? Assessing the impact of Operation BLUNT 2*. London: Home Office
- McConville, M., Sanders, A. & Leng, R., (1991). *The Case for the Prosecution: Police Suspects and the Construction of Crime*. London: Routledge
- Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. California: Sage Publication
- Miller, J. (2010). Stop and search in England: A reformed tactic or business as usual? *The British Journal of Criminology*, 50(5), pp. 954-974.
- MVA & J. Miller (2000) Profiling Populations Available for Stops and Searches. Police Research Series Paper 131, London: Home Office.
- Parmar, A. (2011). Stop and search in London: counter-terrorist or counter-productive? *Policing and society*, 21(4), pp.369-382.
- Phillips, C. (2011). Institutional racism and ethnic inequalities: an expanded multilevel framework. *Journal of social policy*, 40(1), pp. 173-192.
- Phillips, C. & Bowling, B., (2012). *Ethnicities, racism, crime and criminal justice* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) codes of practice". *Home Office*. GOV.UK. 26 March 2013. Retrieved 1 December 2017

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/police-and-criminal-evidence-act-1984-pace-codes-of-practice>

- Potter, J. & Wetherell, M., (1987). *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Quinton, P. (2011). The formation of suspicions: Police stop and search practices in England and Wales. *Policing and society*, 21(4), pp. 357-368.
- Quinton, P., Bland, N. & Miller, J. (2000). *Police stops, decision-making and practice*. London: Home Office.
- Quinton, P., & Packham, D. (2016). *College of Policing stop and search training experiment*. College of Policing.
- Schoderbek, P.P. & Deshpande, S.P. (1996). Impression management, overclaiming, and perceived unethical conduct: The role of male and female managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 15(4), pp. 409-414.
- Shaw, I.S. (2016). Reporting the Lee Rigby Murder and Anti-Muslim Hostilities in the UK in 2013: The Cultural Clash Communication and Human Wrongs Journalism Nexus. In: Roy, S., & Shaw, I. S. (Eds.). (2016). *Communicating Differences* (pp. 29-53). Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Shiner, M., & Delsol, R. (2015). The politics of the powers. In *Stop and Search* (pp. 31-56). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Smith, D.J. & Gray, J. (1985). *Police and people in London*: Aldershot: Avebury
- Smith, J.A. & Osborn, M. (2007). Pain as an assault on the self: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of the psychological impact of chronic benign low back pain. *Psychology and health*, 22(5), pp. 517-534.
- Stone, R. (2014). *Textbook on civil liberties and human rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J.M. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice*. California: Sage Publications
- Tajfel, H. (2010). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The Lammy Review. (2017). *An independent review into the treatment of, and outcomes for, Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic individuals in the Criminal Justice System*.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/643001/lammy-review-final-report.pdf
- Tyler, T. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Tyler, T.R. & Wakslak, C.J. (2004). Profiling and police legitimacy: Procedural justice, attributions of motive, and acceptance of police authority. *Criminology*, 42(2), pp.253-282.
- Weber, L. & Bowling, B. (2011). Stop and search in global context. *Policing and society*, 21(4), pp. 353-356.

- Weisburd, D., Hinkle, J.C., Famega, C. & Ready, J. (2011). The possible “backfire” effects of hot spots policing: an experimental assessment of impacts on legitimacy, fear and collective efficacy. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(4), pp. 297-320.
- Wilcock, R., Bull, R., & Milne, R. (2008). *Witness identification in criminal cases*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yesufu, S. (2013). Discriminatory use of police stop-and-search powers in London, UK. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 15, 281-293.
- Young, J. (1994). *Policing the streets: stops and search in north London*. London: Islington Council.
- Zerbe, W.J. & Paulhus, D.L. (1987). Socially desirable responding in organisational behavior: A reconception. *Academy of Management Review*. 12(2), pp. 250-264.

Table 1: Grounds for searches reported by the police officers to inform suspicion

Grounds of searches	Number of searches	Percentage of total searches
Being previously known to the police	198	9.35
Being located in a known crime hotspot	169	7.9
Fitting a reported suspect’s description	126	5.9
Suspicious activity	310	14.64
Drugs related suspicion	897	42.35
Reported or suspected of being in possession of an offensive weapon	88	4.1
Suspected of carrying stolen goods or going equipped	234	11.05
Responding to a reported incident	96	4.5

Table 2: Influence of ethnicity on the likelihood of an individual being stopped and searched

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
							Lower	Upper
PPower	.027	.667	.002	1	.967	1.028	.278	3.801
Grouds	-.028	.071	.153	1	.696	.972	.846	1.118
Gen	.616	1.157	.284	1	.594	1.852	.192	17.879
Age	-.463	.265	3.051	1	.081	.629	.374	1.058
Ethnicity	.189	.471	.161	1	.688	1.208	.480	3.040
Reasons	.091	.247	.135	1	.713	1.095	.674	1.779
Constant	-4.105	1.417	8.391	1	.004	.016		

Table 3: Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2- sided)	Exact Sig. (1- sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	137.654 ^a	1	.000		
Continuity Correction ^b	136.607	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	108.982	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	137.654	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	1018438				

Table 4: Risk Estimate

	Value	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower	Upper
Odds Ratio for Ethnicity (BME / REST POP)	.470	.414	.535
For cohort Search = NO	.998	.997	.998
For cohort Search = Yes	2.121	1.865	2.412
N of Valid Cases	1018438		