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ABSTRACT
RUNNING THE BOYS’ CLUB:
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by Jennifer Lynn Taylor

May 2014

After struggling for decades for an equal status, it appears that female law enforcement officers in general have overcome the obstacles that initially kept them away from the job. Now, it is not uncommon to see a woman working as a patrol officer or criminal investigator. It took a shift in attitude over time and government intervention for this evolution to occur. Male officers were resistant, because the presence of women was considered a threat to their boys’ club that they so cherished. But, eventually, they have come to accept the role of women in policing.

Unfortunately, another dilemma surfaced for female officers as they attempted to move up in the ranks of their organizations. Many found barriers in place, which kept them from obtaining leadership positions. A limited number of women have overcome these obstacles and have earned the highest positions available at their departments.

The purpose of the following study is to examine the experiences of this elite group of female leaders in law enforcement in order to understand what circumstances and decisions allowed them to make it into the upper ranks. To do this, the researcher assessed the perceptions and experiences of both ranked and subordinate female officers of the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE).
Identifying the perceived and tangible obstacles of the promotions process and documenting the choices made to overcome these is vitally important not just for retention and recruitment purposes, but also to ensure that top-ranked female officers will not be underrepresented in the future.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Women in Law Enforcement

“In valor there is hope”—Tacitus

Etched in the marble of the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington DC, these words commemorate those who have died while performing their promise to protect and serve. The four bronze lions, which stand guard over the approximately 19,000 names, symbolize the bravery and altruism that defined each and every law enforcement officer whose name is listed on it (“Carved on these Walls,” n.d.).

According to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund website, within this conglomeration of lost lives are the names of over 200 female officers (“Law Enforcement Facts,” n.d.). These women, just as their brothers in blue, lost their lives for the call. They are not listed separately or in an exclusive location, but instead, their names are intertwined with their fellow officers forever linking them together as one. These fallen officers represent all age and ethnic groups and worked with law enforcement agencies at local, state, and federal levels (“Advanced Search,” n.d.).

In November 2009, Officer Tina Griswold of the Lakewood, Washington Police Department was killed along with three of her fellow officers (Sergeant Mark Renninger, Officer Ronald Owens, and Officer Greg Richards) in a coffee shop as they completed their duty reports on their laptop computers (Johnson, 2009). The lone gunman, later identified as 37-year-old Maurice Clemmons, wanted to kill police officers that Sunday morning (Stockton, 2010). When he entered the shop, he did not specifically distinguish those sitting at the table as male or female. To Clemmons, they were all the same; they were all police officers. His purpose was clear; he shot and killed all four officers
Griswold’s name, along with her comrades’, was engraved on the Law Enforcement Memorial as one last commendable act to honor the fallen officers. When her name was added in May 2010, she became the 239th female killed in the line of duty and added to the memorial (“Law Enforcement Facts,” n.d.).

Officer Griswold’s presence in this massacre was not questioned or seen as an oddity. Rightly so, her presence was revered as honorable as she lost her life in the line of duty. But, in realistic terms, a few still feel that she and other female officers have no place on the front lines of law enforcement. This attitude of women in the law enforcement field has wavered over decades (Balkin, 1988; Horne, 1980; Sherman, 1973). It has been over a century since females first stepped into the police realm and about forty years since they put on a man’s uniform and hit the streets working in patrol (Martin, 1989b; Walker, 1977). While there still are critics, many have seen the work and progress that has been made because of their presence and know that without them law enforcement agencies would not be as effective for the people they serve. Despite the acceptance of female officers into the boys’ club, the tolerance for women as police supervisors and executives is rare and still very much resisted (Fischer, 2009; Fletcher, 1995; Grennan & Munoz, 1987).

Women in Law Enforcement

Controversy has followed the presence of women in policing since they were first allowed to work in law enforcement in the mid1800s (Horne, 1975). Their work focused mostly on the social welfare of children and females, because it was believed that women could work more effectively than men with these wayward and lost souls (Walker, 1977). Although this work was seemingly justified, many mocked and questioned their presence as well as their abilities. But pioneers, like Lola Baldwin and Alice Stebbins Wells, were
adamant that women did have a place in law enforcement, even though their stance was based on the belief that women could provide a maternal as well as feminine oversight of certain social issues that a man could not offer (Hamilton, 1924). Some agencies initially hired women officers, only to fire them or disband their special units, while other agencies fully supported the work that the women were doing (Duffin, 2010). Resistance and attitudes that a woman was not fit to do a so-called man’s job unfortunately continued throughout the majority of the 20th century. This restricted the number of women who entered the field as well as kept those who did work securely placed in subordinate positions (Garcia, 2003).

Not until 1972, when Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was amended, did significant changes take place (Martin, 1989b). Initially, Title VII prohibited certain types of private businesses from discriminating against employees or potential employees based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin (Schulz, 1995a). The Amendment broadened equal opportunity protection to include local and state government employees (Martin, 1989b). The very next year, the Crime Control Act was passed and was especially motivating, because its guidelines threatened police agencies’ federal funding if not followed (Bell, 1982; Schulz, 1995a). Seemingly customary when efforts were made to modify the status quo, some uncompromising police departments had to be sued and court injunctions handed down before efforts to hire women improved (Bell, 1982).

While these measures opened the doors for women to enter into the world of law enforcement, their greeting was less than welcoming. Male officers, who had enjoyed their boys’ only club for decades, were now being forced to let the girls play with them. Most male officers felt that the women were incapable of performing their duties, because they were neither strong nor aggressive enough to do a man’s job (Hindman,
1975; Linden, 1983; Price, 1982; Vega & Silverman, 1982). Negative attitudes abounded throughout the upper echelons as well (Balkin, 1988).

Historically, men were responsible for the tougher, enforcement-related tasks of policing, while women focused more on crime prevention and the social service aspects of the job (Bell, 1982; Hamilton, 1924). In other words, past police employees were doing gender and meeting the gender expectations of society by maintaining either a feminine or a masculine identity in regard to their work performance (Garcia, 2003; West & Zimmerman, 1987). With the introduction of women as conventional police officers, the movement to feminize law enforcement and end police patriarchy began resulting in substantial hardships and battles for those gutsy women who would go on to join the ranks (Poteya & Sun, 2009; Silvestri, 2006). The gender difference, which permitted them to initially work in law enforcement, has perpetuated over the decades keeping women from advancing to higher ranks (Garcia, 2003). Overcoming this distinguishing factor has been an enormous challenge. Since the 1970s and their right to be equally hired, female officers have attempted to shake off the label of token in exchange for being accepted as an equal, but this has been extremely difficult to do, especially for those in the highest-ranking positions (Kanter, 1977).

Fortunately, research indicates that attitudes are continuing to change, because a woman’s presence in a police agency is not as threatening as it was once regarded. Many male officers, especially newer ones, are far more accepting of policewomen in comparison to veteran officers (Austin & Hummer, 1999; Carlan & McMullan, 2009). Regrettably, though, the overall acceptance of female officers in general has not been reflective in the acceptance of female supervisors (Garcia, 2003; Garrison, Grant, & McCormick, 1998).
Policewomen as Leaders

The influence of the federal legislation and consent decrees in the 1970s began to be seen almost immediately as countless women turned out to apply for sworn police positions and were actually hired. Representation of women as police officers grew from a mere 0.8% in 1960 to 13% in 2001, according to the National Center for Women and Policing (2002). Most recently, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2010) reported that women accounted for approximately 15% of sworn officers at large local agencies. Although tolerance of female company has arrived, it seems that it has only stretched to a certain extent.

Of course, as women worked in patrol and acquired that type of much-needed experience, the next and most natural step for them to take was promotion to a higher rank. While many female officers have acquired first-line supervisory positions, only a limited number have made it all the way to the top. In the United States, it has been reported that there are approximately 212 female police chiefs, accounting for a mere 2% of all police chiefs (Ritchie, 2009). These advancements, though limited in numbers, still allow other female officers to see what they could possibly achieve.

Research also indicates that advancements by women in policing are proportionately lower than males and indicate that women are truly underrepresented in the upper ranks of police agencies (Garcia, 2003; Grennan & Munoz, 1987; Martin, 1989a; Martin & Jurik, 1996; National Center for Women and Policing, 2001). There have been various reasons reported for this absence. Explanations range from sexual harassment issues, eligibility requirements, a differential training process, and unique performance standards on evaluations (Martin, 1989b; Martin & Jurik, 1996). High turnover rates, a lack of mentors, and childcare and family issues have been attributed as
Meager numbers in other career fields demonstrate that women are not very well represented in senior leadership positions or as chief executive officers. The glass-
ceiling concept was created as a metaphorical illustration of the struggle and barriers set in place keeping women from reaching the apex of these institutions (Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986). An argument that not enough women are in the workforce could be easily defeated, when one considers that women over the age of 16 make up 40.5% of the nation’s population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010) and of this percentage 53.2% of them are in the labor force (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). Despite all of the federal and judicial mandates that have been passed to break this glass ceiling, there is evidence that it still may be in place, leaving many to wonder what is keeping these women from reaching the top (Elacqua, Beehr, Hansen, & Webster, 2009; Maume, 2004; Silvestri, 2006).

Making this struggle even more difficult for a female police officer is the realization that she is vying for a leadership position, which is typically stereotyped as a masculine role, in an especially traditional masculine field (Eagly, 2007). There is much debate as to what actually constitutes a successful leader. Most recently, the concept of transformational leadership, which is characterized as interactive, innovative, and inspirational, has been “associated with greater effectiveness” and is indicative of the “cultural shift…in norms about leadership” (Eagly, 2007, p. 3). In contrast, transactional leadership, which is more closely linked to traditional management practices seen in some policing agencies, is based on a relationship of exchange where goals and expectations are met by employees in return for wages (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978).
Interestingly, Eagly (2007) found that women were more inclined to utilize the transformational leadership style than male leaders, thereby defining women, on average, as possibly more effective leaders.

Concerns are high in regard to the small number of female police leaders and middle managers, because court-ordered consent decrees are expiring and efforts have slowed to recruit females (Leinwand, 2004). Yet, this is not a new concern. Over twenty years ago, the President of the Police Foundation, Hubert Williams, expressed his worry that a complacent attitude would befall those responsible for hiring and retention of female officers (Martin, 1989b). More recently, Penny Harrington, who was the first woman assigned as police chief in a major metropolitan city (Portland, Oregon), conveyed her worries about the shrinking pool of female law enforcement officers and how this may affect future numbers for female leaders (Leinwand, 2004). Kim Lonsway of the National Center of Women and Policing sized up this predicament by using the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police as an example. Prior to judicial involvement, only 1% of Pittsburgh’s force consisted of women. Once a court order was issued, women were routinely being hired, so that by 1991, they made up about 24% of the Pittsburgh force. After the court order was removed, the percentage of female officers fell back to 20.5% (Leinwand, 2004). Some, though, contend that their lack of progression is not the result of organizational obstacles, but instead is the result of personal decisions, citing that they are not taking advantage of the opportunities which exist (Silvestri, 2006).

Beyond this is the lack of research conducted on female law enforcement officers (Archbold, Hassell, & Stichman, 2010; Metcalfe & Dick, 2002). There have been empirical studies centering on the barriers to promotion of female officers, on gender issues, and even a study that offered a statistical profile of police chiefs, but there is very
little information available as to the experiences of current female police supervisors, especially female police executives (Archbold et al., 2010; Archbold & Schulz, 2008; Schulz, 2009; Silvestri, 2006).

To comprehend this underrepresentation of women in leadership positions, an examination was made to understand the experiences of women who have attained these leadership positions using the input of members of the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE). NAWLEE, which is comprised of both subordinate and supervisory female officers, seeks to further not just the interests of current female executives, but also those who aspire to attain a higher rank.

Overall, what these top-ranking female pioneers have done is truly amazing; they have bypassed the stresses, the downfalls, and the inconveniences to reach the upper-echelons of the police bureaucracy. Their experiences can offer a way to comprehend and explain why there are not more women in their position as well as show newer female officers and those females interested in the field that women can and do make it to the top.

While fallen female officers like Officer Griswold are sincerely honored by their fellow officers and the public, the reality of the day-to-day struggles that female officers must face is still present, especially for those who attempt to move up in the ranks. Understanding what these women have endured will not only help other females, but will naturally also help police agencies as well.

Statement of the Problem

Female law enforcement officers are able to reflect on an extensive and tumultuous history, including their gradual acceptance by administrators, fellow officers, and the public. For those women eyeing the promotional ladder, this acceptance seems to
dwindle dramatically as they move up each rung. It is as if the old boys’ club is willing to let the girls play, but only in the lowest ranks. For those who want to become a part of the upper echelons, it appears that preparations need to be made for the inevitable uphill battles.

During the hiring process, many females do not necessarily consider the mechanics of the promotion process; they usually have enough procedural obstacles like the hiring process (e.g. physical testing, oral review boards, etc.) and the training process (e.g. police academy training, certifications, etc.) to distinctly focus on rather than whether they will become a captain, major, or chief one day. Yet, these considerations must be taken into account, because once the rookie status has been shaken off, a clearer picture of the future of their career is available. Females need to understand the difficulties they face in the militaristic structure of police agencies and its rigid bureaucratic process of promotion, even with all of the safeguards that are in place to make it a less-biased journey.

With an awareness of the struggles by current female police supervisors and executives, aspiring policewomen as well as those lower-ranking policewomen can know what lies ahead and prepare. This information is not meant to deter them from the field, but instead to give them the fortitude and knowledge to confront these battles better equipped and with less difficulty and pressure.

Past inquiries on this topic have focused mostly on the areas of anecdotal examinations (Duffin, 2010; Gold, 1999; Schulz, 2004), the creation of a statistical profile (Schulz, 2003), and qualitative research interviews (Archbold & Schulz, 2008; Meistrich, 2007; Silvestri, 2007; Wells, 2001). Besides these sources, modern generalizations on the career experiences on female police supervisors usually have been
based on research encompassing both male and female experiences in the workplace in general (Eagly, 2007; Kanter, 1977; Murphy, 2006b). Therefore, the void of understanding the collective experiences of female police leaders is apparent and needs to be addressed.

Purpose of the Study

This study seeks to understand and document the career experiences and perceptions of those female officers who have attained a supervisory police position. With so few women in these positions, even with government intervention, it is vital to understand what challenges they have faced as they advanced to higher ranks as well as to understand those struggles they are currently facing. To better understand these phenomena and to fill the existing gap in the literature on female police supervisors, this study will seek to understand what these officers have experienced throughout their career, to discover what they and subordinate female officers are currently experiencing in general, and to determine how this information can help the future of women in law enforcement.

Definitions

The following terms are utilized in the study:

- **Doing Gender**: “involves a complex of socially guided perceptual, interactional, and micro-political activities that cast particular pursuits as expressions of masculine and feminine natures” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 126).

- **Gender**: “the activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitudes and activities appropriate for one’s sex category” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 127).
• **Glass Ceiling**: a concept used to depict the “invisible barrier” (Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986, pp. A1, A4) that women encounter as they attempt to move up in the hierarchal ranks of an institution, regardless of whether it is a private or public establishment (Maume, 2004).

• **Matron**: “applied to women having care and supervision of women and juveniles in custody” (Schulz, 1995a); applicable to both jails and prisons.

• **Police officer**: “individual given the general right to use coercive force by the state within the state’s domestic territory” (Klockars, 1985, p. 12).

• **Token**: opposite of a dominant; members of a skewed group who are “treated as representatives of their category, as symbols rather than individuals” (Kanter, 1977, p. 208).

• **Transactional Leadership**: management characterized by conditional rewards and corrective actions (Bass, 1985).

• **Transformational Leadership**: management characterized by the four I’s of idealized influence, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation (Bass, 1985; Murphy & Drodge, 2004).

**Limitations**

The researcher has imposed certain limitations on the study. These limitations include the following:

• Participants of this study included only female members of the national group, NAWLEE.

• Participants of this study are sworn officers; non-commissioned personnel were not included.
• Participants of this study include both current full-time officers as well as retired officers.

• Participants of this study who are classified as a sergeant or above were considered to hold a supervisory position, while any rank lower than sergeant would be classified as non-supervisory.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were utilized by the author while conducting this study:

• The participants will complete the survey instrument truthfully.

• This study assumes that those who participate in the study have actually earned the rank that they report to have attained.

• This study assumes that those who will participate in the study have actually lived through the experiences they claim to have undergone.

Justification

Past literature on female police supervisors only initially included individual accounts, historical narratives, and government reports. Scholarly research finally delved into this area and offered more of a comprehensive understanding of the experiences of these women. But, these reviews have been restricted to a certain extent because of small sample sizes, limited subject areas, and the use of mostly qualitative methods. To obtain a more concentrated analysis, the researcher proposed a quantitative study of the career experiences of female police supervisors in order not only to quantitatively document these experiences, but also to offer those women interested in a law enforcement career a comprehensive point of view of these women’s struggles as they moved into supervisory positions. Also, this research will provide current female officers an opportunity to
review the experiences of female supervisors on a national basis, thereby reassuring them that they are not alone in their struggles while stressing what their police career can present to them.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Women’s representation in law enforcement in the United States began in the mid-19th century (Balkin, 1988; Schulz, 1995a). Originally, women were hired only to work with juveniles and females leaving the real police work to male officers. Their scarcity on the force and social welfare assignments came to an end when doors of opportunities were opened in the 1970s (Breci, 1997; Kakar, 2002; Martin, 1991). Government intervention in the forms of legislation and consent decrees compelled police agencies to employ females by prohibiting discriminating hiring practices.

Progress has been slow, but positive results have been noted. According to the Uniform Crime Report (2013), women account for 11.9% of law enforcement officers in our country. Yet, concerns about the modest number of female officers still linger as consent decrees are lifted and the fervent advocacy to hire women diminishes. Many worry that a peak may have been reached and that a plateau has followed.

Adding to this dilemma are the numerous difficulties and pressures associated with being a woman in law enforcement. Concerns like sexual harassment and childcare difficulties are just a few of a long list of dilemmas that a female officer will possibly have to face throughout her career. These dilemmas increase and are magnified as she attempts to move through the ranks of promotion. For instance, the attitudes of fellow officers, which have finally been steered toward a more positive stance, fall back to a negative and threatening standpoint. This reality means that the female police supervisor must struggle to work in a male-dominated field, build experience for a successful career, and, at the same time, try to maintain a sense of self and identity. This study will
attempt to assess her experiences, but a review of the related literature is first presented. It includes a brief historical account of women in law enforcement as well as a review of the various governmental interventions, which led to these significant changes. Additionally, an examination of gender issues and leadership styles provide a basis for understanding the role of women as police supervisors and executives.

Differential Status as a Means of Initial Acceptance

Initially, women were allowed to work in the field of law enforcement, only because it was thought that they would be more attentive to the special needs of children and better serve the interests of wayward females than male officers would. But, local city administrators and law enforcement leaders, who were mostly men, did not just nonchalantly accept the idea of policewomen. It took the passionate concerns by special interest groups, like the Women’s Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), to turn up the pressure on these public administrators to improve the conditions in the facilities where females and children were confined (Schulz, 1995b). These groups were so worried about the negative influences of the social disorders of the early 20th century that they used whatever means necessary, including the sponsorship of women working in the criminal justice field, to fight what they saw as the downward spiral of society (Schulz, 1995b). The WCTU’s argument that women could bring a different perspective to the law enforcement field opened a wide door of opportunity for women. Unfortunately, women’s different status would work against them in later decades (Garcia, 2003). An overall review of their role will provide an understanding of how and why female law enforcement officers are still struggling to make it to the top.
Early History

Historically, women and children were confined in the same holding areas as men (Friedman, 1993). With the support of groups like the WCTU, jail and prison facility conditions began to improve starting in the 1800s. As these facilities began to be upgraded and women and children were separated from male offenders, an additional improvement was made with the introduction of female prison matrons. The matrons had numerous responsibilities and were expected to “care and supervise women and children in custody” (Schulz, 1995b, p. 9). Some of these responsibilities included searching the thousands of women detained each year (especially those considered more respectable) and overseeing the care of females ranging from babies born in lockdown facilities to elderly women as old as ninety years of age (Melchionne, 1976; Schulz, 1995b). In one of the earliest documented cases of a woman working in the criminal justice system, a female was assigned the role of prison matron for female inmates at Auburn Prison in New York in 1832, after a female prisoner became pregnant while in solitary confinement (Freedman, 1981; Schulz, 1995b). Prison matrons would eventually be hired by other facilities to handle female prisoners in order to avoid similar incidents.

Subsequently, women were hired to work in other publically-controlled institutions like local jails to supervise females, who were detained by law-enforcing agencies (Higgins, 1951). These women were designated as police matrons (Owings, 1925). New York City was the first to utilize police matrons when it hired six women in 1845 to work in two separate city facilities, Blackwell’s Island and the City Prison, after succumbing to the pressures of the American Female Reform Society (Higgins, 1951; Schulz, 1995b; Walker, 1977). The idea spread like wildfire, and by the end of the 19th
century, approximately 36 cities throughout the United States had hired female matrons (Schulz, 1995b).

Private organizations also employed women and utilized them as undercover agents and detectives. Two early private companies, Wells Fargo and Pinkerton Detective Agency, realized how valuable women could be in their field and hired them (Scarborough & Collins, 2002; More, 1992). Pinkerton’s Protective Patrol services were the first to employ a female detective, who was hired in the late 1850s for railroad security (Scarborough & Collins, 2002). Even the federal government understood their importance and used females as spies during the Civil War (More, 1992).

Influential Pioneers

The successes of prison and jail matrons led to the idea of women working as police officers, but only to a certain extent. Many felt that the opportunity was present for them to go in a little closer and work, not just with arrestees or convicts but also to work with juvenile delinquents and troubled females. This notion was supported by many because women were considered less hostile and better able to generate a rapport with those groups (Melchionne, 1967).

Mary Owens would be one of the first women to do this. She had not planned on working with the Chicago Police Department, but when her husband who had been a Chicago police officer died unexpectedly, she was afforded the opportunity by the mayor of the city because there were neither city pensions nor any other death benefits at that time (Higgins, 1951; More, 1992; Schulz, 1995b). Previously, some cities would hire a widowed female in the capacity of a jail matron, so that the woman could still care for her family. But, in Ms. Owens’ case, she was not hired as a matron, but as a police officer (Schultz, 1995b). Appointed in 1893, Owens worked in that capacity, assisting detectives
in cases involving women and children and going to court on their behalf for the next thirty years (Higgins, 1951; Horne, 1975; Owings, 1925).

Next in the progression of women’s role in law enforcement was Lola Baldwin. After a successful stint at Oregon’s 1905 Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition where she provided protection for vulnerable young women from foreign men, Baldwin was hired full-time by the Portland Police Department and given arrest authority, which was the first time a woman had been given such powers (Bopp & Schultz, 1972; Higgins, 1951). By giving her this type of authority, Baldwin, who was appointed director of the newly-created Department of Public Safety for the Protection of Young Girls and Women, was able to deal more effectively with social and moral problems, which were seen as threatening to young girls and women (Koenig, 1978). At forty-five years of age, Baldwin, who was called the municipal mother (Myers, 1995), began this passionate work to protect females from the immoral influences of the changing time. Of one girl whom she had attempted to aid, Baldwin wrote, “We have tried in every way to help this girl to a decent life, and having failed, need to send her where she cannot contaminate others” (Myers, 1995, p. 87). For the next seventeen years, she fought hard for her unit and its cause and then retired (Myers, 1995).

Considered the first regularly rated policewoman in the United States, Alice Stebbins Wells, who was a college-educated social worker, firmly believed that male police officers should not be handling children and women, whether they were the victim or the criminal of a crime (Higgins, 1951). Believing that females had a unique place in law enforcement, Wells began her journey by conducting a local survey, which interestingly concluded that there was a dire need for a female presence in policing (Bopp & Schultz, 1972). Using the signatures of some of Los Angeles’ most influential
citizens, Wells petitioned City Hall and was appointed to the position of policewoman in 1910. She was able to keep her endeavor secret until her appointment, so that the anti-feminist sentiment would not quash her and her ideas (Bopp & Schultz, 1972). Because her efforts concentrated on the well-being and preservation of all women and children, she did not keep her work fixed only in Los Angeles. Instead, Wells took her cause and motivation for it to other cities throughout the United States and Canada, contributing to the increase in the number of policewomen who were being hired (Balkin, 1988; Owings, 1969). With the support and financial aid of the WCTU, Wells was able to lecture in 31 cities in 30 days (Higgins, 1951).

Unfortunately, some did not accept Wells’ efforts, even mocking her to a point of embarrassment. When her appointment was finally made public, a newspaper published an illustration of the newly-presented policewoman as a “bony, muscular, masculine person grasping a revolver” (Horne, 1975, p. 18). But, the sharp criticism did not faze Wells, as she roamed movie theaters, skating rinks, and other recreational places visited by women and children. Her desire to assist those who needed social services and steer them away from the social dangers of crime overshadowed any criticism or doubt that may have existed (Schulz, 1995b). Wells strongly supported the college educational programs that were developing in the policing field and encouraged policewomen to acquire as much training and education as possible (Graper, 1921/1969). She also founded the International Policewomen’s Association in 1915, which is still in existence today and is known as the International Association of Women Police (“Brief History,” n.d.).

New York City eventually followed in the footsteps of other major cities and added females to their ranks to work with juveniles and females in 1917 (Melchionne,
Mary E. Hamilton, one of the city’s first policewomen, felt so strongly about the obligations of women and their role as police officers that she wrote a book in 1924 specifying the responsibilities and attitudes in which females who were or who wanted to be policewomen should hold. Hamilton (1924), like many other female pioneers, argued that women were accountable for the protection of the family and the home, and regarded her status as a police officer as a means to ensure that mentality endured (Garcia, 2003). Still, Hamilton, who was a supervisor in the department’s women’s bureau, encouraged her subordinates to have college training and to take self-defense classes. She was an early supporter of the use of fingerprints and actually taught a fingerprinting course to federal agents and school and hospital officials. When Hamilton resigned from her supervisory position after only two remarkable years, she continued using her passion for the field and started her own private detective company (Duffin, 2010).

Establishment of Specialized Policewomen Units

After World War I, specialized women’s bureaus, divisions, or units were created by a number of policing agencies to cater to the needs of the newly-hired policewomen (Duffin, 2010; Owings, 1925). While there were still reservations about a female’s presence within a policing department, some of their male counterparts recognized the usefulness of the women’s work. These special bureaus kept the division of policemen and policewomen intact and ensured that there was no confusion or association of their duties (Higgins, 1951). These bureaus were separate from the police department itself and kept the females segregated from the male officers. The women’s bureaus were considered powerless to a certain extent, even though some of them were able to broaden their regular preventive work into more general police work (Martin, 1980; Schulz,
1995b). The District of Columbia would be one of the first cities to mobilize a women’s bureau in 1918 with four policewomen assigned to the unit (Schulz, 1995b).

Fueling the support of these women’s bureaus was the concept of police professionalism, which had been materializing during the Progressive Era as innovative technologies and new administrative ideologies were introduced (Walker, 1977). After years of corruption blemished the work of law enforcement agencies, the police professionalism movement sought to improve job-related training, ban political influence, and upgrade administrator qualifications (Walker, 1977). The work of the newly-created women’s bureaus fell right into place with this concept because of the emphasis on crime prevention, which was an innovative initiative at the time. Many of the larger metropolitan cities utilized these bureaus and assigned their policewomen into them (Bopp & Schultz, 1972). The units not only gave police administrators a place to put the women, but it also ensured that the distinct line between male police work and female police work was acknowledged.

Even though the women’s bureaus were loosely considered part of the police departments, many were specifically located in separate facilities from headquarters, which guaranteed that they were kept away from the main organization (Hutzel, 1933). Mary Hamilton (1924) of the New York City Police Department strongly supported the physical separation of police headquarters and the women’s bureaus because she felt that women did not need to be around the policemen’s rugged and dirty workplace. She is distinctively known as the policewoman who bragged about renovating an old precinct house so that it looked more like a “charming club house for girls rather than an old-time police station” (Hamilton, 1924, p. 58). Hamilton, who had been assigned as one of the supervisors of the Women’s Precinct in 1921, felt that women could assist the male
officers with their jobs, without leaving them feeling alienated or threatened (Melchionne, 1962). As with most of the policewomen of that time, she stressed their role as one of police protection and crime prevention. Hamilton (1924) focused this protection and prevention on troubled juveniles and women because “danger lurks in parks, playgrounds, beaches, piers, and baths, unless there is someone there to watch over these pleasure haunts experienced enough to recognize a devastating evil” (p. 170). Her mentality explains the fervent support she had for her separate bureau. A few years later and after much success, the Women’s Precinct was formalized as the NYPD Policewoman’s Bureau (Darien, 2002). Other city agencies also created separate women’s bureaus. For instance, in 1919 Indianapolis launched a Bureau of Policewomen, while the Policewoman’s House was opened that same year in Dayton, Ohio (Bopp & Schultz, 1972).

Because the special units consisted of mainly females, most supervisory positions were given to women like Portland’s Lola Baldwin (Myers, 1995). The thought of a woman director did not cause much controversy because the women were not supervising any men and their leadership was contained in their special units. Overall, the creation of these divisions as well as the assignment of a female supervisor was generally supported (Owings, 1925). Women’s bureaus in Detroit, New York, Cleveland, and Portland all utilized female directors, who oversaw successful divisions (Higgins, 1951). Male officers were sometimes assigned to these specialized units, but worked exclusively with male juvenile delinquents (Schulz, 1995b). This arrangement kept the policemen working with the male delinquents, while the policewomen focused on the problems of females and children.
While the police professionalization movement had soared in the 1920s and early 1930s, its ideology would quickly shift from *social work* to *crime fighting* (Walker, 1977). With the encouragement of influential police leaders, like FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, law enforcement officials became associated more with arresting criminals like John Dillinger and Al Capone than it did with concerns about social issues like delinquency, unemployment, and personal hygiene. Support for policewomen and their bureaus declined, leaving many to believe that their work with society could be done through other governmental agencies that were being created at the time (Friedman, 1993; Scarborough & Collins, 2002; Walker, 1977).

Many of the women’s bureaus survived, even though they did not flourish. This time in policewomen’s history was known as the *Latency Period*, which started in the 1930s and stretched into the 1970s (Heidensohn, 1992; Martin, 1980). Of course, this time in history started with the dark days of the Great Depression. Women’s bureaus became to be considered an expensive frill and began to diminish when special interest groups’ money and influence disappeared, leaving the policewomen with no one to support them in their cause (Williams, 1946). World War II did help for some time because women were used to supplement empty work positions. But, this was only temporary because once the male soldiers returned, many women were terminated (Horne, 1975). The lack of support and funding would keep policewomen in a dormant state for nearly forty years.

It would take until the 1970s for all of the women’s bureaus to be eliminated, after the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) recommended for all police agencies to “immediately abolish all separate organizational entities composed solely of police women…” (p. 214). New York City, like many other
cities, accepted the Commission’s recommendations and abolished its Women’s Bureau and defined career path guidelines that would allow women to work in patrol and other specialized sections in 1973 (Bernstein, 1975; Koenig, 1978).

More Recent Progress

Starting in the 1960s, government intervention and civil lawsuits allowed women to have the opportunity to be a part of all department sections as well as to have the opportunity to hold a supervisory position that included the leadership of men. Unfortunately, it became quite obvious over time that they were being assigned to some very familiar work. The recurrence of policewomen appointed to work with juveniles and female subjects was commonplace (Martin, 1980). If not assigned to work with these specific groups, female officers were often placed into positions that seemed menial and more suitable for women like street crossing guards or parking meter maids (Melchionne, 1967).

Interestingly, some policewomen were used by their agencies in a different capacity than just serving in gender-appropriate positions. Even prior to the government mandates, female officers were being used as undercover agents or decoys for covert operations. Their assignments covered a wide-array of settings and events, including crimes like gambling, criminal abortion, fortune-telling, and black market baby adoptions (Melchionne, 1967). Because they were able to penetrate social settings where women would not be suspected as being law enforcement agents, male supervisors had no reservations about using women in this way (Darien, 2002). Some argued, though, that these privileged appointments were merely a means for the women to be used as pawns in order for the male officers to complete their missions and reap the benefits of a successful assignment (Melchionne, 1967).
When women were finally able to work as regular patrol officers, the setting was not a trendy metropolitan area like Los Angeles or Chicago. Instead, the setting was Indianapolis, Indiana, where in October 1968, two women, Elizabeth Coffal and Betty Blankenship, became the first female patrol officers in the United States (Duffin, 2010). Their assignment was not the result of a good-will gesture or ground-breaking move by city administrators, but was the result of a promise made to be later kept. When Coffal and Blankenship were trainees in the police academy, they suggested to Instructor Winston Churchill that females should be allowed to patrol the streets as men did. Churchill agreed and told them that if he ever became police chief that he would make them patrol officers. So, in 1968, newly-appointed Police Chief Winston Churchill kept his promise and assigned Coffal and Blankenship to patrol; they answered calls for service as they rode together in a marked police unit, Car 47 (Schulz, 1995b).

But Coffal and Blankenship’s experience was unique because the majority of female officers in the 1970s would remain working primarily on cases involving juveniles, lost children, female criminality, and sex crimes (Horne, 1980). Legislation and court mandates did help with changing the mentality of administrators. When they finally succumbed to the pressures of the government to hire females, women were not just recruited but were actually hired. Although they are much more commonplace than what they were decades ago, policewomen unfortunately still comprise a minority of the total amount of officers. And research is finding that female officers continue to be placed in specialized sections serving mostly juveniles and women, even though they prefer to work in other sections (Murphy, 2006a, 2006b).
Acceptance of Policewomen’s Role

Acceptance by Law Enforcement Agencies

The introduction of women into law enforcement rocked the largest boys’ club, which for generations had provided steady employment for fathers and sons and defined what was considered so-called tough and rough. Images of a police officer had usually brought to mind a white, Anglo-Saxon male with a badge and gun, who was always in charge. This depiction explains why many considered the placement of females in law enforcement as a fad and patiently waited for the demise of their intrusion to occur (Hutzel, 1933). This attitude paralleled that of African Americans beginning their struggles to enter and move up in the police ranks; their presence was considered to be an experiment (Rudwick, 1962).

The significant changes made during the 1960s and 1970s in the form of federal mandates and court decisions not only tried to obliterate these attitudes but also attempted to solidify the presence of females in these agencies. Women were finally able to move into positions of opportunity and diversify their careers. Arguments that female officers were an under-utilized resource would eventually lead to the realization that women could contribute much more to policing than just services to juvenile delinquents and women (Melchionne, 1967).

In the first part of the 20th century, the acceptance of women in law enforcement was based on the premise that they were offering skills and insights into the arena of policing, which would allow male officers more of an opportunity to handle the real crime and not waste their time on community-oriented incidents. Female officers were allowed to work in order to be the moral guardians and social enforcers of unruly females and juvenile delinquents (Darien, 2002; Duffin, 2010). Their presence only
supplemented the duties of male officers and definitely did not make them equal. The job, though, was not for just any female. Those who worked as policewomen were expected to be true ladies; that is, they were respectable and of high moral character (Darien, 2002; Melchionne, 1962).

To appease the special interest groups of the early 1900s that had been putting pressure on law enforcement agencies to employ women, local administrators began to hire females and eventually allowed for the formation of the women’s bureaus. There were no special efforts made to recruit women; most came to them to apply. Not until the late 1960s and 1970s did momentum shift toward an avid recruitment of more females (Platt et al., 1982). This shift was the result of the poor response from the effort to recruit minorities and college graduates, which had been a recommendation of the President’s Crime Commission in 1967. More importantly, some departments were finally recognizing the benefits of employing females as officers. For instance, they were noted to have the ability to calm violent situations and also had excellent people skills (Platt et al., 1982). Additionally, the representation of women on the force served to pacify those who demanded that police forces become more indicative of the general population, especially after the turbulent years of the 1960s. Having women police proved to critics that police agencies were trying to move from an order maintenance stance to a more service-oriented position (Platt et al., 1982).

Another self-serving reason for police agencies to accept the role of female officers was the desire to be accredited through CALEA, or the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement, which requires the agency to have an employee composition that is reflective of the community’s composition (Raganella & White, 2004).
In recent times, female officers’ presence has been generally accepted by most agencies, but their recruitment can still be complex and frustrating. Concentrated efforts have been made by some departments to attain more female officers, but, unfortunately, those efforts have been futile (Hunt, 1990; National Center for Women and Policing, 2001; Silvestri, 1998, 2003). Even the prospect of equal pay, which initially was one of the ways to get women to apply, is not working as it once did to draw females to the job (Platt et al., 1982).

Overall, female law enforcement officers are seen and accepted today as a part of the general labor force. The FBI’s 2013 Uniform Crime Report reported that there are approximately 670,000 law enforcement officers in this country and females comprise only 11.9% of this number. While their presence is noted, it is not hard to realize that they make up only a minor portion of the total amount of officers after forty years. Unfortunately, female police leaders comprise an even smaller percentage of this portion. Time will tell whether or not these numbers will ever change.

Acceptance by the Public

Women’s involvement as criminal justice practitioners in the mid-1800s was clearly a sign of the times, as dramatic changes took place and redefined the construct of society as it was known. Falling on the heels of the Victorian Era, the Progressive Era, which stretched from the late 1800s to the 1920s, would redefine a woman’s place in society by moving her from the shelter of a quiet and secure home into the public sphere of activism and influence (Briggs, 1983; Myers, 1995). These women, who were mostly wealthy and prominent, felt that they could bring a sense of social morality to a world collapsing from the evils of industrialization and immigration. They realized that their
voices could not be silenced if they joined together and impelled those in power to make the changes they felt were appropriate (Myers, 1995; Schulz, 1995b).

The WCTU became one of the most dominant women’s groups of the Progressive Era. It supported numerous causes including women’s sexual health issues, runaway and desolate children, and alcohol prohibition. The WCTU even encouraged the presence of women in law enforcement, not for reasons of women’s rights, but for the protective services that they could offer to children and females (Schulz, 1995b). Their strong belief that a feminine presence was needed in places like detention homes, prisons, and mental hospitals led many to support the idea of prison matrons (Balkin, 1988). Additionally, they financially and politically supported the work of prominent policewomen like Alice Stebbins Wells, who was able to crusade throughout the country arguing for more women police (Higgins, 1951; Walker, 1977). Other groups, like the Women’s Prison Association, the National League of Women Voters, and the American Female Guardian Society also strongly supported the feminine presence of women in these facilities because of past indecencies and abuse suffered by those imprisoned at the hands of men (Balkin, 1988; Darien, 2002).

Citizens’ attitudes of women police have evolved over time as the acceptance of women working outside of the home intensified. It would take decades though, after the Victorian Era, when women were the face of the femininity and the home for this to change. Initially, many considered policewomen to be an absurd and foolish concept. The offensive depiction of Alice Stebbins Wells by newspapers characterized the overall feeling of those who felt this way (Koenig, 1978). When the police administrators realized that they would have to accept women into their department, they did, but only
on a segregated basis, placing the females into specialized women’s divisions (Schulz, 1995b).

As law enforcement agencies began to adhere to the requirements of federal mandates of the 1960s and 1970s, there was intense desire to determine if women could really do the job, which they won the right to have. This began the search to establish if a female police officer could be as effective as a male police officer. Some researchers used public perception as a means of determining whether or not female officers were doing a good job and were accepted. It would take well over a decade before research conducted on policewomen shifted from this focus on their effectiveness to a focus on their experiences as law officers (DeJong, 2004).

*Initial Research.* One of the first studies to address the question of female efficacy as police officers was conducted by Bloch and Anderson (1974) through the Police Foundation. Eighty-six female officers and eighty-six male officers from the same academy class in Washington, D.C. were compared in regard to their effectiveness and their ability to handle violent incidents. Some of the survey contributors were the city’s citizens. The study reported that the females were found to be as effective as male officers and were less likely to become involved in conduct that would damage community relations (Bloch & Anderson, 1974). It was determined that most people generally approved of the work of female patrol officers and felt that there was not much difference between the performance of male and female officers. Although the citizen participants supported equal opportunities for women in law enforcement, they were not as confident when questioned about a female’s ability to control a violent incident. Many felt that a volatile situation would be handled better by two male officers than a male and female team (Bloch & Anderson, 1974).
Public perception of policewomen was tapped into again in 1975 when Lawrence Sherman conducted a review of females’ effectiveness as police officers in St. Louis County in Missouri. Sherman (1975) reported that citizens felt as safe with policewomen responding to their calls as they would have if a policeman would have responded. Even more interesting was the finding that the public felt that the female officers were more receptive to their needs, especially when handling domestic altercations (Balkin, 1988).

If these two comprehensive studies were not enough to prove that citizens felt generally confident with the response of female officers, the California Highway Patrol conducted another study on the West Coast in 1976. The research indicated similar results; women were found to be competent as highway patrol officers. Additionally, research discovered that the attitudes of the residents of Denver, Colorado were no different from policewomen as to policemen (Bartlett & Rosenblum, 1977). Citizens of New York City felt that female officers were more courteous as well as more competent than male officers, resulting in more favorable interactions with the policewomen (Sichel, Friedman, Quint, & Smith, 1978).

Not all findings were entirely complimentary, especially when it came to certain work-related incidents (Carlan & McMullan, 2009). Answers to questions of competence were many times based upon gender lines. In other words, a complainant wanted a male officer if there was a physical fight, while a female officer was preferred if the incident was domestic or sexual in nature (Kennedy & Homant, 1983; Kerber, Andes, & Mittler, 1977).

Criticisms regarding the standards used to initially determine a female officer’s effectiveness on duty were reported. The exclusive focus on male stereotypes and the indifference to gender disparities were two of the main reasons why it was argued that the
women would never be evaluated equally and fairly. This had to be taken into account by researchers until more unbiased evaluations were created (Morash & Greene, 1986).

Still, citizens’ positive attitudes of female officers handling patrol duties signified a move in the right direction for them (Homant, 1983). Many pointed out that this connection to female and juvenile victims would always be inevitable because of female officers’ excellent communication skills (Kerber et al., 1977; Price, 1985; Worden, 1993), emphasizing one of the many unique skills that women could bring to the job.

Current Research. Over the last fifteen years, studies on public acceptance of female officers have uncovered similar conclusions. Leger (1997) found Kentucky citizens to have mostly positive attitudes on women in patrol, while Breci (1997) discovered that Minnesota residents felt that female officers were just as effective as male officers. Interestingly, gender preferences to incident response were still noted, as participants advised that they believed that policewomen handled domestic calls like juvenile complaints or family disturbances better than policemen (Breci, 1997).

On a different note, certain research has been geared to college students and their perceptions of female law enforcement officers. Male students, especially with increasing educational levels, were more accepting of policewomen (Breci, 1997; Koenig & Juni, 1981; Vega & Silverman, 1982). Unfortunately, though, there was evidence that they were still negative about the female officers in a number of areas of questioning (Austin & Hummer, 1994, 1999).

Regardless of the respondent, whether a member of the general public, a college student, or a supporter of law enforcement, it appears that women have been largely accepted as police officers. Whether this same acceptance is present for female police supervisors remains to be seen.
Government Intervention and Influence

The significance of the federal government’s intervention and influence in the area of women and law enforcement cannot be understated. The passage of federal laws and the decisions in significant court proceedings had a direct role, not only in the hiring and retention of policewomen but also in their job assignments as well (Harriman, 1996; Scarborough & Collins, 2002; Schulz, 2003). If these modifications had not been made, the current status of women in law enforcement, although still paltry, would not be where it is today, and the little progress made by female police supervisors would have been unheard. A short review of these laws and rulings offers a better understanding of the impact of the government on females in policing.

Federal Directives

The year before the Civil Rights Act, Congress passed the Equal Pay Act (EPA) in 1963, which banned unequal pay for the same type of work based upon gender (Darien, 2002; Scarborough & Collins, 2002). Then, the next year, the celebrated Civil Rights Act was passed amid pressures from minority and social justice groups. Title VII of this Act forbade private businesses, which had 25 or more employees and was involved in interstate commerce, to discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin when hiring or employing individuals (Scarborough & Collins, 2002; Schulz, 1995b). The classification and training of employees had to be equivalent and not based on any of the listed discriminating factors. Title VII also stressed that advertisements for employment could not show preference or indifference to any particular group in order to make the recruitment process impartial (Civil Rights Act of 1964). Although Title VII did not actually apply to police departments, it would later be revised and bring major changes to employment policies.
According to Howard, Donofrio, and Boles (2004), “the modern era of criminal justice” began in 1967, when President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Crime Commission issued its report entitled, “The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society” (p. 382). The Commission, which was officially entitled the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, was supposed to offer the answers to the problems of civil unrest and rebellion that plagued the decade. Consisting of 19 police executives and approximately 200 advisors, who were mostly social scientists, the Commission set out to define the steps needed to address the dilemmas of the criminal justice system through research and analysis of its agencies (Darien, 2002; Howard et al., 2004).

The Crime Commission directed attention concerning law enforcement to the serious manpower crisis in the nation’s police forces, which was mainly represented by white males (Platt et al., 1982). It acknowledged patrol as the so-called heart of law enforcement, but it questioned the current status quo’s ability to actually fight crime, noting that there was no strong evidence that criminal activity was being deterred by police patrol (Schulz, 1995b). Stressing the need for philosophical changes as well as a need for new kinds of people, the Commission encouraged departments to actively recruit and hire college graduates, minorities, and women (Darien, 2002; Platt et al., 1982).

The importance of the work and possible contributions of policewomen was mentioned in the Commission’s report, although not in great detail (Schulz, 1995b). The suggestions offered by the Commission regarding female officers included the following:

Policewomen can be an invaluable asset to modern law enforcement, and their present role should be broadened. Qualified women should be utilized in staff service units, such as planning and research, training,
intelligence, inspection, public information, community relations, and as legal advisors. Women can also serve in such units as data processing, communications, and forensic laboratories. Their value should not be limited to staff functions or police work with juveniles; women should also serve regularly in patrol, vice, and investigative divisions. Finally, as more and more well-qualified women enter the service, they can assume administrative responsibilities. (President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1967, p. 125)

The acknowledgement of policewomen in the Commission’s report demonstrated that at least some of the high-ranking officials and researchers had taken their work seriously and saw that they had a permanent place in the law enforcement field.

There would be no recognition of women, though, when the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder, also known as the Kerner Commission, released its report in 1968. What it did recognize were the negative and harmful effects of the hostile and militaristic tactics used by policing agencies during the turbulent times of the 1960s. The Kerner Commission failed to mention the efforts of policewomen and only used the term policeman to reference police officers (Schulz, 1995b). But, with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the recommendations of the 1967 Crime Commission, change within the police ranks was imminent and expected; women were moving closer and closer to becoming full-fledge police officers.

Reeling off of the recommendations of the Crime Commission, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act was passed by Congress in 1968 (Scarborough & Collins, 2002). This Act created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which was responsible for distributing the designated federal funds to policing
agencies in order for them to meet the objectives of the Crime Commission (Schulz, 1995b). Those receiving this assistance were well-aware of the possibility of the funds being withdrawn if they failed to adhere to the requirements of no discrimination, including that against women (Darien, 2002; Gold, 1999). The monies made it possible for colleges and universities to start criminal justice programs, for police departments to begin training its officers in a manner other than in a militaristic format, for enhancing the educational standards of officers (including those of minorities and women), as well as for offering many other new and alternative ways to fine-tune the law enforcement aspect of the criminal justice system (Gold, 1999; Scarborough & Collins, 2002).

In 1969, President Richard Nixon issued Executive Order No. 11,478, which prohibited federal agencies from using gender as a reason for not hiring an individual (Schulz, 2009). Because of the reference to civilian employees in the Order, there was confusion on the interpretation as to whether or not the Order was applicable to sworn officer positions (Schulz, 2009). As a result, it was not until two years later that the Secret Service and the Executive Protective Service hired female special agents. The Federal Bureau of Investigations finally followed suit in July 1972 by assigning two women to train as special agents (Schulz, 1995b).

Significant changes for females ultimately came in 1972 when Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act to include state and local agencies. Discrimination was prohibited when hiring or employing a person by local police departments and state policing agencies, not just private businesses (Koenig, 1978; Schulz, 1995b; Schulz, 2003). The Act required that a commission be created to oversee the enforcement of this civil rights extension as well as to investigate charges of discrimination. This is the origin of the Equal Employment
Opportunities Commission (EEOC), which is today still investigating civil rights violations (Scarborough & Collins, 2002).

Just as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act came on the heels of the Crime Commission Report in 1968, the Crime Control Act was enacted the following year in 1973, after the modifications were made to Title VII. The Crime Control Act, which was a revised version of the Omnibus Act of 1968, required law enforcement agencies with 50 or more employees that were receiving $25,000.00 or more in federal grants to set up equal opportunity programs and procedures or face losing the monies being provided to them from the federal government through the LEAA (Garcia, 2003; Koenig, 1978; Schulz, 1995b). In other words, if these qualifying agencies discriminated against anyone on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, they would lose thousands of dollars in grant money that was being offered to them for training, equipment, and programs. This stipulation put pressure on these agencies to either follow the law or lose federal funds. Obviously, the Act’s size requirement did not compel smaller agencies to hire those who had faced discriminatory practices, including women; the results of this are still seen today, considering the modest number of women working for rural or small agencies. Although the Crime Control Act’s provisions had been delineated, some of the qualifying departments did not take heed and had to be sued before consenting to the requirements (Bell, 1982).

Strong support for women in law enforcement by a federal committee finally came from the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in 1973 (More, 1992). The Commission recommended that recruitment, hiring, and training neither discriminate nor favor women and strongly encouraged their employment for law enforcement positions. The board urged the immediate abolishment of any
specialized units that only had females assigned to them. It also advised police agencies to provide ways for women to fully utilize their abilities and experiences throughout their careers (More, 1992).

**Judicial Influence**

Besides legislative measures, the judicial branch of government played a role in ensuring that the laws passed by the government were being followed. Most of the cases were applicable to women in general, not just female law enforcement officers, and particularly concentrated on the areas of discriminatory hiring practices and sexual harassment.

Two significant cases, *Reed v. Reed* (1971) and *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.* (1971), were decided in 1971. In *Reed v. Reed* (1971), the 14th Amendment was cited as a basis for the Court to rule that gender discrimination was unconstitutional. This ruling would set the stage for the modifications to Title VII and the passage of Equal Employment Opportunity Act the following year. In *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.* (1971), the Court ruled that only bona fide occupational qualifications (BFOQ) could be used for employee selection, especially if a qualification targeted a specific group of people. Weight and height requirements of many law enforcement agencies would come under intense scrutiny after this decision, forcing them to drop the requirement and allow women to qualify for application (Scarborough & Collins, 2002).

One particular case during this time stands out regarding the advances made by women in the field of law enforcement. In 1961, one of the first cases to be filed by a female officer against her department was *Shpritzer v. Lang* in New York City. Felicia Shpritzer led a class action lawsuit against the city for denying her the right to take the promotion examination to become a sergeant (Koenig, 1978; Scarborough & Collins,
2002). Shpritzer, who held two Master’s degrees, initially had to wait four years just to become an officer because there were no openings for women. Shpritzer won, and the New York Court of Appeals upheld the decision that all of women on the suit were allowed to take the promotion examination (Scarborough & Collins, 2002). In 1965, she became New York City’s first female police sergeant and eventually retired as a lieutenant, arguing that gender had nothing to do with being a good supervisor (Koenig, 1978; Scarborough & Collins, 2002).

Judicial influence also played a part in the decision to keep women in their roles as police officers because of their effectiveness while on duty. There was only one instance where negative findings were reported as to the efficacy of policewomen. In Philadelphia in 1980, Peter Horne informed officials that his research indicated female officers did not handle police work as proficiently and safely as male officers, citing their weakness in displaying control. Horne’s study, as were many others, was the result of a court order after a civil lawsuit was filed against the Philadelphia Police Department for sex discrimination (Balkin, 1988). Even though his study did little to promote the plaintiff’s cause, the court still ordered the department to stop its discriminatory actions and hire female officers (Balkin, 1988; Horne, 1980).

With government intervention, court decisions, and consent decrees in place, women found themselves being hired and placed into the police role in greater numbers. But as time passes since the interventions and decrees, it appears that the number of women being hired is slowing, despite a rise in the percentage of sworn female officers. The National Center for Women and Policing (2001) reported that from 1990 to 2000 there was a 4.9% increase in representation, in comparison to 4.1% from 1970 to 1980. With the expiration of most of these court decrees, the moderate increases have many
concerned that with such low numbers of female officers, there will be no one to take the place of those in higher ranks who are retiring. One can only wonder what other, if any, steps besides affirmative action can be taken by the government to support women’s positions in police bureaucracy. With the Shpritzer decision and many other similar cases, the courts have demonstrated that they are willing to align themselves with government action. Along with judicial authority, additional modifications at an organizational level may be the answer. For now, one thing is certain. Women’s roles in law enforcement, no matter how small or insignificant, have laid a foundation that will never be broken.

Gender Issues and Females in Law Enforcement

When women began entering the patrol ranks in the 1970s, the feminization of law enforcement began (Poteyeva & Sun, 2009). Their elusiveness and silence, which had stretched since the 1930s, had ended. Why all of the concern? Basically, male officers considered women to be a threat because police work was supposed to be a man’s job. Joseph Balkin (1988) offered another simple reason in his article, “Why Policemen Don’t Like Policewomen,” explaining that female officers threaten male officers’ manliness and are a source of anxiety to them. The belief that females did not have male-specific qualities like assertiveness, rationality, and bravery needed not only to perform the duties of a police officer but to defend themselves and others in violent situations has been attributed to this attitude (Miller, 1999; Price, 1982).

It was their difference in gender-specific qualities that initially allowed women to gain access onto the force, but it has been that same diversity that has kept them at bay as a marginalized group (Garcia, 2003). These female-specific disparities started to change as women began to step out during the Progressive Era and display what some considered
unfemale behavior or conduct that was deemed unnatural feminine behavior (Cullen & Agnew, 2006). Opponents to policewomen argued that females had no place in the unrefined world of law enforcement (Miller, 1999; Price, 1982). Supporters countered this argument by citing that the specific duties of the policewomen were far from the harsh duties of the male officers and noted that their presence had more of a social welfare overtone than one of crime-fighting. Those appointed as policewomen substantiated this argument; they were there to help and assist those in need, not to arrest people (Darien, 2002; Higgins, 1951). Some of the early pioneers in the field even wrote about their feminine and maternal responsibilities. For instance, Mary E. Hamilton (1924) of the New York City Police Department argued that the motherly qualities and instincts of women made them most suitable to care for adolescents.

Traditionally, young girls have been expected to grow up and be the quintessential wife and mother, while cooking, cleaning, and caring for those in her life. In recent years, the popular remake of the original movie, The Stepford Wives, starring actors, Nicole Kidman and Matthew Broderick, parodied what life for a man was supposed to be like with the ideal wife; one who did everything with a smile and no complaints (Bozman, Selig, & Oz, 2004). In the movie, the wives became perfect only after they had been transformed into robots and lost their self-identity in order to please their husbands. Unfortunately for many female officers, this same dilemma occurs as they try to maintain a sense of self while attempting to fit in as a police officer (Fletcher, 1995). Being a police officer is a challenge in itself; being a police officer and being female brings about a whole new set of challenges, especially if trying to move up the promotional ladder.
Doing Gender

Initially, women in the policing field took their duties so seriously and stayed within the confines of their position so well that their work was considered by some to be the domestic welfare of the streets (Darien, 2002). Yet, they were doing what they had been hired to do, which was to care for unruly females and children and stay out of the way of the duties of male police officers.

What the women were actually doing was what some experts today would entitle *doing gender* (West & Zimmerman, 1987). To review, females were finally allowed to enter the man’s world of law enforcement only after their argument of helping wayward children and women was accepted. Not all agencies originally agreed to this, feeling that despite the possible benefits of a woman supervising these lost souls, there was still no place for women in law enforcement. Yet, many departments in the early 20th century accepted the reasoning of prominent individuals like Alice Stebbins Wells and influential organizations such as the WCTU, allowing women to work on their forces. The gender difference was the shifting factor and opened the door for women to enter because they were naturally doing what it was believed that women were supposed to do: that is, to care for others, especially children (Garcia, 2003; Hamilton, 1924). Another way to look at it is to consider the concept of doing gender as a way to explain how a male is supposed to show his masculinity by doing boy things, while a female is supposed to show her femininity by doing things that are for girls. This concept has been used to explain various social behaviors including male criminality (Messerschmidt, 1993).

But, what exactly does doing gender mean? When West and Zimmerman (1987) coined this term, they wanted to reconceptualize gender with more of an interactional influence by switching the focus from the individual to a focus on a person’s interactions
with other people. They contended that the notion of gender was not a personal role or display as noted by sociologist Erving Goffman (1976). Instead, West and Zimmerman (1987) argued that people organize their interactions “to reflect or express gender and they are disposed to perceive the behavior of others in a similar light” (p. 127). In other words, gender is accomplished individually by meeting the social expectations and arrangements assigned to us according to our sex. To do gender is to do what is considered natural as a male or a female, while at the same time following what is socially-accepted and socially-directed (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Organization of Gender

To more thoroughly understand gender differences and female criminality, Steffensmeier and Allan (1996) introduced their theory of the organization of gender, offering a structural arrangement of the distinctions between male and females and how they are socially different. Although it was employed to explain criminal behavior, its applicability in providing a simple method of grasping the variations between males and females in general is apparent. They defined five areas of life, which included gender norms, moral development and amenability to affiliation, social control, physical strength and aggression, and sexuality (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). These areas can provide a way to study the social and behavioral differences between male and female officers as well.

Gender norms are those social norms that proclaim if there is a woman present, then there should be a nurturing and graceful presence also (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). The stereotype that a woman is supposed to be domesticated, subservient, and ladylike still prevails today in popular culture, private and public institutions, as well as in many religions and cultures. Any behavior that goes against this is considered deviant
to some. Those who violate gender norms, like female officers, are considered odd and eccentric (Fletcher, 1995).

Besides behavior, there are certain expectations in appearance and sexuality, which reinforce the person’s role of being either a male or a female. Not meeting these expectations sometimes guarantee a difficult time (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). For instance, most uniforms that female officers have to wear are designed to fit a man. These uniforms are a far cry of the fashionable statements made by today’s movie stars and models, resulting in policewomen getting critical looks at times from others (West & Zimmerman, 1987).

Then, as young girls develop into women, they are supposed to have a passionate predisposition to be caring and nurturing, while also being drawn to strong relationships. It is believed that females have more of a moral development and amenability to affiliations than males (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Females’ concern for others directs them to be givers not takers like men and socializes them to be more receptive to others’ needs (Messerschmidt, 1986). They are, therefore, expected to think of others instead of being selfish, which substantiates the belief that policewomen are more service-oriented (e.g. givers) while policemen are more centered on order maintenance (e.g. takers) (Higgins, 1951; Tenny, 1953).

The third area of the theory of the organization of gender is social control (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Throughout history, women have had to meet the social expectations of the times. For instance, during the Victorian Era women were expected to be pure and chaste before marriage, while still modest after the wedding. Those who had fallen from the graces like prostitutes were considered victims and were treated as such (Briggs, 1983). But as time and attitudes progressed into the 20th century, many
were not so forgiving. Any behavior that fell outside of the domestic sphere resulted in negative stereotypes and usually social sanctions (Simmons & Blyth, 1987). Women were expected to be subservient to dominating husbands and were not allowed to witness or explore the world’s malicious temptations (Briggs, 1983; Collins, 1992). These social controls increased a woman’s dependence on others as well as prevented her from engaging in risky or harmful behavior (Giordano, Cernkovich, & Pugh, 1986). The female police officer does not fit into this social control mold and actually plays a part in it instead, falling on the opposite end of the spectrum to the subservient, sheltered woman.

There is an argument that there are far fewer women incarcerated in our prison system because women have different physical strength and aggression levels than men have (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). This is the same argument used by critics of female law enforcement officers, who cite that women do not have the physical strength or disposition to become aggressive and handle violent subjects. One of the main concerns of some male officers is that a female partner will not be able to provide the backup needed to handle an out-of-control suspect. They consider females to have less power and training and are more likely to use physical force compared to male officers (Charles, 1982).

Still, men and women biologically are not the same. Reproductive and sexual differences lay the groundwork for those who believe that it is biological influences, and not social influences, which fully explain gender differences. A female’s sexuality can both benefit and hinder her aspirations and dreams (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Some believe that entry into a male-dominated organization like a police department can be easier if a woman uses her sexual prowess. But, this tactic may not guarantee her success
if she wants to be promoted and may cause hardships for other females who are attempting to earn their advancement by their work and dedication (Fletcher, 1995; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

**PoliceWOMEN vs. POLICEwomen**

Rookie females realize quickly their new job status does not mean that their worries of working in a male-dominated profession have vanished. Unfortunately, they become aware that certain stereotypes of female officers still prevail. Male officers will sometimes label a female officer as either a *slut* or *dyke* (Wexler & Logan, 1983). Regardless of whether they apply to the female or not, these labels can disrupt the initial stages of her career so much that her worries are centralized on her reputation and not on training and integration into the system. This can result in a career that ends before it even got a chance to start.

Besides labels, issues ranging from uncomfortable uniforms to undesirable beat assignments to differential training follow the new female recruits as they try to fulfill the requirements set before them by their departments (Fletcher, 1995). Deciding how they will approach these issues starts early and may define how they are interpreted by others.

Susan Ehrlich Martin (1979), who has greatly contributed to the research of women in policing, presented the concepts of *police*women and *policewomen* as a simple way to understand the dichotomy of roles faced by females entering the policing field. She applied their experiences to the work of Arlie R. Hochschild (1973), who had defined the work of professional women to result in either being *defeminized* or being *deprofessionalized*, arguing that women must either resolve to do the same things that men do to meet a job’s criteria (defeminized) or they must accept the role by working more as a woman and not as an equal (deprofessionalized).
Martin (1979) related these terms to females in law enforcement and labeled the opposite ends of the work-role continuum policewomen and policewomen. While most women fall in between these categories in some way, these definitions allow an easy way to study the occupational roles of female law enforcement officers (Martin, 1979). To a certain extent, a female must decide to either be policewoman or policewoman.

_Policewomen_ are defeminized because their work and actions meet the obligations of the job and not of their gender; in other words, they are more police than women (Martin, 1979). _Policewomen_ are those females who accept the traditional police norms, are highly motivated, and gain respect of their fellow male officers by acting rough and tough. As a professional, the policewoman does not mind working as a patrol officer because it embodies all that law enforcement officers should be, trying hard to keep her sex role as a female from interfering in her job. They do not want to be seen as Barbie dolls and have just as much ambition as the male officers (Martin, 1980).

Located on the other end of the spectrum, policewomen are considered deprofessionalized because they prefer to meet the expectations of their gender role and not that of the job (Martin, 1979). They maintain their femininity, recognize their physical boundaries, and have few career aspirations. Seen as more service-oriented, policewomen willingly fall into the mold of the weak female and show little assertiveness and force on duty. They prefer to be behind a desk, instead of working as a patrol officer (Martin, 1980).

Whichever tactic the female decides upon may define who she is and how she is accepted throughout her career. Either way, she will more than likely find herself being labeled as well as prejudged by her male co-workers.
**Female Officers as Tokens**

So, why are not there more women in top positions in policing? Have not there been enough accommodations made to help them move up the ladder of promotion? Some experts say no and point to one of the leading explanations regarding the difficulties faced by female officers, in general, as well as those of a higher-rank. This explanation is based on a perspective that uses the organization itself as the basis for the obstacles in place (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

In her renowned piece, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Rosabeth M. Kanter (1977) utilized types of organizational groups to describe the “different proportional representations of kinds of people” (p. 208) and to interpret the activity of various social groups. One of the four organizational group types she presented was designated as the *skewed group*, which consisted of *tokens* and *dominants*. The skewed group was defined by a proportional ratio of 85:15 where the dominants constituted the majority of the population (at least 85%) and the tokens were made up of 15% or less of the remaining subjects (Kanter, 1977). Another and more simple way of understanding this concept is to consider that tokens are *in* the organization, but are not *of* the organization (Poole & Pogrebin, 1988). When considering the sex ratio of men to women in male-dominated career fields, they are the minority group (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990).

The dominant group’s superiority allows them to have fewer negative experiences than those classified as *tokens* (Archbold et al., 2010; Kanter, 1977). Women as tokens can expect higher levels of workplace stress due to issues like critical assessments by the dominant group, a hostile work environment, exposure to harassment and bias, as well as fewer promotional and training opportunities (Martin & Jurik, 1996; Maume, 2004; Sanders, Willemsen, & Millar, 2009). This can result in a self-perpetuating cycle where
an escape from their minority status is impossible. Another unfortunate consequence of being a token according to Kanter (1977) is the possibility of being “treated as representatives of their category, as symbols rather than individuals” (p. 208).

Female law enforcement officers have been considered tokens for decades. Their token status is also believed by some to be the primary reason for their continuously small representation in the police ranks (Kanter, 1977). Promotions, for example, can be difficult for policewomen because of their exclusion from important networking of influential supervisors, which gives male officers an advantage; a phenomenon also found to occur in the United States military (Baldwin, 1996; Kanter, 1977). Research has substantiated this by demonstrating how management positions have traditionally been linked with gendered personality traits shown to be associated with males, leaving the perception that females lack the traits needed to do a good job (Kanter, 1977; Maume, 2004).

Being defined as a token is only one part of the concept; the other part is the experiences that the tokens must endure. To further explain why they are in such a unique position, Kanter (1977) provided three perceptual tendencies of visibility, contrast, and assimilation.

Because there are so few female officers, they are usually more obvious and stand out from their male counterparts. This high visibility can result in more workplace stress because they seize the attention of those from outside of the organizational group (Kanter, 1977; Morash, Kwak, & Haarr, 2006). The policewoman does not only have to work to prove herself as an officer, but she may have to work twice as hard to actually accomplish that goal (Archbold et al., 2010; Bell, 1982; Bullard, 1980; Horne, 1975).
The female officer’s uniqueness draws attention as well as critical analysis, resulting in performance pressures that can be compared to a two-edged sword (Kanter, 1977).

Their obvious differences may be emphasized and overstated by the dominant group resulting in even more stress to live up to the demands of the job (Archbold et al., 2010). The contrast sensed by policewomen can leave them with feelings of isolation because they begin to see themselves as polar opposites (males and females) instead of the same (policemen) (Kanter, 1977). This segregation can result in the female officer trying to avoid mistakes so fervently that she can possibly destroy her career if she is not careful (Wertsch, 1998).

The assimilation process requires the tokens to fit into their stereotypical role, so that their displayed behavior is appropriate and accommodating to those in the dominant group (Archbold et al., 2010; Kanter, 1977). Any type of individuality is lost, which contrasts with the fact that they already stand out in a crowd because of their high visibility (Kanter, 1977). Still, the dominant group prefers to keep their tokens in these limited roles, so that they do not venture out and threaten their control and power.

Aspirations of promotion by a female police officer can be seen by some male police supervisors as the attempt of a token not fitting in and trying to step out of their expected role (Archbold et al., 2010).

But, this is not always the case. In 2008, Archbold and Schulz reported that the female officers of their study actually received the encouragement of their male supervisors to take part in the promotion process. Some of the women were apprehensive of their supervisors’ motives and chose not to participate, showing that the concept of tokenism is not easily outlined (Archbold et al., 2010; Archbold & Schulz, 2008).
What is even more interesting is to consider how these perceptual tendencies intensify for female officers as they are promoted, for the percentage of their representation becomes smaller and smaller as they move up into higher ranking positions (Kanter, 1977; Sanders et al., 2009). Unless the negative effects of tokenism are diminished, women’s effectiveness as leaders will continue to be questioned and the aspirations of future female leaders will be dampened (Boyce & Herd, 2003; Kanter, 1977; Yoder, 2001). Currently, the presence of females in the nation’s workforce constitutes a stronghold of jobs in a variety of fields (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013). But in many professions, especially those that are male-dominated, women fall into the minority percentage, leaving them with fewer opportunities and less power than males (Kanter, 1977). The concept of tokenism draws the attention back to the structure of the organization and recommends that the agency itself make necessary adjustments. Improving individual skills by offering educational and training programs that allow different groups to work side-by-side and become more familiar with each other is one of the proposals offered to improve employee relations (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). Also, affirmative action programs have aided many women and offered support and protection against dominant male groups.

Kanter (1977) presented the idea that those who are not a part of the majority find themselves in a position defined by minimal opportunities, stereotypes, obstructed mobility, and insufficient motivation for higher and better positions. So, until policewomen start to represent more of the total percentage of their departments, there should be no avid expectation that our country will see more females in top law enforcement positions.
Differential Experiences

Female officers usually endure an entirely different career experience than male officers, simply because they are women (Fletcher, 1995). Starting in the initial stages of training and lasting until the day they retire, a policewoman undergo a variety of pressures and encounters that a male police officers does not face. One of the most unpleasant and stressful aspects of the job is for female officers to acknowledge that many male officers may oppose their presence on the police force (Bloch & Anderson, 1974; Martin, 1980; More, 1992; Sherman, 1975). Although this general attitude has shifted somewhat toward a more positive outlook, it is a reality for many women who become officers (Carlan & McMullan, 2009). A brief inquiry into each phase of their career will offer an understanding as to the basis of argument that female officers experience something different than male officers.

Distinctive Standards Required for Female Law Enforcement Officers

Historically, women have been treated differently from men regardless of where they were—in the home, at work, or in social settings. Their distinctive role as mothers and caregivers has provided them with a special place of protection and preference (Bertin & Henifin, 1987). Some women take advantage of this, while others battle to prove that they are equal to men.

Initially, as women began to enter the workforce more noticeably, their uniqueness presented employers with a new set of problems that they never had to address. Efforts of reformers led to the protection of female workers through regulations that actually worked to the women’s advantage. Some of them had special privileges like rest breaks, minimum wage pay, and a limitation on the number of hours they worked, which were not applicable to male workers (Bertin & Henifin, 1987).
The United States Supreme Court even ruled on separate occasions for the preservation of women’s workplace protection. In *Bradwell v. Illinois* (1873), the Court held that to safeguard women was the “law of the creator” and noted that “the paramount destiny and mission of women are to fulfill the noble and benign offices of wife and mother” (p. 141). Nearly forty years later, the Court again ruled that a “woman’s physical structure and the performance of maternal functions place her at a disadvantage in the struggle for subsistence” and that “this difference justifies a difference in legislation” (*Muller v. Oregon*, 1908, at 421-423).

In some ways, rulings like these benefited female workers but only to a certain extent. Decades later, these decisions would provide a legal basis for male employers to treat female workers in a distinctive way; law enforcement agencies were no different. For instance, the selection of policewomen was based on separate criteria from policemen (Horne, 1975; Milton, 1972). Their hiring standards, which were justified because of the special work the females were expected to perform, towered over the few requirements of the male applicants (Bopp & Schultz, 1972).

Many of the agencies required that their female applicants have either a college degree or at least some college in social work or in a related area. Work experience in these same fields was also preferred (Schultz, 1995a). These qualifications usually resulted in older, more affluent women applying for the policewomen position. But, college and work experience did not mean that the women officers were paid more than the men. For decades, females received less pay than their male counterparts although they wore the same badge. For the most part, policewomen could at least claim that they were more educated than policemen (Horne, 1975).
Another area of differential selection was associated with the height and weight requirements imposed by most agencies. Although this prerequisite kept some male applicants from qualifying, women mostly fell victim to it and were considered unqualified. Claims by agencies that the prerequisites were needed to ensure safety and guarantee excellent performance on duty were squashed by the changes to Title VII along with court decisions like Griggs that ruled only BFOQ could be used for selection of employees (Martin, 1989a; Scarborough & Collins, 2002; White & Bloch, 1975). Although hiring conditions seem obsolete today, one study found weight and height standards were still required at 3.5% of the participating departments as late as 1987 (Fyfe, 1987).

Once these requirements were lifted, females became eligible to apply for the position, but that did not mean that they were selected to work because another barrier was already in place—the physical fitness test. The courts eventually ruled that physical agility testing must be job-related and vital to the job position without eliminating a disproportionate number of females (Sulton & Townsey, 1981).

The oral interview section of the hiring process also resulted in female applicants being disqualified from the hiring pool because the review boards were comprised of mostly men. Many departments have since adopted a more structured format in order to combat any claims of discrimination or bias (Martin, 1989a).

The Training Academy

“We don’t want women here” (Goodman, 2010, p. 20). This phrase was heard by many women in the training academy as they began what they hoped would be long and lively policing careers. Far from being welcomed with open arms, female recruits had to survive initial training, especially because they had to face the toughest questions and
most demanding scenarios that were purposely given to them by the academy instructors (Fletcher, 1995). It was not uncommon for a female recruit to be the only woman in a training class, resulting in the absence of mentorship and in a very isolating experience.

Instead of being role models, the academy instructors made every effort to ensure that the female recruits had as hard of a time as possible and hoped for their resignation, so they could train those who would be the real police officers (Fletcher, 1995). This perception permeated from the instructors to the male recruits, especially if the women had the opportunity to complete more female-friendly training courses which were less physical than the men’s courses. Eventually, all of the training would be designed to be the same for males and females. Although this should have added to the support of females becoming equal and full-fledged members of the force, it did not (Melchionne, 1967).

**Deployment**

Early policewomen were in many ways so very different from the ones we see today. Not wanting to be considered police officers, Lola Baldwin and her subordinates were known as workers or operatives (Higgins, 1951; Schulz, 1995b). Female officers, of course, have struggled to move beyond the principles of their predecessors in order to be considered equal to their male counterparts. Yet, this concept of equality has not been quite fully recognized, especially at a supervisory level.

Consider when a female submits an application to a policing agency. As soon as her name is read on the application and before she is even hired, there are deep concerns of whether or not she can physically handle an aggressive subject (Duffin, 2010; Fletcher, 1995). If hired, the recruit will realize very quickly that her success and reputation as an officer will fall on her performance during academy training and initial incident
responses involving violent persons; scrutiny will be more intense for her than a male officer. The small stature that a woman sometimes has may have its advantages. As one female officer stated “...sometimes guys will just challenge a big cop. They want to get in a fight with a big guy. But with a woman, where’s the sport?” (Fletcher, 1995, p. 9).

Out of concern for her safety, a female officer may be deployed to a more serene and less violent precinct if in patrol, or if transferring to a different division, may be assigned to a section dealing with juveniles or females. Because of this, their presence is somewhat underrepresented in other specialized sections like drug investigations and traffic divisions (Martin, 1989c; Sulton & Townsey, 1981).

Working with Policemen

Still present, but not as discernible, is the underlying notion that many male officers do not like females working with them (Fletcher, 1995). Criticism starts at the recruit level and travels all the way to the supervisory level. Negative attitudes abound and stem from complaints that females are indecisive, are hard to supervise, and are not aggressive enough for certain situations (Platt et al., 1982). Today, it can be seen in a minor action or heard in a trivial comment, but, fortunately it is not as obvious as it initially was. Ella Bully-Cummings, the first female police chief in Detroit, recalled how in the late 1970s her male colleagues “would either call in sick or go home sick” when she showed up for work (as cited in Fischer, 2009, p. 113).

Because of government intervention and court rulings, the blatant distaste for women had to become more subtle. Gone are the days of centerfold pictures posted everywhere, dead rats left in personal lockers, and broom closets designated as female changing areas (Fletcher, 1995). While current policewomen may not have to deal with such obvious signs of aversion, they may have a worst enemy; one that is surreptitiously
waiting for the chance to display its ugly head in the most opportune moment. Questions of whom to trust and when you can trust them can definitely bring misery to an already stressful job.

Proving Oneself

It seems that every female police officer has had a male officer, whether a recruit or veteran, propose the infamous scenario of the *250-pound man in an alley* question to see what answer she will offer, if and when her safety would be threatened by such a figure (Fletcher, 1995). For decades, women have had to defend their vulnerability using this scenario. But, the illustrious figure represents more than a symbolic assailant; he represents every situation that a female officer must handle and the question as to whether or not she can do so with the proper agility and force necessary to contain the incident. Because of this, many policewomen feel the constant need to prove themselves to their male partners. Although there may be a deep concern about this, female officers are able to effectively respond to their assigned calls. Even though their response may be slightly different than a policeman’s response, the incident is still contained, and the job gets done (Fletcher, 1995).

Despite their overall positive performance, there are still those who object to women in policing because of the premise that women are not physically strong enough to do the work required of a police officer. Some research suggests women have about two-thirds of the strength that males do, even though there are also arguments against this (Messite & Welch, 1987). Either way, female officers are subject to scrutiny and judgment on the way they handle these situations. Because violent incidents require aggressive responses, many male officers feel that women do not have the ability to handle these incidents, even if they do handle them properly. If and when they do
control a violent outburst, female officers then undermine the distinctive feature of the males’ superiority, especially if done so in the act of defending a male partner (Martin, 1989c). So, either way, the female officer will not get it right.

Sexuality

A woman’s presence can dramatically change the tone of the work environment, especially those that are male-dominated. Sexual references like explicit pictures and jokes or offensive language suddenly are not welcomed. Male officers initially resented the idea that their freedom to these references had to be limited, if not altogether eliminated (Martin, 1989c). Therefore, female officers must decide whether or not they will tolerate it because voicing a complaint may result in negative consequences (Fletcher, 1995). Administrators know that sexual harassment issues can hinder employee relations as well as cost the agency in litigation if a lawsuit is filed.

Then, to add to the complexity of the environment, a relationship may develop between a male and a female officer. Many feel that sexual intimacy has no place in the police work environment because of the problems that may arise from it. For instance, if competition develops among the officers because of an interpersonal relationship, there may be a shift in focus resulting in poor job performance and irrational decisions (Martin, 1980). Patrols officers at the same agency, who are husband and wife, present a different set of problems with scheduling adjustments needed to ensure that they do not work the same shift together.

Personal Life

When a woman becomes a police officer, her life will change in more ways than just in her work environment. The influences of her job will filter into her social life and may affect her relationships with her partner (whether married or not), her children (if she
decides to have any), and her friends. Becoming a police officer can affect a female’s health as well (Ellison & Genz, 1983; More, 1992).

The most dramatic consequences of this stress are the suicide rates for female law enforcement officers. Generally, police officers commit suicide at a higher rate than the citizens they serve. One study reported that police officers were twice as likely to end their own lives as have them lost on duty (Violanti, 1996). When compared proportionally to females in the general population, female officers kill themselves at a much higher rate (Marzuk, Nock, Leon, Portera, & Tarkiff, 2002). Their suicide rate was nearly four times higher (13.1 per 100,000 compared to 3.4 per 100,000) than females outside of law enforcement (Marzuk et al., 2002). The consequences of the job were seen very early in history as Britain’s very first female officer, Edith Smith, committed suicide after resigning from her position. The stress of working seven days a week for two years straight caught up with her, and after a few years of retirement, she killed herself (“Town Remembers First Policewoman,” 2006).

Research has also shown that there can be serious health risks for women who become police officers. Besides being burned out overall, female officers reported having more headaches, backaches, and stomachaches, more insomnia, more nervousness, more exhaustion, and more irritableness than their male counterparts (Ellison & Genz, 1983). While their level of burnout was only slightly higher than men, women proved to be the winners of stress-related disorders like headaches, exhaustion, and insomnia (More, 1992).

The stress of the job can affect family relationships as well (Brown & Fielding, 1993). A woman working in a male-dominated job must be prepared to show dedication to her position by working a tremendous number of hours, in what would be considered a
display of loyalty to the department and the badge. This expectation can, of course, seriously affect the amount of time a woman can spend with her family. If she is unwilling to show her loyalty by excessively working, then she can anticipate not advancing in the department as fast as male officers do.

Seen by some researchers as the social control of women in male-dominated work environments, this work-family spillover can create intense pressures for the woman (Maume, 2001). The choice to dedicate as much time to her family as to policing may result in the interpretation by administrators that the female is not as devoted as the male officers. Interestingly, some females have chosen to take the route of full loyalty to the department at the expense of not having a family or by being less committed to her family (Maume, 2001). If she does decide to have one, the possibility of divorce and problems with child custody may result. Schulz (2003) found that most of the female police executives she surveyed were married but also discovered that many had been divorced or were living with someone to whom they were not married. She also found that many of the women were married to fellow police officers. All of these possible scenarios may impact a woman’s decision to stay in the field, but, more importantly, they may influence her decision to consider opportunities for promotion, keeping her career at a mediocre level (Archbold & Hassell, 2009).

Former female police executives believe that women in law enforcement should make every effort for the subject of gender not even to arise. They believe that gender only becomes a concern when it is allowed to do so (Fischer, 2009). Two former female chiefs, Nan Hegerty of Milwaukee and Ella Bully-Cummings of Detroit, do not argue that there are various trials and tribulations that a female officer must face throughout her career. They just agree that to focus on the fact of being a female only adds to those
problems and does not solve anything (Fischer, 2009). So, their advice is to be a police officer, not a female police officer.

**Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues**

For young women, the thought of one day becoming a mother and raising a family is part of the natural cycle of events that occur in her life. The thrill of bringing this thought to reality can bring about a sense of contentment as well as a feeling of completeness. While the pregnancy may be treacherous because of sickness and motherhood challenging, many women choose to have children as part of their journey through life.

*Pregnancy*

An additional challenge to motherhood is the expectation or the need for the woman to work before, during, and after pregnancy. Problems with sick leave and childcare can force a mother to leave her career or cause her to be ineligible for advancement, because of the days and times she has had to miss due to these issues. These concerns can sometimes result in a mother being mistakenly seen as not being as professional and not as dedicated as other employees who do not have children (Farley-Lucas, 2000). Legislation, like the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 (PDA), has made it easier for women to have children and not have to face the backlash of problems that may arise (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009). But even with these safeguards, the struggles surrounding motherhood and career continue, especially for women in law enforcement who have higher turnover rates than male officers (Martin, 1989a).

Many aspiring female officers will have to face this dilemma during their career. The female, who wants not only to be a police officer but also a mother, will need to be
prepared for a multitude of strains and drawbacks throughout her career, including the decisions surrounding having children. Unfortunately, the added stress of family-child responsibilities may result in policing being a short-term job, instead of a life-long career. Described by a British policewoman as an *irresolvable conflict*, the battle to be both a police officer and a mother can sometimes be so overwhelming that a choice has to be made to be one or the other (Silvestri, 2006). For those female officers who choose not to have children, the prospects of having a lengthy and successful career are great. For those who choose to leave to raise a family, the loss of their possible contributions to the field is unfortunate. For those who try to have it all (job and family), the tension to do both can be quite overwhelming and harmful to one or both of those areas (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009).

Becoming pregnant while in a highly masculinized work environment can move a woman from a status of equality and neutrality into one that is specifically female (Buzzanell & Liu, 2007; Cowan & Bochantin, 2009). This shift can thrust the female into an even greater feeling of being a token by intensifying the perception of isolation, as she becomes more and more visible while fitting perfectly into the stereotype of femininity (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009; Kanter, 1977).

Some women, who have experienced being pregnant as a police officer, advised that their agencies treated their pregnancy as a crime or as an illness (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009). Or, they saw the attitudes of their male co-workers shift; the pregnant females were considered to have less serious career ambitions and were predicted to leave the field early (Adams, 2001).

Interestingly, some women meticulously plan their pregnancies, so they will not interfere with their job or their specific job assignment (Silvestri, 2006). But, negative
effects still arise, including immediate reassignment to another section or lack of maternity-appropriate uniforms. One officer, who was the first woman to become pregnant at her department, explained that her supervisors “did not know what to do with her, so they just sent her home” (as cited in Cowan & Bochantin, 2009, p. 27). Policies have become more pregnant-friendly thanks to legislation like the PDA, but just as it took some time for law enforcement agencies to accept women working as cops, it has also taken awhile for them to address the issues facing pregnant cops (Campbell & Hernandez, 2006; Kruger, 2006; Risher, 2006).

While the PDA does not mandate that employers fully accommodate their pregnant employees, it does require them to treat these women equally (Kruger, 2006). Specifically, it directs employers to regard “women affected by pregnancy, childbirth, or related conditions as other persons not so affected but similar in their ability or inability to work” (PDA, 1978) and to “guarantee women the basic right to participate fully and equally in the workforce, without denying them the fundamental right to full participation in family life” (California Fed. S & L v. Guerra, 1987, p. 289). Additionally, policing agencies can reassign a pregnant officer only when she cannot physically perform the duties of her current assignment (Kruger, 2006).

Having Children

Maternity leave brings about a new set of additional problems. According to Silvestri (2006), the decision to make a hasty return to work after pregnancy rests on two concerns, including the desire for the female to prove that she is committed to her career and the desire not to be left behind for promotion opportunities. Wanting to prove that she is still dedicated to her job, the female officer may slide family obligations onto the sidelines and place her success as a police officer back as her top priority, especially
because some administrators feel that the time put into a job is considered what indicates a loyal employee (Silvestri, 2006).

Some agencies are making the effort to accommodate new mothers by even going so far as to allow them to work part-time (Silvestri, 2006). In Britain, a woman can return to work, while, at the same time, play an active role in her children’s lives. Still, many consider part-time work as a sign of the lack of devotion to the job and an indication that the woman is more worried about her family than her career (Silvestri, 2006). Those who are considering promotion to a higher rank may have to wait until there is a better time for children. Regardless of the choices made, the issue of pregnancy is definitely one that will challenge those women who decide to have a child.

Unfortunately, this natural part of a woman’s life can have a very negative effect on her policing career by disrupting the flow of events that need to take place for her to advance to the top.

Childcare Issues

Childcare can be a major stumbling block for mothers, especially those with odd work hours and scheduling. Without the help of their families or daycare, many women would not be able to work as a police officer, just like other fields (e.g. nursing) that require shift work (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009). These arrangements, which are usually private in nature because of the work schedule, are sufficient for the most part, unless the child does not often get sick. Then, it is usually the mother’s (female police officer) responsibility to stay home and care for the child (Lebowitz, 1980). Depending on the female officer’s schedule, she will have to juggle times, places, and people to have her child cared for in a proper way. If the woman is married or living with someone, then their two schedules will have to be revised on a daily basis to ensure the child is properly
supervised. If the woman is a single mother, she will have to carry the burden by herself. Either way, when it comes to a working household, the mother is usually the one who has to fall into her gender role and take care of the children (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009).

An option to this child care dilemma most often seen in the corporate world is on-site day-care centers. While many private corporations offer this benefit as an employment incentive, it is rare to find government agencies that are able to cover the costs involved and provide these services. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, which is located in Glynco, Georgia, is one of the very few on-site child-care facilities available for government employees. The Little Rookies Child Development Center offers services during daytime hours and is located on the training center’s grounds (“Child Care,” n.d.).

But even with others’ help, household duties like cleaning, cooking, and shopping are still expected to be addressed. While most male officers have their wives to take care of these matters, female officers cannot necessarily depend on their husbands to do the same (Kirkcaldy, Brown, & Cooper, 1998). Then, with the added responsibilities of being a parent, there is little doubt that there will be struggles to face. Balancing work and home can become nearly impossible as the desire to have it all drives them into an exhausting state, making them realize that some enormous sacrifices like promotions at work will have to be made (Archbold & Hassell, 2009; Cowan & Bochantin, 2009; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999). Most female officers have to literally plan out when they can have their children and how to fit childcare responsibilities into their schedule because of the short window of opportunity that is available to them as they get older biologically and as opportunities for promotion flash before them (Archbold & Hassell, 2009; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999).
Doing Time and Moving Up the Promotional Ladder

Once the decision is made to become a police officer, one of the next wrangling decisions for a female is to choose whether or not to move into the upper echelons of the establishment. Depending on the agency’s promotional policies, confrontation of this issue can begin within a few years or stretch to over a decade after joining the force. Sometimes the decision and process just to become a police officer is so profound that many do not even consider the impending factors that will shape their career. In other words, the initial stress and effort can be so intense and overwhelming that promotional issues are the last worries in the mind of a new female recruit.

Eventually though, this decision must be made. When the time does arise, it comes with no less intensity than the original decision to even become a police officer. Issues such as childcare, lack of mentoring, sexual harassment, eligibility requirements, differential training, negative evaluations, and high turnover rates are some of the reasons why many female officers do not participate in the promotional process and, therefore, are not in higher-ranking positions in policing agencies (Archbold & Hassell, 2009; Cowan & Bochantin, 2009; Fischer, 2009; Martin, 1989a; Martin, 1989b; Martin & Jurik, 1996).

There has been a substantial amount of research focused on the decisions by police officers in general to participate in this process (Archbold et al., 2010; Murphy, 2006b; Wertsch, 1998; Wexler & Quinn, 1985; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999). These studies have found notable variations between promotional concerns faced by female officers in contrast to those faced by male officers. For instance, females cited organizational barriers such as the lack of role models as well as administration bias and personal barriers like childcare and family constraints, as a few of the key reasons for not
participating (Murphy, 2006b; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999). The variety of barriers offered in these studies show the complexity that exists when trying to determine why female officers are not grabbing the opportunities to be promoted. In many cases, the chance for promotion is available to them, but they are not taking the offer (Silvestri, 2006). To understand what may be keeping policewomen from the top spots as well as what has allowed others to conquer the promotional ladder, a look at the road from promotion to leadership as well as the concept of the glass ceiling will be undertaken.

**Road to Promotion**

The majority of law enforcement agencies are bureaucratically structured with a limited number of positions available in the upper echelons. Those wanting to fill these few positions have to be willing to sacrifice and commit themselves to satisfy the requirements of the title. Competition results among aspiring supervisors as those in command positions consider who will fill the openings (Silvestri, 2006). Female officers will especially feel the stress of the rivalry, since by this time in their lives, many have started families with household and child-rearing obligations to consider (Archbold et al., 2010; Silvestri, 2006).

Because policing is considered a masculine occupation, policewomen are at a disadvantage, not only because of commitments at home but also because of workplace organizational barriers (Archbold & Hassell, 2009; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Garcia, 2003). According to Whetstone and Wilson (1999, p. 135), the most frequently cited reasons by females for not participating in the promotion process included the following:

- Prefer present shift and assignment.
- Issues related to childcare and family matters.
• Bias from the administration.
• Simply not interested in becoming sergeant.
• Concern with a reduction in salary because of limitations to overtime hours.

While male officers listed similar reasons for not participating, they did not list administration bias as one of them (Whetstone & Wilson, 1999). For females though, these barriers are significant enough to keep many from even taking the examination with as few as 12% of those qualified taking part in the process in some cases (Whetstone, 2001). While research has covered this question for both male and female officers, specific gender roles are usually not considered when questions arise about the lack of females in supervisory positions (Archbold & Schulz, 2008). Reflecting on the realization that gender may have much more influence on women’s role in law enforcement than any other factor, one would think that it is important enough to be taken into account.

Efforts have been made by some policing organizations to encourage females to take a larger role in positions of the upper echelons. The argument for a change of the traditional, militaristic manner of administering police agencies has been around for decades. Beginning in the 1960s and 1970s, decrees for change in leadership and administration tactics were issued like those by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorder (1968). Community policing and its focus on citizen relations, not crime-fighting, was advocated as the preferred manner of performing police work. More modern approaches to leadership were strongly encouraged because the traditional responses had been so ineffective (Engel, 2001; Stevens, 2000).

But significant organizational changes have not necessarily meant that female officers would decide to participate in the promotional process. Miller (1999) found that
even those departments, which had shifted from militaristic policing tactics to a
community policing approach, did not have female officers who were more likely to be ready for promotion or to actually participate in the process. For the most part, the majority of policing organizations, like the military, are still of a traditional bureaucratic structure and masculine in nature (Boyce & Herd, 2003). In this context, administrators and senior officers define what approach will be used and control the resources for promotion, leaving women struggling to move forward in rank (Densten, 2003; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Maume, 2004).

Female officers have noted that organizational barriers like the lack of role models and co-worker support were major factors in their decision to not participate in the promotion process (Archbold et al., 2010; Murphy, 2006a). Many of them reported to feel disenchanted by the whole process and had little confidence in it because of the realization of what was going to be expected of them and the determination that the higher rank was not what they wanted (Murphy, 2006a). Without someone to help and guide them into the higher position, a number of female officers felt that the burden would be just too much and preferred to stay right where they were with veterans being less likely to want to advance (Archbold et al., 2010; Murphy, 2006b; Poole & Pogrebin, 1988). Murphy (2006a) also found that those who did want to be promoted did so to become role models for other females because they were deprived of having one.

Administrative bias toward female officers is nothing new as many leaders feel that women are temperamentally unfit for management positions, especially in those organizations that are male-dominated (Boyce & Herd, 2003). Replacing a white male supervisor with another white male supervisor offers peace of mind to the administration because the males’ life experiences and beliefs are usually similar (Kanter, 1977). With
the advantage in the court of the male officers, females, who are not part of the boys’ club, succumb to the lack of support and the presence of competition and do not participate in the process for promotion (Archbold et al., 2010; Silvestri, 2006).

If a female officer does attain a higher rank, concerns about her job performance will linger, as they have for other female police supervisors for decades. For example, the lack of patrol experience worried some of the earliest female officers who earned higher rank with the San Francisco Police Department and felt that their subordinates would not see them as competent but as tokens. Fears about negative reactions from male officers also contributed to the lack of confidence they held (Wexler & Quinn, 1985). Additionally, it has been found that some female officers did not have the same promotional aspirations as male officers, but also believed that female supervisors got less respect and were not treated as fairly than male supervisors (Archbold et al., 2010).

Other research has noted how the token status can negatively affect a female officer’s choice to participate in the promotional process (Archbold & Schulz, 2008; Wertsch, 1998). Even with the encouragement of male supervisors, some female officers, who see the support as a contradiction to everything they have seen or heard, take no part in the process (Archbold & Schulz, 2008). Others report that they did not enjoy their jobs and would not recommend the job to other females; these officers were more likely to leave for another job as well as more likely to see their work with their department as unimportant (Krimmel & Gormley, 2003).

Even with promotional opportunities available, many women are opting not to participate because of these kinds of organizational barriers (Silvestri, 2006). Still, the organization does not seem to carry the entire burden of blame. Personal barriers can
also deter a female from not participating in the promotional process, and interestingly, these barriers are gender-related (Garcia, 2003; Murphy, 2006b; Silvestri, 2006).

Even though both male and females officer have noted family and childcare issues as reasons for non-participation, women have had an especially difficult time considering their domestic responsibilities (Archbold et al., 2010; Silvestri, 2006). Although male officers sometimes have these similar obligations, they do not have to tussle with the administrative barriers that the women do. Other gender-specific factors come into play. Consider the questions of commitment that arise when a female officer becomes pregnant. Time away from the job will be needed before, during, and after the pregnancy, leaving many in the upper ranks to wonder if the female officer is committed to her home or to her job (Silvestri, 2006). Family obligations like child-rearing have unfortunately resulted in the abandoned hopes for promotion by many female officers (Murphy, 2006b). Male officers may take some time off from their job for the birth of their child, but they can quickly return without having to worry about health-related problems or other maternal and domestic issues. Women, on the other hand, sometimes feel the pressure of the administration and know that their time at home may bring into questions about their loyalty and desire to advance (Silvestri, 2006).

The promotion process is a vital part of any police officer’s career. It is important for researchers to continue to study this process and understand why some females are not taking full advantage of the opportunities that lie before them. While government intervention has attempted to deter differences between women and men, it seems that women are still falling behind in the race to move to the top.
The Glass Ceiling Effect

While nearly 53% of women work in the United States (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013), many remain as lower-level employees with little opportunity for advancement (Maume, 2004). Even with the mandates of the Equal Opportunity Employer Commission (EEOC), progression to higher ranks for some women can be impossible, if not the least bit stagnant. The concept of the glass ceiling has been used to describe the plight of women, who are highly recruited and hired, but then are denied the opportunity to advance to the highest ranks of the organization (Maume, 2004). This concept originated from the work of two journalists, Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt (1986) of the Wall Street Journal, as they tried to offer a visual depiction of the frustrations and obstacles that women face as they struggle to make it to the top.

The concept became so popular that it was used in the title of a national review commission, the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, which was established in 1991 to assess the equal advancement of women as well as minorities in workplace settings. In March 1995, the findings of the Commission confirmed the existence of the “invisible but impenetrable barrier” (p. iii) between women and the highest positions available. The panel noted that the glass ceiling was not a “temporary phenomenon” (p. iv), because of the reality that over 90% of chief executive officers in the nation were white males nearly twenty years after amendments had been made to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act in 1972 (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995).

In the field of policing, the persuasive influence created by the modifications of Title VII in 1972 allowed women to freely enter the ranks. While that challenge had been met, there would be another one waiting for them in the form of their representation in the upper echelons of their departments. Studies conducted in the 1980s revealed that
it was too soon to determine whether or not there would be promotion barriers for the women. It had been only a few short years since they were allowed to work as patrol officers, so they did not have enough seniority built up in order to move into supervisory positions (Sulton & Townsey, 1981). This excuse no longer exists because nearly four decades have passed and many of the first female police supervisors have since retired with a new generation of female officers falling right behind them. Now, with reports like that of the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission (1995), it appears barriers to promotion for women are still present and flourishing (Agars, 2004; Eagly, 2007; Eagly et al., 2003; Murphy, 2006a).

Besides policing, another male-dominated institution, the Armed Forces of the United States, has recognized the role of the glass ceiling in its ranks. In 1994, the Department of Defense reported that females represented only 12.7% of their officers (Baldwin, 1996). Women in the military were reported to be grossly underrepresented, especially in the highest ranks (Baldwin, 1996). Ironically, women wearing a military uniform face similar struggles as those women wearing a police uniform.

So, exactly what is keeping women from being equally represented in upper-level positions, especially those in male-dominated work settings? Many cite the glass ceiling as the culprit, because it allows women to see the possibility for promotion, yet blocks them from reaching it. They argue that gender discrimination and stereotypes contribute to their meager numbers in higher-ranking positions (Agars, 2004; Eagly et al., 2003; Elacqua et al., 2009). In many cases, the bias is not blatant or intentional; government safeguards in place have kept cases of overt discrimination to a minimum. Instead, the bias is usually unintentional and based on the social role expected of women in the workplace (Agars, 2004). This expected role, or stereotype, is believed to be the
mitigating factor because gender role expectations summon men for leadership roles more so than women (Agars, 2004; Eagly & Karau, 1991). In 2007, Eagly and Carli noted this phenomenon by simply stating that “in male-dominated settings, ideas about leadership and women diverge most sharply” (p. 190). This along with the perception that men hold particular personality traits, like decisiveness and boldness that compliment managerial work, further explain the reservations of placing a female into a higher supervisory position (Kanter, 1977; Maume, 2004).

The underrepresentation of women in the upper echelons of the police bureaucracy are not only isolated in our country. For instance, in 2004, female officers in Great Britain accounted for only 8% of those at a rank of chief inspector and above (Christopherson & Cotton, 2004). Remarkable efforts have been made there including the 2001 Gender Agenda, which focused on improving the opportunities for females to advance to higher administrative levels (Silvestri, 2006). For the last ten years, the Agenda has pushed to ensure that gender issues remain a part of police policies and agendas. Efforts like these have proven to be productive. For instance, British police officers in any of their seven ranks are allowed to work part-time to dedicate their time and effort to their families if needed. Also, the total number of females in top positions increased from an 8% representation in 2004 to a 13.4% representation in 2009 with 508 females listed in the position of chief inspector or higher (Mulchandani & Sigurdsson, 2009).

Exact numbers for female officers in supervisory and executive positions in the United States are hard to obtain because of constant transformations of the thousands of law enforcement agencies in the country. Besides that, there have been only a limited number of studies conducted on them (Archbold & Hassell, 2009). Of the few, Schulz
reported in 2003 that there were around 175 female police chiefs in the United States, comprising only about 1% of the total number of chiefs. By 2008, there were approximately 212, or less than 2%, of them, according to the National Center for Women and Policing (Ritchie, 2009). Other higher-ranking positions have little female representation as well. For instance, in 2002, the National Center for Women and Policing advised that women held merely 7.3% of the top command ranks and 9.6% of the supervisory ranks. In 2013, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that women accounted for only 17.5% of the first-line supervisors/managers of police and detectives in the nation. All of these numbers collectively illustrate that, as recently as within the last ten years, women held a minority representation in the higher ranks of policing agencies.

Since the idea of the glass ceiling emerged over twenty years ago, there have been other concepts introduced, which further offer a means of understanding the struggles faced by women wanting to advance to the top positions in policing. Wirth (2001) noted how glass walls allow for a woman to hold a position with a fancy title but offer nothing in the form of preparation for an executive spot. Glass walls block females from essential core activities and shelter them in areas that are more feminine-centered (Wirth, 2001). The concept of the glass cliff offers a way to understand the trend of some institutions that place a woman in a top position, only when the institution is facing a serious downturn or dilemma. The likelihood of failure is high and the female is blamed for it (Ryan, Haslam, & Kulich, 2010). More specific to policing, Schulz (2004) noted that female officers had to break through the brass ceiling and not the glass ceiling. In law enforcement, the top people are considered the brass, because of the rank insignia that they wear in a paramilitary style. Women attempting to wear that brass have got to first
break through the barriers that are keeping them from it (Schulz, 2004). In 1998, even the International Association of Chiefs of Police noticed the hindering effects of the brass ceiling in their study on the future of women in policing and listed it as an area in need of improvement (Horne, 2006). Most recently, Eagly and Carli (2007) argued that the glass ceiling has long been broken, but the rat race to search for ways and sometimes compromises to move to a higher-level position has left many women in a labyrinth. In an attempt to advance toward a leadership role, the woman must navigate through a series of twists and turns and end up many times at a dead end. These theories touch on the realities faced by women aspiring to a higher level and help to conceptualize their difficult experiences.

Even though the glass ceiling has been proven to exist by the government, whether or not it actually does depends on whether you are asking an agency’s administration or the women who must struggle with it. Regardless of the answer, one thing is certain; female officers are underrepresented in the higher ranks of their agencies.

Leadership Theories

Effective leadership is an intrinsic feature of any successful organization. Leaders, who can motivate and simultaneously direct their followers, are invaluable tools for the entire organization (Andreescu & Vito, 2010). What exactly makes a leader effective has been the source of research and speculation for decades (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Burns, 1978; Eagly, 2007). The debate intensifies when you add the variable gender to the discussion. The common belief that men are the better leaders has permeated in our society and is the result of our long history of males in leadership roles (Eagly & Carli, 2007). This age-old notion leaves aspiring females handicapped to a certain extent before the struggle to move higher even begins.
Mental preparations are necessary not only because of a position’s responsibilities, but also because of the likelihood of facing resistance based on cultural stereotypes (Eagly & Carli, 2007). There is a consensus by some that females are supposed to display more of a communal (e.g. thoughtful and affectionate) behavior, whereas men are expected to be more assertive and confident, or agentic (Eagly & Karau, 1991). These expectations leave the door open for many women in these positions to be labeled, especially those in male-dominated occupations like policing, as incompatible and in violation of gender standards because of social expectations (Barbuto, Fritz, Matkin, & Marx, 2007; Eagly, 2007). In other words, there is sometimes a feeling that being a leader and being feminine is counterproductive (Weikart, Chen, Williams, & Hromic, 2006).

Besides the organizational and personal barriers previously discussed, effects of tokenism, which had been already been apparent, intensify as a female tries to move into a higher position (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Kanter, 1977). For instance, media attention, which can focus on everything from their mannerisms to their appearance, heightens an already critical eye on female officers attempting to take over the top spots (Fiorina, 2006). Disparities in training and support become even more apparent as well (Archbold et al., 2010). Even if their qualifications and time served are the same, men usually reap the benefits, because females are out of the career pipeline (Federal Glass Ceiling Commission, 1995) and are perceived to be socially different from administrators, who are mostly men (Kanter, 1977; Maume, 2004).

But, the difference, which initially allowed them to be hired over a century ago, may have come around full-circle and be working in their advantage again. For the few who have had the opportunity to fill a higher-ranking position, research is indicating that
some of these women are utilizing a much more effective type of leadership called
*transformational leadership* (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Eagly, 2007; Silvestri, 2007).
This leadership style, which was introduced in 1978 by James McGregor Burns, is future-oriented because those using it seek to mentor and empower and transform their followers (Eagly, 2007). Also known as *charismatic leadership* (Conger & Kanungo, 1998), it is characterized by the *four I’s* (Murphy & Drodge, 2004), which include individualized consideration, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation. Feminine behavioral characteristics, such as collaboration and mentoring, compliment this kind of contemporary leadership and possibly give women skills that can make them just as effective, if not more effective, leaders (Eagly, 2007).
While female leaders have been documented to be social facilitators, male leaders seem to prefer to be task-oriented (Eagly & Karau, 1991). This is not to say that women are not task-oriented, or work to get the job done, but that they do show a preference to directing their subordinates in more of a transformational and humanistic way (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Silvestri, 2007).

Research has shown that women also have tendencies to direct others using the two other leadership types, *transactional leadership* (corrective actions and tangible exchanges) and *laissez-faire leadership* (lack of leadership), which round out the three styles of the Full Range Leadership model (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Barbuto et al., 2007; Bass, 1985). Yet, their propensity to utilize an approach that compliments the transformational leadership style has been documented on more than one occasion (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Eagly, 2007; Silvestri, 2007).

While some research has reported that there is no difference between male and female leadership styles, other studies have indicated that there are obvious differences
(Barbuto et al., 2007; Eagly, 2007). Because women are expected to simultaneously be feminine and behave like leaders in order to balance gender expectations, most have to overcome the problem in order to be effective (Barbuto et al., 2007). According to Eagly (2007), this dilemma, or cross-pressure, can sometimes be resolved by women, who find a resolution down a middle path by being not overly female or overly male. Depending on how they confront the job, those females who find themselves in the lead role still have to realize that they can be labeled either a bitch or a bimbo, too hard or too soft, etc. (Fiorina, 2006). Those in male-dominated environments, like law enforcement and the military, usually surrender to the need to imitate masculine leadership behavior in order to be promoted as well as to be considered a good leader (Boyce & Herd, 2003; Eagly & Karau, 1991). Whether they surrender or not, there is still a dilemma; some even rely on a “hybridized” way of commanding (Silvestri, 2007, p. 53). Whatever leadership style and method a female leader chooses she cannot be too female or too male, because this adds the pressure of an already stressful predicament.

Life as a Female Police Leader

Information regarding women’s experiences in supervisory positions, especially those in executive positions, is limited and is one of the reasons for this study (Archbold & Hassell, 2009). Promotional concerns and token perceptions are the usual topics of research (Archbold & Schulz, 2008; Wertsch, 1998; Wexler & Quinn, 1985; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999). Areas of concentration within these topics can be reviewed to offer some depth to what is known about the life of a female police supervisor.

One area that is an exception and has been researched to a certain extent is the reaction of a female law enforcement supervisor and her subordinates. Society’s response to female officers in general can be interesting in and of itself to any woman
who is an officer, but it is the reaction of her subordinates that can make or break her.
Instead of being welcomed with open arms, many new female supervisors walk into an
environment shrouded in hostility and cynicism (Fletcher, 1995). The excitement and
satisfaction of getting a promotion can be short-lived. While both males and females can
experience some sort of anxiety, research has shown that women supervisors can expect
to encounter more resistance and less support than new male supervisors (Cohn, 2000;
Wexler & Quinn, 1985). Not only can this affect the new female supervisor’s work
performance, but it can also affect subordinate female officers who are in need of a strong
role model (Murphy, 2006a). Younger officers, both male and female, need reliable
mentors who will guide and encourage them to higher levels of performance. Without
them, many do not even consider the possibility. Time served and mentorship also seem
to have an effect on the desire to strive to that higher level. For instance, research has
found that the longer time males put into the job, the more they wanted to take part in the
promotion process, while females, after years of work, had fewer aspirations for
advancement (Gaston & Alexander, 1997; Poole & Pogrebin, 1988).

Overall, females have definitely made some progress since the 1960s and 1970s.
Current numbers show that women, especially those working with larger agencies,
comprise approximately 7.3% of the highest supervisory positions from captains to
chiefs, while only 9.6% of lower ranking supervisors like sergeants and lieutenants are
women (National Center for Women and Policing, 2002). So, just as there is still is not
enough women working as police officers in general, there is even more of a long-
standing deficient when considering the number of females in higher-ranking positions
(Melchionne, 1967). While the glass ceiling appears to have been broken, it has only
been in a hypothetical manner. Their representation is still quite trivial in the upper
echelons of their organizations and there is really no justifiable reason for this (Silvestri, 2006).

In 2003, Dorothy Moses Schulz established a statistical profile of women police chiefs in an effort to offer a demographical sketch of an American female police chief and to understand what patterns, if any, followed them in their career path. She was able to firmly establish that in the winter of 2000 there were 157 female police chiefs and 25 female sheriffs in the United States (Schulz, 2003). Responses from a questionnaire mailed to each provided Schulz with the information she needed to characterize a female in an executive law enforcement position. She found that most of the chiefs (49%) administered municipal departments followed by chiefs of college and university departments (42%). The rest of the chiefs represented county chiefs, airport authority chiefs, tribal chiefs, and state police chiefs. The size of the departments that were run by women ranged from one officer to 1,763 officers with the majority of agencies having fifty or less sworn officers (Schulz, 2003). To move up into the rank of chief, one-third were able to stay at the departments where they began their careers, while two-thirds of the women had to move from their home agency to another, illustrating the importance of willingness to relocate in order to reach the top positions. Regarding tenure in office, the average number of years in policing was approximately twenty-two years, but the range of the number of years in policing was from two years to 32 years. The majority of the chiefs were White with other ethnic groups represented by African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans. The average age of the chiefs was 45.6 years old with the youngest chief being 28 years old and the oldest being 58 years old (Schulz, 2003). Schulz’s findings show how rare it is to see or hear about a female police chief, which is why a study as this is so valuable.
Tokenism effects like feelings of isolation can be magnified and reach its peak as a female officer moves up the promotional ladder until the position of police chief is acquired. With only about 1% to 2% of police chiefs in this country being female, what should be the best moments of a female officer’s career may instead become the worst and most stressful times (Ritchie, 2009; Schultz, 2003). Besides finding some support from the officer’s department and family, a female police executive can find certain encouragement and camaraderie from various organizations specially organized for women in law enforcement. While associations like the National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP) and Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE) offer assistance to all female officers, the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE) was created specifically for women in supervisory positions, although they do accept members who have not acquired rank yet (Fischer, 2009). But NAWLEE’s purpose is the same as the others; that is to reach to other females and encourage them to excel in the field no matter what roadblocks lie in their path.

Still, the experiences of female police executives are often unknown, because there have been so few women in that position and because there has been only limited research done in the area (Fischer, 2009). Fortunately, there are a number of past and present female police chiefs, who have been candid about their experiences, regardless if those experiences were positive or negative. For example, former Detroit Police Chief Ella Bully-Cummings offered the advice of focusing more on doing the job right and less on being female (Fischer, 2009). Former Boston Police Commission Kathleen O’Toole stated that it is all about “establishing credibility” initially as a rookie and continuing it throughout one’s career (as cited in Fischer, 2009, p. 114-115). Former Milwaukee Chief Nanette Hegerty recommended that females desiring to be an agency’s top official
“shouldn’t waste their time worrying about their gender” (as cited in Fischer, 2009, p. 112).

These three former female chiefs all felt that they faced difficulties similar to male officers going through the same promotional process and that their gender did not account for any differential treatment. Yet, there is still evidence that effects of gender and the glass ceiling are still present (Archbold et al., 2010; Eagly, 2007). So many questions prevail. With the doors open for promotion, why are there still so few female police supervisors? What is keeping them from advancing? Does gender play a role in promotional decisions? While answers to these specific questions may fall outside of the scope of this study, an attempt can at least be made to understand their journey. To be a leader and be female is unique, but to be a leader and female and a police officer is extraordinary. Just the little bit of advice from the three former chiefs is extremely valuable and should be inspiration for a study such as this. The experiences of female police leaders need to be documented as well as cherished, because what they have actually undergone is still relatively unknown. While individual accounts are important, a more comprehensive review needs to be completed that can offer a general understanding not only for historical purposes but, more importantly, for females in the lower ranks aspiring to run the boys’ club one day.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This exploratory study examined the experiences of female law enforcement officers, concentrating on those who hold leadership positions. The purpose of this study was to discover the perceptions and attitudes that female officers have about their careers as well as to identify the challenges and stressors experienced by those who had attained the rank of sergeant or higher. The researcher was interested in determining what factors have contributed to the underrepresentation of women in higher ranks, despite government interventions over the past several decades (Grennan & Munoz, 1987; Martin, 1989a; Martin & Jurik, 1996; National Center for Women and Policing, 2001).

The study was also designed to contribute to the general body of empirical information that is available on female police supervisors, because there is so little currently existing (Archbold et al., 2010; Archbold & Schulz, 2008; Schulz, 2009; Silvestri, 2006). Also, the researcher hoped that the information gathered by this study provides future female officers and current lower-ranking female officers with a more accurate outlook of their futures as they advance in rank. The findings from this study may assist law enforcement agencies with recruitment, training, and retention efforts for female officers.

This chapter explains the research design used to accomplish these goals. It also presents the research questions and corresponding hypotheses. The selection of the participant sample is established as well as the development and the implementation of the survey instrument. The limitations of the study are revisited. The analysis section will provide a look at the statistical procedures that were employed to analyze the data.
Research Design

Through a quantitative design, this exploratory study sought to determine what female officers in general are facing or have faced in their role as law enforcement officers as well as what perceptions and attitudes they have about these experiences. While the primary focus of the study is on the experiences of those who have been or are supervisors, the researcher chose to include the experiences of subordinates as well to provide a more comprehensive look into this marginalized world.

The study had two main objectives, which are addressed using three research questions and coinciding hypotheses. The first objective of this research concentrates on assessing previous research and historical documentation of female police personnel to determine if it is applicable to current female police officers and supervisors. Research questions one and two pertain to this initial objective. The second objective seeks to understand the path that must be taken to be promoted, who may take this path, and the experiences of a female in police leadership; the third research question applied to this objective. Each of the research questions and their hypotheses follow below.

Research Question #1

Are the perceptions of study participants regarding overall acceptance of females in law enforcement similar to those previously reported in the available literature?

Research Hypothesis #1A. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are considered a distinctive presence in the profession.

Research Hypothesis #1B. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are still being assigned to traditional female roles.
Research Hypothesis #1C. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers are not as accepted by their agencies as are males.

Research Hypothesis #1D. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers are generally accepted by the public.

Research Hypothesis #1E. Study participants will agree that the federal government has done all that it can to ensure equal opportunity for women in law enforcement.

Research Question #2

Are the perceptions of study participants regarding their experience working in law enforcement similar to those previously reported in the available literature?

Research Hypothesis #2A. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general violate society’s gender codes as a member of the occupation.

Research Hypothesis #2B. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general will have to make the decision regarding how to approach their job.

Research Hypothesis #2C. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are considered as tokens in their occupation.

Research Hypothesis #2D. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general do not go through the same career experiences as do males.

Research Hypothesis #2E. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are not viewed as equals by their male counterparts.
Research Hypothesis #2F. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general have negative transformations in their family lives because they work in the law enforcement field.

Research Hypothesis #2G. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general manifest additional worries at work than do male officers because of pregnancy, children, and childcare issues.

Research Question #3

Are the perceptions of study participants regarding the promotion process and leadership styles similar to those previously reported in the available literature?

Research Hypothesis #3A. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors in general regard the promotion process as unfair and preferential to males.

Research Hypothesis #3B. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors in general have to break through the glass ceiling in order to be promoted.

Research Hypothesis #3C. Study participants will report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors in general make every effort to be effective leaders regardless of resistance.

Participants

The national policewomen’s organization, National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE), was selected as the sample source. Access to this group allowed the researcher to have a convenient, yet suitable, sample listing. This prevented the researcher from the formidable task of contacting various agencies in order to find an appropriate number of female officers to participate in the study, especially
because some agencies do not have an adequate number of female officers, much less any female police supervisors. Because NAWLEE members are from across the United States, the researcher felt that the study results would be considered more general in nature and not as limited, if they had been selected from just a few states like Mississippi and Louisiana.

Responses were collected from female NAWLEE members occupying both supervisory and subordinate positions. The organization, which consists of approximately five hundred members, represents both current and retired female law enforcement officers from local, state, and federal agencies. A final sample size of 105 female officers, including 88 supervisors and 17 subordinates, was obtained.

Instrument

The survey instrument, which was designed by the researcher, covered a vast array of topics in order to explore the life cycle of a female police supervisor. Subject matter included gender issues, general acceptance, differential experiences, family issues, promotion decisions, and the glass ceiling. Unlike much of the research conducted on police supervision, which includes both male and female officers, this study only focused on female officers, because it is their experiences that formulate the core of the study.

The researcher used a nonprobability convenience sampling procedure because the purpose of the research centered exclusively on female officers. Considered appropriate for certain types of research, convenience sampling is most justified for a study that concentrates on a group’s characteristics at a certain point in time, as is the case with this study (Maxfield & Babbie, 2012).

The survey instrument (Appendix A) was designed to assess the experiences of females in law enforcement, using previous research and theoretical concepts and
findings, which applied to the study. The instrument was divided into 17 sections with 80 items. The sections include the following:

A. Distinct Presence (2 items)
B. Assignment to Traditional Female Roles (5 items)
C. Acceptance by Agency (5 items)
D. Acceptance by the Public (4 items)
E. Government Intervention and Influence (2 items)
F. Gender Expectations (5 items)
G. Effects of Decision-Making (6 items)
H. Concerns with Tokenism (5 items)
I. Differential Experiences (7 items)
J. Working with Policemen (4 items)
K. Personal Life (3 items)
L. Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues (7 items)
M. Road to Promotion (6 items)
N. The Promotion Process (6 items)
O. Glass Ceiling Effect (4 items)
P. Life as a Female Law Enforcement Supervisor (5 items)
Q. Resistance (4 items)

In the first part of the survey, all participants, regardless if they were a supervisor or a subordinate, were asked to respond to each item; there were 12 sections in this portion. One of the subsections centered on pregnancy, children, and childcare issues and could only be completed by those who responded “yes” to the contingency question “I have children.” The other 11 sections did not have a contingency clause linked to them.
In the first section of the survey instrument, the participant’s distinctive presence was assessed using two items and sought to determine if today’s female law enforcement officers still feel different in the male-dominated world of policing as their predecessors did (Garcia, 2003).

Assignment to traditional female roles was next covered using five items. These items attempted to determine whether or not current female law enforcement officers have moved past their different status, because some research has found that they are still being placed in specialized sections, only because they are women (Murphy, 2006a, 2006b).

Since history also attests to the displeasure and opposition of male officers who were forced to work with female officers, the next five survey items addressed the participants’ perceptions and experiences regarding general acceptance by their agency (Bloch & Anderson, 1974; Martin, 1980; Sherman, 1975). Attitudes about recruitment and hiring were also addressed here.

Public acceptance was measured using four items. Previous researchers used the attitudes of citizens about the effectiveness and competency of female officers to determine their acceptance (Bloch & Anderson, 1974; Breci, 1997; Sherman, 1975). These items attempted to determine whether or not the participants have a mutual feeling of acceptance from the public using these same parameters.

Efforts made by the government for females to have an equal chance to be hired as well as opinions about affirmative action are addressed in the government intervention and influence section. Two items were presented to the participants to determine if they feel that more governmental action is needed and to discover their perception about affirmative action.
Gender expectations were the focus of five items that stem from Steffensmeier and Allan’s (1996) organization of gender theory. Each item touches on one of the areas of life that Steffensmeier and Allan used to explain the social and behavioral differences between males and females.

Making the decision to be a policewoman or a policewoman was addressed in the seventh section of the survey instrument and originates from Susan Martin’s (1979) argument that most female officers will have to face the choice of either being more of a cop or more of a woman as they establish their career and how this choice can affect them for years.

The concept of tokenism was addressed by five items in the section entitled “Effects of Organization on my Career.” The three perceptual tendencies of tokens, including visibility, contrast, and assimilation, were used to formulate the items to determine if the participants felt that they were in a token position (Kanter, 1977).

To establish whether the participants believed that their experiences have been different from that of their male counterparts, seven items were presented. Many still feel that female officers are facing a completely different career experience only because they are women, so this section was used to determine whether the participants felt this way (Fletcher, 1995).

The next section, “Working with Policemen,” was similar in nature to the previous section, but continued to address the participants’ experiences as female officers. These four items touched on some of their most avid concerns like acceptance and trust on duty, the ability to handle an aggressive subject, and sexual harassment (Duffin, 2010; Fletcher, 1995).
Three items were utilized to assess the consequences of the job on a female officer’s personal life. These items touched on the health and family problems that may arise as a result of being an officer. This was important to include especially because research has shown that female officers have more health risks as well as have to deal with more negative effects on family relationships (Brown & Fielding, 1993; Ellison & Genz, 1983; Maume, 2001; More, 1992).

Definitely unique to female officers are the issues and decisions concerning pregnancy, children and childcare. The first two items of this section were applicable to all participants. Only those participants who responded “yes” to the contingency question on whether or not they had children were able to complete the remaining five items. This section was designed to survey the participants about some of the problems that may arise from trying to be a mother and a law enforcement officer at the same time (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009; Silvestri, 2006).

The second part of the survey was relevant only to those participants who have held a supervisory position at some point in their career. The “Road to Promotion” section was composed of six items. This section touched on topics like mentoring, encouragement and respect, advancement opportunities, and aspirations (Archbold et al., 2010; Gaston & Alexander, 1997; Murphy, 2006b; Silvestri, 2006; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999).

The next section, which also consisted of six items, focused on the issues considered when deciding to become a supervisor. Whetstone and Wilson (1999) found that deciding to become a supervisor isn’t always as simple as it seems, especially for female officers.
The effect of the glass ceiling was addressed in the next section with four items. Questions about competency will sometimes still arise when a female is placed in a supervisory position, especially in those fields that are male-dominated (Boyce & Herd, 2003; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Maume, 2004). These items focused on determining whether or not the participants felt that they had faced the glass ceiling and their perception about its existence at their respective agency.

Next on the survey instrument was a section that was composed of five items and presented the participants with questions about their life as a female police leader. Some of these items were based upon the concept of transformational leadership, which has been linked to females in leadership roles (Eagly, 2007). Other items centered on a female supervisor’s daily experiences.

Resistance to female leadership was addressed in the final section of the instrument. These four items attempted to find the sources of anxiety from co-workers and determine if certain groups (e.g. male subordinates or female subordinates) were the source of more or less resistance (Cohn, 2000; Wexler & Quinn, 1985).

The majority of the items were structured using the Likert scale and were designed so that 1=“strongly agree,” 2=“agree,” 3=“neutral position,” 4=“disagree,” and 5=“strongly disagree.” Some of the items required either a “yes” or a “no” response because of the necessary wording arrangement, where 1=“yes” and 2=“no.” Participants documented their responses by selecting an answer from the appropriate range of possibilities.

Demographic data was also collected. Information was requested in nine categories including number of years as a law enforcement officer, number of years at current agency, state in which your agency is located, the type of law enforcement agency
you work for, current rank, population size your agency serves, your race/ethnicity, your marital status, and highest level of education. Some of these categories were replicated from the research conducted by Schulz (2003) in her statistical profile study of female police chiefs.

Because there were 80 survey items, the researcher made every effort to make the instrument aesthetically appealing to the participants so that it would not be too overwhelming for them to complete. The survey instrument was therefore designed to have different sections with adequate spacing between item responses.

To review, the first part of the survey instrument allowed all ranked and subordinate NAWLEE members the chance to convey their personal experiences and perceptions in each of the topic areas. To complete the latter part of the instrument, the participant had to acknowledge that she was a supervisor; the items in that section were specifically targeted for them.

Procedure

Once the survey instrument was approved by The University of Southern Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (see Appendix B), a pilot study was conducted prior to the distribution of the final survey instrument. Feedback was gathered from ten current and retired female law enforcement officers, ranging from a novice patrol officer to a current police chief, in order to ensure that the instrument was mechanically sound. Their recommendations, along with those from committee members, resulted in necessary modifications of the instrument.

The instrument was implemented using the online survey resource, SurveyMonkey.com. Online surveys have become prevalent recently because they offer both professional and novice researchers a means of connecting to possible participants.
that they would have never reached, if not for this resource. SurveyMonkey is an online company that offers users the opportunity to create reliable web-based surveys for their research purposes. The survey data is owned by the principal investigator and is not used by SurveyMonkey.com. The data gathered is stored on the company’s servers that are safeguarded by staff. Information is retained as long as the principal investigator has an account with the company. Once the account is cancelled, the data is deleted.

SurveyMonkey.com offers Secure Socket Layer (SSL) encryption protection, which helps to ensure the confidentiality of the participant’s responses. The survey instrument did not request any direct identifiers like name or social security number from participants, and responses were collected anonymously because the principal investigator had the ability to disable the storage of email and IP addresses.

Because NAWLEE prefers to use this means of gathering data from their members, the researcher, of course, opted to utilize the online survey method, instead of a mailed-out survey. The group feels that online surveys are the least intrusive to its members. NAWLEE’s Executive Director gave permission via telephone for the study to be conducted and, once the instrument was reviewed by their Board of Directors, it was approved and placed on their website. Members were notified of the study via email with a link to participate if desired. The participant had an option to choose to participate after voluntarily going to the survey’s web address and reading the online consent form. Potential participants were greeted with an introduction that explained the purpose of the research, explained their voluntary participation, and assured their confidentiality if they chose to participate. A contingency question was used in the participant’s voluntary participation decision. If the potential participant did not want to consent to participate, her answer of “no” would automatically allow her to leave the website; a click on “yes”
allowed the participant to continue through the survey. Participants were not coerced to complete the instrument, because they were able to skip any question or exit the survey at any time, if they desired.

Contingency questions were also used for the sections on pregnancy, children, and childcare as well as the supervisor section. If the participant responded positively to the question, they were lead into a series of additional questions in that respective section.

NAWLEE allowed for the web link address to remain on their website for approximately five weeks and then removed it. A representative from the group notified the researcher when they did so.

Limitations and Assumptions

The researcher identified certain limitations of the study which may pose a threat to its internal validity. The sample pool was limited to only include female members of NAWLEE, who were current or retired sworn law enforcement officers; non-commissioned personnel were excluded. Subordinates were designated by the researcher as those below the rank of sergeant; those holding the rank of sergeant and above were defined as supervisors.

The selection to utilize only NAWLEE members will limit the generalizability of the research to other female officers and supervisors throughout the United States. NAWLEE’s inclusion as the sample source allowed the researcher to have an accessible and functioning resource to hundreds of females who worked in the field of law enforcement with some having reached the upper ranks of their organizations.

NAWLEE members’ avid participation in the organization poses another limitation for the study. Their involvement demonstrates their active approach to women in the law enforcement field. While there are thousands of female officers in this
country, this group of 500 accounts for some of the most cognizant and enthusiastic female officers in the United States. On a regular basis, NAWLEE posts internet links to studies being conducted by various researchers throughout the country on their website. For members who participate in these studies on a regular basis, there may be some testing effects present because their exposure to survey participation is quite different than non-NAWLEE members, who may not ever participate in any type of research. Therefore, the participants may contribute to the study in a way that other female officers would not. Maxwell and Babbie (2012) cautioned researchers when using convenience sampling by stating, “the more self-selection is involved, the more bias will be introduced into the sample” (p. 136).

Still, the researcher assumed those participating completed the survey truthfully and actually earned the rank they reported. It was also assumed that participants’ responses on their perceptions, attitudes, and experiences in the law enforcement field were honest and accurate.

Data Analysis

Data gathered from the returned online survey instruments was analyzed using version 20.0 of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) for Windows. The first type of statistical analysis employed was the generation of frequency distribution tables for each survey item. Frequency distribution tables allow for the simple tabulation of the number of responses for each section and make it easy to see how the participants’ responses are distributed. Even though this type of analysis is considered by some to be too basic and simple, frequency distribution tables offer a way to initially interpret opinions from surveys, which is quite essential in this study (Williams, 2009). The
patterns developed from this data allowed the researcher to make comparisons between the participants’ responses to each survey item and previous documentation.

To determine the existence of relationships between demographic data and survey items, Pearson chi-square tests were applied. Survey items were first placed in groups that were concluded by the researcher to be intuitively similar in nature and then relabeled. For those items using the Likert scale as a response option, expected and observed frequencies came from combined categories, including collectively agree (composed of “strongly agree” and “agree”), collectively disagree (composed of “strongly disagree” and “disagree”), and neutral position. Items using “yes” and “no” as a response option were also used.

Next, Pearson chi-square tests were used to assess the presence of statistically significant relationships between the grouped survey items and demographic data, which were relabeled. This statistical technique tests the significance of the relationship through the null hypothesis, which states that the included variables have no relationship and are statistically independent; any differences that are noted may be attributed to random error. If chi-square records larger values, then these differences did not occur by chance alone and the null hypothesis is rejected (Williams, 2009). The researcher was able to determine what survey items resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis and concluded that these were statistically significant in nature. These were two-tailed significant tests with the alpha values set at the .05 level.

With the complex design of the survey instrument, the researcher knew that the multifaceted phenomena covered in the vast range of survey item topics needed to be simplified. Before conducting an exploratory factor analysis procedure, the data was first entered into a Cronbach’s Alpha procedure for data reduction purposes. Cronbach’s
Alpha is the most common measure of the internal reliability of a scale (Field, 2009). This procedure was performed for the subordinate/supervisor section and then for the supervisor only section; the survey items specific to those participants who had children were not included. Those items that displayed some form of reliability were then inserted into a factor analysis procedure.

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was next used to identify any underlying constructs, or factors. EFA is designed to reduce the number of variables that are representing an underlying dimension or concept (Field, 2009). Collinear variables are needed to create factors that explain as much shared variance within a set of variables as possible (Norusis, 2006). EFA was used to determine what survey items were basically measuring the same concepts. This was conducted for the first part of the survey instrument for the combined subordinate and supervisor section, and then again for the section covering supervisors only.

After the EFA was completed, the remaining factors were placed into a Cronbach’s Alpha procedure again. This time it was used to determine the reliability of the created factors in order to conclude whether or not the created factors were cohesive in nature.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Introduction

A web link for the survey instrument was placed on NAWLEE’s website for approximately five weeks and was then removed by their webmaster. Only 125 members chose to agree to the consent form and continue to progress through the instrument. Of these 125 responses, only 105 were found to be functional and could be utilized for the study and analyses.

Descriptives

To help summarize the demographic data, the researcher utilized the software SPSS, Version 20.0, in order to compile descriptive statistics. Demographic data included number of years as a law enforcement officer, number of years at current agency, state in which your agency is located, the type of law enforcement agency you work for, current rank, population size your agency serves, race/ethnicity, marital status, and highest level of education.

Demographic data from those items centering on the participants’ organization and rank were computed. It was determined that the majority of participants listed their home agency in Florida (12.4%) followed by the states of Kansas (8.6%) and Wisconsin (4.8%). Most of the participants worked with an agency that served a population of over one million (19.0%). As reported in Table 1, the sample largely consisted of female officers from municipal police departments (58.1%) with only a small fraction from federal law enforcement agencies (1.9%). The majority of participants classified themselves as either lieutenants (23.8%) or sergeants (22.9%).
Table 1

*Organizational Demographic Characteristics of the Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Law (Enforcement Agency)</td>
<td>Municipal Police Department</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Sheriff’s Department</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Police Agency</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Enforcement Agency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Rank</td>
<td>Chief of Police or Sheriff</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deputy Chief or Undersheriff</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspector, Commander, Colonel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Major, Deputy Inspector</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer, Deputy Sheriff, Corporal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

The participants reported the number of years that they worked as a law enforcement officer. Their responses ranged from three years to 40 years with a mean of 22.80 years (SD=6.70).

Demographic data on a more personal level (race/ethnicity, marital status, and highest level of education) as presented in Table 2 show that the sample consisted of
mostly Caucasian participants (85.7%), who were married (57%), and had either a Bachelor’s degree (37.1%) or a Master’s degree (46.7%).

Table 2

*Personal Demographic Characteristics of the Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education</td>
<td>High school diploma/GED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College, No Degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level</td>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Education</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Statistical Results

Each section of the survey instrument was rooted in history or past research and attempted to determine if the participants had similar perceptions to those noted in earlier literature. Each survey item was developed by the researcher to coincide with this previous research resulting in sections that did not always seem to have a consistent pattern of questioning. The initial section of the survey instrument was designed to answer the first two research questions that focused on predicting participants’ perception of their overall acceptance and experiences working in law enforcement respectively in comparison to available literature. The second section shifted attention to those in supervisory positions and their perception about the promotion process and leadership styles in contrast to previous research.

To analyze the obtained data, frequency distributions were first created and used to report the percentage and number of responses for each possible answer for an item. Next, the survey items and demographic data were prepared for additional analysis using Pearson’s chi-square test of independence. Used to determine if statistically significant
differences exist within the response pattern of survey items, chi-square is appropriate for this type of analysis because the data is considered categorical in nature.

**Overall Acceptance of Females in Law Enforcement**

The research question “Are the perceptions of study participants regarding overall acceptance of females in law enforcement similar to those previously reported in the available literature?” was addressed in the initial section. Four hypotheses were developed and tested in order to answer this question. Examined first was the hypothesis (#1A) predicting that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are considered a distinctive presence in the profession. The second hypothesis (#1B) examined the likelihood that participants would agree with the proposition that female law enforcement officers are still being assigned to traditional female roles. The third hypothesis (#1C) predicted that participants would convey the belief that female law enforcement officers are not as accepted by their agencies as are male officers. The fourth hypothesis (#1D) anticipated participants to report that female law enforcement officers are generally accepted by the public. The final hypothesis (#1E) expected participants to agree that the federal government has done all that it can to ensure equal opportunity for women in law enforcement.

**Distinct Presence.** It was hypothesized (#1A) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are considered a distinctive presence in their profession. The participants’ responses to two survey items were utilized to draw a conclusion for this hypothesis. A majority of the participants (82.9%) collectively agreed that they had felt “different” at times from other officers because they were female (see Table 3). Also, eight out of 10 (81.0%) participants responded “yes” when asked if they had been the first female of some accomplishment during their career.
Table 3

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Distinct Presence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have felt “different” at times from other officers because I am female</td>
<td>31.4 (33)</td>
<td>51.4 (54)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Chi-square analysis revealed that participants with a Master’s degree or greater were more likely than those with a Bachelor’s degree or less to collectively agree with the proposition that they had felt *different* at times from other officers because they were female [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.707, p = .021$]. Specifically, there was a higher than expected count reported for those with a Master’s degree, Doctoral degree, or Law degree as noted in Table 4.

Table 4

*I have felt “different” at times from other officers because I am female*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.707, p = .021$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree
Participants with 21 years or more of service were found to be more likely than those with 20 years or less of service to report that they had been the first female of some position or accomplishment \( [\chi^2 (1, 105) = 6.369, p= .012] \). In simple terms, there was a higher than expected count (see Table 5) reported for those with 21 or more years of service.

Table 5

I have been the first female of some position or accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years or less of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=21 or more years of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2 (1, 105) = 6.369, p = .012; 1= \text{yes}; 2= \text{no} \)

Based upon the results obtained, there exists mixed support for the hypothesis (#1A) predicting that members of the present sample would report the perception that female officers in general are considered a distinctive presence in the law enforcement field. This finding presents evidence that additional research may need to be undertaken in this area. Only with a balanced evaluation of the remaining four hypotheses can a more accurate and complete understanding be offered regarding the participants’ experiences and their overall acceptance within the law enforcement field. Attention will now shift to the analysis of participants’ perceptions on the presence of females in specialized sections.
Assignment to Traditional Female Roles. The next hypothesis (#1B) anticipated that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are still being assigned to traditional female roles. Table 6 reveals that more than one-half (53.3%) of the participants collectively agreed with the proposition that female officers were more likely than male officers to be transferred into sections that focused on juveniles, domestic violence, or sex crimes. Interestingly, when questioned about their personal experience in these assignments, a majority (88.6%) of participants indicated that they had worked in a specialized section, yet most had not worked in a juvenile section (75.2%), a domestic violence section (69.39%), or a sex crimes unit (64.8%).

Table 6

Frequency Table of Survey Items/Assignment to Traditional Female Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female officers are more likely to be assigned to work in sections that deal with juveniles, domestic violence, or sex crimes</td>
<td>20.0 (21)</td>
<td>33.3 (35)</td>
<td>24.8 (26)</td>
<td>19.0 (20)</td>
<td>2.9 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of predicted versus observed responses for this item depending upon the population size served by the respondent’s agency. Specifically, those serving a population size of 100,000 or less were more likely than those who serve a population size of 100,001 or more to collectively agree with the proposition that female officers are more inclined to be assigned to work in sections that have been traditional feminine roles \[\chi^2 (2, 105) = \]
10.941, p = .004]. As reported in Table 7, there was a higher than expected count reported for those serving a population size of 100,000 or less.

Table 7

*Female officers are more likely to be assigned to work in sections that deal with juveniles, domestic violence, or sex crimes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected</strong></td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=population of 100K or less

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected</strong></td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2=population of 100,001 or more

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 10.941, p = .004$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Chi-square analysis also revealed that participants who worked for agencies that served a population of 100,001 or more were more likely than those who served a population of 100,000 or less to respond “yes” to the proposition that they had worked in a specialized section [$\chi^2 (1, 105) = 4.682, p = .030$]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count reported for those who worked for larger agencies than smaller ones as observed in Table 8.

Table 8

*I have worked in a specialized section*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Count</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expected</strong></td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2=population of 100,001 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (1, 105) = 4.682, p = .030$; 1=yes; 2=no

Disaggregation of this data using chi-square analysis next revealed that participants serving populations of 100,000 or less were more likely than those serving populations of 100,001 or more to indicate that they had worked in a sex crime unit [$\chi^2 (1, 105) = 4.350, p = .037$]. As noted in Table 9, there was a higher than expected count reported for those participants serving a population of 100,000 or less than for those working with a larger agency.

Table 9

*I have worked in a section that specializes in sex crimes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=population of 100K or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>59.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=population of 100,001 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (1, 105) = 4.350, p = .037$; 1=yes; 2=no

Additionally, chi-square analysis revealed that participants differed in their responses to the item proposing that they had worked in a domestic violence unit.

Married participants were found to be more likely than those not married to indicate that
they had been assigned to a domestic violence unit \( \chi^2 (1, 105) = 10.541, p = .001 \).

Specifically, there was a higher than expected count for married participants than those participants who were not married (See Table 10).

**Table 10**

*I have worked with the domestic violence unit of our department*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Not married</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Married</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2 (1, 105) = 10.541, p = .001; 1=\text{yes}; 2=\text{no} \)

Even though the participants’ lack of experience in these units was evident, their modest confirmation about the perception of female officers’ roles in these sections offers support to the hypothesis (#1B). This conclusion is consistent with perceptions previously noted by others in the reviewed literature. While this finding is indeed useful, there are three remaining hypotheses that must be examined in order to draw a conclusion for the first research question linking current female law enforcement officers’ experiences with past literature.

*Acceptance by Agency.* The third hypotheses of this section (#1C) stated that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers are not as accepted by their agencies as are male officers. As reported in Table 11, over one-half (50.5%) of participants collectively agreed that they were accepted by the male officers that they were first assigned to work with on duty. They also agreed collectively that
they were accepted by their first male supervisor (56.2%). More than half of the
participants (52.4%) collectively agreed to the proposition that they had been accepted as
a full-fledged member of their department when they were first hired. Close to two-
thirds (62.8%) of them collectively disagreed that they were heavily recruited by their
department only because they were female. The participants also disagreed collectively
that they were hired only for diversity purposes (64.7%).

Table 11

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Acceptance by Agency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Neutral Position %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was accepted by the male officers I was first assigned to work with</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
<td>32.4 (34)</td>
<td>13.3 (14)</td>
<td>25.7 (27)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was accepted by my first male supervisor</td>
<td>21.0 (22)</td>
<td>35.2 (37)</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
<td>11.4 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was accepted by my department as a full-fledged member when I first joined</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>38.1 (40)</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
<td>21.0 (22)</td>
<td>8.6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was heavily recruited by my department only because I was female</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>37.1 (39)</td>
<td>25.7 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was hired only for diversity purposes</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>13.3 (14)</td>
<td>15.2 (16)</td>
<td>35.2 (37)</td>
<td>29.5 (31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the item focusing on participants’ perceived acceptance by the first male officers they worked with and the region of the country they
were from. Beforehand, the researcher had placed the state noted by each participant into a region defined by the United States Census Bureau’s template of regions and divisions (2013). Those participants from the Midwest and the South were more likely than those from the West and the Northeast to collectively agree that they were accepted by the first male officers they were assigned to work with $[\chi^2 (2, 105) = 12.940, p = .044]$.

Specifically, there was a higher than expected count (see Table 12) for those noting their agencies were in the Midwest and the South.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=West</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Midwest</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Northeast</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=South</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 12.940, p = .044$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Disaggregation of the data using chi-square analysis revealed that participants not married were more likely than married participants to collectively express that their first supervisor accepted them $[\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.829, p = .020]$. As noted in Table 13, there was
a higher than expected count reported for those participants not married than for participants who were married at the time.

Table 13

*I was accepted by my first supervisor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Not married</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Married</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.829, p = .020$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Further examination of the data using Pearson’s chi-square indicated a statistically significant departure between participants with 21 or more years of service and those with 20 years or less of service and their attitude about the proposition that they were heavily recruited by their department because they were female. Specifically, those who served 21 or more years were more likely to collectively disagree with this item [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 12.712, p = .002$]. There was a higher than expected than observed count for those who served 21 or more years than those with less service time (see Table 14).

Table 14

*I was heavily recruited by my department only because I was female*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years or less of service</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistically significant differences were also found between participants with 21 or more years of service and those with 20 years or less of service and their perception as to whether they were hired for diversity purposes. Those who had served more years were more likely than those who served less time to collectively disagree that the reason they were hired was for purposes of diversity [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 9.045, p = .011$]. As reported in Table 15, there was a higher than expected count reported for participants with 21 or more years of service.

Table 15

\textit{I was hired only for diversity purposes}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years or less of service</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=21 or more years of service</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 9.045, p = .011$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree
Additionally, chi-square analysis revealed another statistically significant difference for this same item and the participants’ agency type. Stated differently, participants who indicated that they worked with an agency other than a municipality (e.g. sheriff’s office, state agency, or federal agency) were more likely than those who worked with a municipality to collectively agree that their hiring was for the purpose of diversity $[\chi^2 (2, 105) = 11.343, p = .003]$. There was a higher observed count than expected count (see Table 16) for those working at other agencies in comparison to those working at a municipal agency.

Table 16

*I was hired only for diversity purposes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Municipal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=All others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>71.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 11.343, p = .003$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Frequency responses to the five items supported the stated hypothesis (#1C). Most of the participants agreed with the items focusing on acceptance and disagreed with those examining their perceptions on recruitment and hiring. Two more hypotheses remain to be reviewed before a conclusion can be drawn on the overall acceptance of females in law enforcement.

*Acceptance by the Public.* It was hypothesized (#1D) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers are generally accepted by the
public. Using personal perceptions, nearly all of the participants (99.1%) collectively agreed that they felt just as effective as their male counterparts when dealing with the public. Table 17 reveals that 99.0% of participants also agreed with the proposition that they are just as competent as male officers at handling the public’s complaints. Eight out of every ten (81.0%) participants collectively supported the proposition that they had better communication skills than their male counterparts. Finally, most participants (92.4%) agreed that the public accepted them.

Table 17

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Acceptance by the Public*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been just as effective as my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td>88.6 (93)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been just as competent as my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td>89.5 (94)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better communication skills than my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td>59.0 (62)</td>
<td>21.9 (23)</td>
<td>17.1 (18)</td>
<td>1.9 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been accepted by the public</td>
<td>48.6 (51)</td>
<td>43.8 (46)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

More detailed examination of the data using Pearson’s chi-square did not reveal any statistically significant departures from the null model for these four items and the demographic characteristics.
Frequency responses attained for these four survey items lend support to the above stated hypothesis (1D) that female officers would report the perceived outlook of being accepted by the public, which coincides with the reviewed literature and confirms the external validity of previous studies. With only one more hypothesis to review in this first section, the research question is coming close to being answered.

**Government Intervention and Influence.** The final hypothesis in this section (1E) stated that participants would agree that the federal government has done all that it can to ensure equal opportunity for women in law enforcement. Nearly half (44.8%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that the government needs to increase government intervention in order to increase the number of female law enforcement officers in the country (see Table 18). A larger percentage (57.1%) collectively agreed with the statement that government initiatives like affirmative action policies hurt female officers.

Table 18

**Frequency Table of Survey Items/Government Intervention and Influence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree %</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that more government intervention should be taken to increase the number of female police officers in this country</td>
<td>15.2 (16)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>30.5 (32)</td>
<td>34.3 (36)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that affirmative action policies hurt female officers because of the perceived preferential treatment bestowed upon them</td>
<td>15.2 (16)</td>
<td>41.9 (44)</td>
<td>26.7 (28)</td>
<td>13.3 (14)</td>
<td>2.9 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105
Comparison between predicted and observed responses for these two items based upon demographic characteristics did not reveal any statistically significant departures from the null chi-square model.

The pattern of responses obtained for these items supported the hypothesis (#1E) that participants would agree that the federal government has done all it can to ensure equal opportunity for women in law enforcement. These findings reflect that the fact that many of the participants believe that the government has offered them sufficient assistance with their careers in law enforcement.

**Conclusions on the Overall Acceptance of Females in Law Enforcement**

The findings of these five areas of inquiry (initial acceptance, assignment to traditional female roles, acceptance by agency, acceptance by the public, and government intervention and influence) provide an answer to the first research question that asked “Are the perceptions of participants regarding overall acceptance of females in law enforcement similar to those previously reported in the available literature?”

Participants expressed support for the proposition that female officers in general are still being assigned to traditional female roles. Encouraging was the finding that some of the female officers are as accepted as male officers by their agencies. The participants also reported that they feel accepted by the public. Finally, participants indicated that overall they felt that the federal government had done all that it can to ensure equal opportunity for them. There was mixed support, though, regarding the distinctive presence of women in law enforcement. It seems reasonable to conclude that the findings in this first section are generally consistent with previous literature and affirm that the collective attitude of acceptance of the sample is equivalent with those reported in previous literature.
Experiences of Females Working in Law Enforcement

The second research question asked “Are the perceptions of participants regarding their experience working in law enforcement similar to those previously reported in the available literature?” The first hypothesis (#2A) examined the likelihood of participants to report the perception that female officers in general violate society’s gender codes as a member of the occupation. Also examined was the hypothesis (#2B) that participants would convey the belief that female law enforcement officers generally have to make the decision on how to approach their career. The third hypothesis (#2C) expected participants to report that female officers are considered as tokens in their occupation. The fourth hypothesis (#2D) anticipated participants to report that they do not go through the same career experience as do males. The fifth hypothesis (#2E) asserted that participants would support the proposition that females are not viewed as equals by their male counterparts. The next hypothesis (#2F) expected participants to report having negative transformations in their family lives because they work in the field of law enforcement. The final hypothesis (#2G) examined the likelihood of the participants to report the perception that female officers in general manifest additional worries at work than do male officers because of pregnancy, children, and childcare issues.

Gender Expectations. It was hypothesized (#2A) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general violate society’s gender codes. The pattern of responses for five survey items in this section is reported in Table 19. Two-thirds (66.7%) of the participants collectively felt that they were violating society’s gender norms by being a female officer. Nearly two out of three participants (59.1%) felt that they were more receptive than their male counterparts to the needs of the public. A notably larger percentage (72.4%) expressed collective agreement with the
proposition that they do not fall under society’s attempt to control what a woman should do or be. The responses to the fourth item in this section revealed nearly two-thirds (61.0%) of participants agreed collectively that they had at times felt that their male counterparts did not want to work with them. Finally, a majority of participants (68.6%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that biological differences are the “only” differences between male and female officers.

Table 19

*Frequency Table of Survey Item/Gender Expectations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I feel at times that I have violated the gender norms that society has about women</td>
<td>27.6 (29)</td>
<td>39.0 (41)</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>2.9 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I feel that I have been more receptive to the needs of the public than my male counterparts</td>
<td>24.8 (26)</td>
<td>34.3 (36)</td>
<td>31.4 (33)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I feel that I do not fall under society’s attempt to control what a woman should be or do</td>
<td>21.9 (23)</td>
<td>50.5 (53)</td>
<td>19.0 (20)</td>
<td>7.6 (8)</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I have felt at times that my male counterparts did not want me working with them</td>
<td>21.0 (22)</td>
<td>40.0 (42)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>26.7 (28)</td>
<td>5.7 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I feel that biological differences are the “only” differences between male &amp; female officers</td>
<td>5.7 (6)</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>11.4 (12)</td>
<td>60.0 (63)</td>
<td>8.6 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105
Further exploration of the data obtained for each of the preceding items through the application of Pearson’s chi-square revealed only one statistically significant finding. In particular, it was determined that participants who had 21 or more years of service were more likely to collectively agree with the wording of the final survey item than others who had 20 years or less of service. In simple terms, participants who had served longer were more likely than those who served less time to agree with the proposition that biological differences were the only differences between male and female officers [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.903, p = .032$]. As noted in Table 20, there was a higher than expected count for long-term veteran participants than those with 20 or less years of service.

Table 20

As a female officer, I feel that biological differences are the “only” differences between male and female officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years or less of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=21 or more years of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.903, p = .032$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

The results indicate support for the hypothesis (#2A) which predicted that participants would report the perception that female officers in general violate society’s gender codes. These findings are consistent with reports of other researchers found in the literature. Six more hypotheses still need to be examined before an answer to the second research question can be offered.
Effects of Decision-Making. It was hypothesized (#2B) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general will have to make a decision regarding how to approach their job, either as a policewoman or policewoman (Martin, 1979). Analysis of the data revealed that nearly eight out of ten (82.8%) participants had been labeled in a derogatory way during their career (see Table 21). A large majority (87.6%) also reported that they have had to worry more about their reputation than their male counterparts. All (100.0%) collectively agreed that they considered their position to be that of a “professional.” More participants agreed collectively (44.8%) than disagreed collectively (39.1%) with the proposition that they had to gain the respect of their male patrol partners by acting “rough and tough.” Regardless of these job pressures, a majority of participants (83.8%) collectively agreed that they try to keep their gender from interfering with the duties of the job. Nearly half (48.6%) advised that they try to maintain their femininity while on duty.

Table 21

Frequency Table of Survey Items/ Effects of Decision-Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been labeled in a derogatory way at some point in my career</td>
<td>43.8 (46)</td>
<td>39.0 (41)</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
<td>2.9 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had to worry about my reputation more than my male counterparts</td>
<td>45.7 (48)</td>
<td>41.9 (44)</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
<td>7.6 (8)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my position to be that of a “professional”</td>
<td>84.8 (89)</td>
<td>15.2 (16)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had to gain the respect of my male patrol partners by acting “rough &amp; tough”</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>28.6 (30)</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>30.5 (32)</td>
<td>8.6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tried to keep my gender from interfering with the duties of my job</td>
<td>45.7 (48)</td>
<td>38.1 (40)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
<td>1.9 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to maintain my femininity while on duty</td>
<td>15.2 (16)</td>
<td>33.3 (35)</td>
<td>29.5 (31)</td>
<td>21.0 (22)</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

More detailed examination of the data using Pearson’s chi-square did not reveal any statistically significant departures from the null model for these six items with demographic variables.

The response pattern of these survey items offered mixed support for the hypothesis (#2B) predicting that female officers in general will have to make the decision regarding how they will approach their job, either as a policewoman or a policewoman. It appears that labeling, proving one-self, and self-identification issues all still have their place for a female on the force. While this finding is indeed useful, attention now shifts to the concept of tokenism and its role with females in law enforcement.

Concerns with Tokenism. A third hypothesis (#2C) stated that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are considered tokens in their profession. Nearly half of the participants (46.7%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that they had more negative work experiences than their male
counterparts so far in their career (see Table 22). They were more likely (45.7%) to collectively agree with the statement that they experienced more workplace stress than male officers. Greater than one-half (56.2%) expressed collective agreement with the item that suggested that they had more of a hostile work environment than male officers. One out of every two participants (52.4%) collectively agreed that they had been more critically evaluated by their supervisors in comparison to their male counterparts. Over half of the participants (55.2%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that they had fewer promotional and training opportunities than male officers.

Table 22

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Concerns with Tokenism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout my career so far, I have had more negative work experiences than my male counterparts</td>
<td>12.4 (13)</td>
<td>21.9 (23)</td>
<td>19.0 (20)</td>
<td>40.0 (42)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout my career so far, I have experienced more workplace stress than my male counterparts</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>31.4 (33)</td>
<td>21.9 (23)</td>
<td>27.6 (29)</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout my career so far, I have had more of a hostile work environment than my male counterparts</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
<td>38.1 (40)</td>
<td>11.4 (12)</td>
<td>29.5 (31)</td>
<td>2.9 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throughout my career so far, I have been more critically evaluated by my supervisors than my male counterparts</td>
<td>21.9 (23)</td>
<td>30.5 (32)</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>26.7 (28)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout my career so far, I have had fewer promotional &amp; training opportunities than my male counterparts</td>
<td>13.3 (14)</td>
<td>22.9 (24)</td>
<td>8.6 (9)</td>
<td>37.1 (39)</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of predicted versus observed responses for the item focusing on a hostile work environment depending upon rank. Specifically, those having the rank of lieutenant or lower were more likely than those having the rank of captain or higher to collectively agree with the proposition that they have had more of a hostile work environment than their male counterparts so far in their career [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 8.055, p = .018$]. As reported in Table 23, there was a higher than expected count for those of a lower rank than those of higher rank.

Table 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Throughout my career so far, I have had more of a hostile work environment than my male counterparts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2=Captain or higher</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>91.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 8.055, p = .018$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Chi-square analysis also revealed that participants with 21 or more years of service were more likely than others who had served 20 years or less to collectively agree with the proposition that they had been more critically evaluated by their supervisors in comparison to male officers during their career $[\chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.227, p = .044]$. As noted in Table 24, there was a higher observed than expected count for those who had worked over 20 years than those with less service.

Table 24

*Throughout my career so far, I have been more critically evaluated by my supervisors than my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1=20 years or less of service</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2=21 or more years of service</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.227, p = .044$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

The above hypothesis (#2C) predicting that participants would report the perception that female officers are considered tokens had mixed support. Frequency
responses indicate that law enforcement agencies are making some effort to improve the work environment for female officers, but there is evidence that work experiences for some of the participants has been negative. Four more hypotheses need to be reviewed so that a conclusion can be drawn on women’s overall experience working in law enforcement.

**Differential Experiences.** It was hypothesized (#2D) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general do not go through the same career experiences as do male officers. Participants were as likely to collectively agree (41.9%) as they were to collectively disagree (41.9%) with the proposition that they were experiencing an entirely different career compared to male officers. A notably large percentage (97.1%) collectively disagreed with the suggestion that they had used their feminine status to get out of job details or to get special treatment. Nearly half of the participants (48.6%) collectively agreed that they struggled to prove that they were equal to their male counterparts. The participants reported to have more education (66.7%) than male officers had. The majority of participants (63.8%) also indicated to have come from a middle-class background. Nearly two-thirds (62.0%) of participants collectively disagreed with the proposition that they had a harder time passing the initial physical fitness test than male applicants. Finally, over three-fourths (76.2%) of participants also collectively disagreed that they had a harder time in the police academy than their male counterparts (See Table 25).
Table 25

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/ Differential Experiences*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am enduring an entirely different career experience compared to my male counterparts</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>27.6 (29)</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>33.3 (35)</td>
<td>8.6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used my feminine status at times to get out of job details or to get special treatment</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
<td>1.9 (2)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>23.8 (25)</td>
<td>73.3 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have struggled to prove that I am equal to male officers</td>
<td>17.1 (18)</td>
<td>31.4 (33)</td>
<td>12.4 (13)</td>
<td>28.6 (30)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more education than most of my male counterparts</td>
<td>43.8 (46)</td>
<td>22.9 (24)</td>
<td>17.1 (18)</td>
<td>12.4 (13)</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I come from a lower- to middle-class background</td>
<td>23.8 (25)</td>
<td>40.0 (42)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>24.8 (26)</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a harder time passing the initial physical fitness test than my male counterparts</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
<td>18.1 (19)</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>41.0 (43)</td>
<td>21.0 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a harder time in the police academy than my male counterparts</td>
<td>1.0 (1)</td>
<td>12.4 (13)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
<td>45.7 (48)</td>
<td>30.5 (32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Chi-square analysis revealed that participants with a Master’s degree or greater were more likely than those with a Bachelor’s degree or less to collectively agree with the proposition that they are enduring an entirely different career experience compared to their male counterparts \( \chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.663, p = .036 \). Specifically, there was a higher
observed than expected count for participants who noted that they had a Master’s degree, Doctoral degree, or a Law degree as reported in Table 26.

Table 26

*I am enduring an entirely different career experience compared to my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.663, p = .036$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Chi-square analysis next revealed that participants with 21 or more years of service were more likely than those with 20 years or less of service to report that they had more education than most of their male counterparts [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.998, p = .018$]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count (see Table 27) for those participants with 21 or more years of service than those who had served less time.

Table 27

*I have more education than most of my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years or less of service</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=21 or more years of service</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.998, p = .018$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree
Disaggregation of the data using chi-square also revealed that participants who had earned a Master’s degree or greater were more likely than others who held a Bachelor’s degree or less to collectively agree that they had more education than their male counterparts [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 29.145, p = .000$]. There was a higher observed than expected count reported for those participants who noted that they had attained a Master’s degree, Doctoral degree, or a Law degree as reported in Table 28.

Table 28

*I have more education than most of my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1=Bachelor’s</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or less</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>88.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.6%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2=Master’s</strong></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or greater</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>70.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 105) = 29.145, p = .000$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Chi-square analysis revealed that participants who listed their rank as lieutenant or lower were more likely than those who listed their rank as captain or higher to report that they had more education than most of their male counterparts [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 6.646, p = .036$]. Specifically, there was a higher than expected count (See Table 29) for those with the rank of lieutenant or lower than those with the rank of captain or higher.
Table 29

*I have more education than most of my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>48.6%</em></td>
<td><em>22.2%</em></td>
<td><em>64.7%</em></td>
<td><em>46.7%</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Captain or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>51.4%</em></td>
<td><em>77.8%</em></td>
<td><em>35.3%</em></td>
<td><em>53.3%</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2$ (2, 105) = 6.646, p = .036; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Chi-square analysis again revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of predicted versus observed responses for the survey questioning the participants on their initial fitness test and their level of education. Specifically, those with a Master’s degree or greater were more likely than those with a Bachelor’s degree or less to collectively agree with the proposition that they had a harder time passing the physical fitness test than male officers [$\chi^2$ (2, 105) = 5.993, p = .050]. As noted in Table 30, there was a higher observed than expected count for those with higher degrees than those with a lower or no degree.

Table 30

*I had a harder time passing the initial physical fitness test than my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>26.1%</em></td>
<td><em>52.9%</em></td>
<td><em>55.4%</em></td>
<td><em>48.6%</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>73.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2$ (2, 105) = 5.993, p = .050; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Using the obtained survey data, the above hypothesis (#2D) predicting that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers do not go through the same career experience as do male officers was found to have mixed support. Two hypotheses remain to be reviewed before an answer can be provided for the corresponding research question.

Working with Policemen. It was hypothesized (#2E) that the participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general are not viewed as equals by their male counterparts. Four survey items were developed to examine this hypothesis. A majority of the participants (70.5%) collectively agreed that they felt as though some male officers really did not like working with them (see Table 31). Three out of every four (78.1%) collectively agreed that they had to figure out which male officers they could trust. Interestingly, just over one half of the participants (52.4%) did not support the proposition that their male counterparts had expressed strong concern regarding their ability to handle a violent subject. Finally, it was found that eight out of ten (80.0%) participants reported having to deal with inappropriate jokes, comments, and/or pictures while at work.
Table 31

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Working with Policemen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have felt that some male officers really did not like me working with them</td>
<td>23.8 (25)</td>
<td>46.7 (49)</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
<td>19.0 (20)</td>
<td>5.7 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to figure out which male officers I could trust &amp; which ones I could not</td>
<td>31.4 (33)</td>
<td>46.7 (49)</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
<td>13.3 (14)</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My male counterparts expressed strong concern in my ability to handle a violent</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>21.0 (22)</td>
<td>17.1 (18)</td>
<td>43.8 (46)</td>
<td>8.6 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had to deal with inappropriate jokes, comments, and/or pictures while at</td>
<td>32.4 (34)</td>
<td>47.6 (50)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>6.7 (7)</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Analysis between the expected and observed responses for these four items and demographic characteristics did not reveal any significant differences from the null chi-square model.

The distribution of categorical responses obtained from the four items offered mixed support for the hypothesis above (#2E), which proposed that participants would report the perception that female officers are not viewed as equals by their male counterparts. Not only was it determined that the majority of participants felt that some male officers did not want to work with them because they were female, but it was also
reported that most participants were not sure which male officers they could trust. The final two hypotheses focus on family issues.

**Personal Life.** It was hypothesized (#2F) that participants would report the perception that female officers in general have negative transformations in their family lives, because they worked in the law enforcement field. Over one half (56.1%) of the participants did not agree with the statement that they had experienced more minor health problems than their male counterparts (see Table 32). Nearly two out of three participants (62.9%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that they have had higher levels of burnout than male officers. The last item of this section reports that participants were more likely to collectively agree (44.8%) than to collectively disagree (42.8%) that they have had difficulties trying to balance their job with family and friends.

Table 32

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Personal Life*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have experienced more minor health problems like</td>
<td>4.8 (5)</td>
<td>9.5 (10)</td>
<td>29.5 (31)</td>
<td>37.1 (39)</td>
<td>19.0 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head/stomach aches than my male counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have higher levels of burnout compared to my male</td>
<td>3.8 (4)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
<td>22.9 (24)</td>
<td>40.0 (42)</td>
<td>22.9 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had difficulties in trying to balance this job</td>
<td>5.7 (6)</td>
<td>39.0 (41)</td>
<td>12.4 (13)</td>
<td>31.4 (33)</td>
<td>11.4 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and my family/friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105
Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the first item depending on the participant’s type of agency. As reported in Table 33, those participants working with an agency other than a municipality were more likely to collectively agree that they have experienced more minor health problems like head/stomach aches in comparison to male officers \(\chi^2 (2, 105) = 8.126, p = .017\). Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count reported for those who served with a sheriff’s office, state agency, or federal agency than for those working with a municipality.

Table 33

*I have experienced more minor health problems like head/stomach aches than my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Municipal</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=All others</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(\chi^2 (2, 105) = 8.126, p = .017\); 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

The pattern of frequency responses obtained for these three items supported the above hypothesis (#2F), which predicted that participants would report the perception that female officers have negative transformations in their family life because they work in law enforcement.

*Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues.* It was hypothesized (#2G) that the participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general
manifest more worries than do male officers because of pregnancy, children, and childcare issues. Less than half of the participants (41.0%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that they had a hard time deciding if and when they were going to have a child or children as reported in Table 34. Also, most participants (45.7%) collectively disagreed with the idea that female officers who have children are considered not as dedicated to the job by male officers.

Table 34

*Frequency Tables of Survey Items/Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I had a hard time deciding if and when I was going to have a child or children.</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>16.2 (17)</td>
<td>26.7 (28)</td>
<td>30.5 (32)</td>
<td>10.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female officers who have children are considered not as “dedicated” to the job by male officers.</td>
<td>14.3 (15)</td>
<td>26.7 (28)</td>
<td>13.3 (14)</td>
<td>38.1 (40)</td>
<td>7.6 (8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the first item depending on the participant’s years of service. As reported in Table 35, those participants with 20 years or less of service were more likely than those who had served 21 or more years to collectively agree that they had a hard time deciding if and when they were going to have a child or have children [$\chi^2 (2, 105) = 7.982, p = .018$]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count reported for those with 20 years or less of service.
Table 35

*As a female officer, I had a hard time deciding if and when I was going to have a child or children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years or less of service</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>35.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=21 or more years of service</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2(2, 105) = 7.982, p = .018$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Further disaggregation of the data obtained in this section revealed that married participants were more likely than those not married to have children [$\chi^2(1, 105) = 4.396, p = .036$]. There was a higher observed than expected count (see Table 36) reported for married participants.

Table 36

*I have children*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Not married</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>59.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Married</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>62.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2(1, 105) = 4.396, p = .036$; 1=yes; 2=no
Participants with a child or children (n=66) were redirected to answer additional items using a contingency question. Over one half of the participants (56.1%) collectively disagreed that they have had problems finding reliable childcare (see Table 37). A majority of them (57.6%) reported that they have not had problems with sick leave from work because of a sick child. Nearly three out of four (72.8%) collectively agreed, though, that they had additional stress because of work-home-child obligations. One out of two participants (51.5%) collectively disagreed with the proposition that they had to plan their pregnancies so that they did not interfere with their job. A majority of the participants (66.7%) also rejected the suggestion that they considered leaving their job because of problems associated with being a *cop-mom*.

Table 37

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/ Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues/Children Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am having or had problems finding reliable childcare</td>
<td>16.7 (11)</td>
<td>21.2 (14)</td>
<td>6.1 (4)</td>
<td>43.9 (29)</td>
<td>12.1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am having or had problems with sick leave from work because of a sick child</td>
<td>7.6 (5)</td>
<td>22.7 (15)</td>
<td>12.1 (8)</td>
<td>40.9 (27)</td>
<td>16.7 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am having or had additional stress because of work-home-child obligations</td>
<td>25.8 (17)</td>
<td>47.0 (31)</td>
<td>12.1 (8)</td>
<td>10.6 (7)</td>
<td>4.5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am having or had to plan my pregnancies so that they do/did not interfere with my job</td>
<td>7.6 (5)</td>
<td>13.6 (9)</td>
<td>27.3 (18)</td>
<td>37.9 (25)</td>
<td>13.6 (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am having or had to consider leaving my job because of problems associated with being a “cop-mom”</td>
<td>7.6 (5)</td>
<td>13.6 (9)</td>
<td>12.1 (8)</td>
<td>37.9 (25)</td>
<td>28.8 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=66

A statistically significant relationship was found using chi-square between the type of agency and the item regarding perception of additional stress due to work-home-child obligations. Participants who worked at an agency other than a municipality were more likely to collectively agree with the assertion that they had additional stress because of work-home-child obligations [$\chi^2 (2, 66) = 7.132, p = .028$]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count for those who work with sheriff’s office, state agencies, or federal agencies as observed in Table 38.

Table 38

I am having or had additional stress because of work-home-child obligations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Municipal</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1=Municipal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=All others</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 66) = 7.132, p = .028$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree
The results indicate support for the hypothesis (#2G) which predicted that participants would report the perception that female officers in general manifest additional worries at work than do male officers because of pregnancy, children, and childcare issues. A majority of participants with children also supported the propositions about the presence of additional stress and problems that arise from motherhood. These findings are consistent with reports of other researchers found in the literature. Now that all of the hypotheses have been addressed, a response to the second research question can be suggested.

Conclusions on the Experiences of Females Working in Law Enforcement

The pattern of responses obtained from the survey items included in this part of the survey instrument helped to answer the second research question that was interested in determining how closely participants’ perceptions and attitudes were reflected in previous literature regarding females’ experiences working in law enforcement. The seven areas of inquiry (gender expectations, effects of decision-making, concerns with tokenism, differential experiences, working with policemen, personal life, and pregnancy, children, and childcare issues) provided the answer to this research question. Four out of the seven hypotheses did not receive the complete degree of support anticipated. For instance, participants did not fully support the predictions expecting them to report that they are not viewed as equals by their male counterparts and that they do not go through the same career experience as male officers. They also did completely agree that they had to decide how to approach their career and did not necessarily consider themselves to be tokens. Consistent with previous reports, participants felt as though they violated society’s gender codes by working in law enforcement. Furthermore, many supported the
prediction that they have experienced negative transformations in their family lives and that those with children have additional worries because of increased responsibilities.

It seems reasonable to conclude that the findings in this second section of the instrument indicate a need for scholars to undertake additional research in this area, since a clear pattern could not be reached regarding the work experiences of the current sample and those noted in previous literature.

Promotion Process and Leadership Styles

The final section of the survey instrument addressed the research question “Are the perceptions of study participants regarding the promotion process and leadership styles similar to those previously reported in the available literature?” The first hypothesis (#3A) anticipated the likelihood of participants to report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors consider the promotion process as unfair and preferential to male officers. Also examined was the hypothesis (#3B) that participants would support the proposition that female supervisors have to break through the glass ceiling in order to be promoted. Finally, the last hypothesis (#3C) in this section sought to determine whether the participants felt that female supervisors make every effort to be effective leaders despite resistance.

Using a contingency question, 88 out of the 105 participants reported that they were in a supervisory position; those who denoted that they were retired were also taken into consideration. The question, “I am currently in a supervisory position,” allowed those participants who were not supervisors to be redirected to the end of the survey, while those responding “yes” were allowed to continue with the survey items.

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the contingency question that categorized those who
were supervisors from those who were not and their marital status. As reported in Table 39, married participants were more likely than those not married to identify themselves as supervisors \(\chi^2 (1, 88) = 7.732, p = .005\). Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count reported for those who were married.

Table 39

*I am currently in a supervisory position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Not married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(\chi^2 (1, 88) = 7.732, p = .005; 1=yes; 2=no\)

Further disaggregation of the data using chi-square for this same item revealed that the majority of participants held the rank of lieutenant or lower \(\chi^2 (1, 88) = 6.863, p = .009\). Specifically, as noted in Table 40, there was a higher observed than expected count reported for those who had attained the rank of lieutenant or lower than those with the rank of captain or higher.

Table 40

*I am currently in a supervisory position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Lieutenant or lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2=Captain or higher</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (1, 88) = 6.863, p = .009; 1=yes; 2=no$

Road to Promotion. It was hypothesized (#3A) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors in general regard the promotion process as unfair and preferential to males. Nearly two thirds of participants (62.5%) collectively agreed that they had a mentor who strongly encouraged them with their endeavors (see Table 41). Also, most participants (51.2%) collectively disagreed with the inversely-worded item suggesting they got less respect after they were promoted by comparison to male counterparts. Participants were more likely to collectively disagree (47.8%) than to collectively agree (43.2%) on the perception of fairness after promotion. Nearly seven out of ten (68.2%) felt that they had been encouraged by their supervisors to be innovative and think on their own. Also, a majority of participants (61.4%) reported that they had been able to advance as much in rank as they wanted. Finally, nearly two-thirds of participants (62.5%) collectively disagreed with the inversely-worded item suggesting that female officers have fewer aspirations after years on the job than male officers.
Table 41

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Road to Promotion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had a mentor who strongly encouraged me with my endeavors</td>
<td>22.7 (20)</td>
<td>39.8 (35)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
<td>17.0 (15)</td>
<td>12.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got less respect after I was promoted in comparison to my male counterparts</td>
<td>14.8 (13)</td>
<td>25.0 (22)</td>
<td>9.1 (8)</td>
<td>36.4 (32)</td>
<td>14.8 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not treated fairly after my promotion in comparison to my male counterparts</td>
<td>13.6 (12)</td>
<td>29.5 (26)</td>
<td>9.1 (8)</td>
<td>33.0 (29)</td>
<td>14.8 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was encouraged by my supervisors to be innovative and think on my own</td>
<td>19.3 (17)</td>
<td>48.9 (43)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been able to advance as much as I want to in rank</td>
<td>20.5 (18)</td>
<td>40.9 (36)</td>
<td>18.2 (16)</td>
<td>11.4 (10)</td>
<td>9.1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female officers have fewer aspirations after years on the jobs than male officers</td>
<td>3.4 (3)</td>
<td>19.3 (17)</td>
<td>14.8 (13)</td>
<td>33.0 (29)</td>
<td>29.5 (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the fifth item and rank. Specifically, participants holding the rank of lieutenant or lower were more likely than those holding the rank of captain or higher to collectively agree that they had been able to advance in rank as much as they wanted \[\chi^2 (2, 88) = 7.268, p = .026\]. There was a higher observed than expected
count (see Table 42) for lieutenants and below than for those with the rank of captain or higher.

Table 42

*I have been able to advance as much as I want to in rank*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Lieutenant</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or lower</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>63.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Captain</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or higher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2 (2, 88) = 7.268, p = .026; \) 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Chi-square analysis also revealed that participants who had 20 years or less of service were more likely than those who had served 21 or more years to collectively agree that they got less respect after they were promoted in comparison to their male counterparts \( \chi^2 (2, 88) = 6.293, p = .043 \). There was a higher observed than expected count (see Table 43) for those who had fewer years of service than more experienced officers.

Table 43

*I got less respect after I was promoted in comparison to my male counterparts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=20 years</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or less of</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chi-square analysis also revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the survey item that questioned the participants about their perception of the encouragement they received from their supervisors and the population of the jurisdiction they served. As reported in Table 44, those participants who worked for agencies serving 100,001 or more people were more likely to collectively agree than those serving populations of 100,000 or less with the proposition that they were encouraged by their supervisors to be innovative and to think on their own [$\chi^2 (2, 88) = 6.336, p = .042$]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count reported by those serving larger populations than those serving smaller populations.

Table 44

*I was encouraged by my supervisors to be innovative and think on my own*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=population of 100K or less</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=population of 100,001 or more</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 88) = 6.336, p = .042$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree
Disaggregation of the data through chi-square analysis revealed another notable distinction between perception about aspirations and education. Specifically, members of the sample who held a Master’s degree or greater were more likely than those with a Bachelor’s degree or less to collectively agree with the statement that female officers have fewer aspirations after years on the job in comparison to male officers \( \chi^2 (2, 88) = 10.992, p = .004 \). As reported in Table 45, there was a higher observed than expected count for those with a Master’s degree or greater than those with a lesser or no degree.

Table 45

**Female officers have fewer aspirations after years on the job than male officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Expected</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0% 46.2% 58.2% 46.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count Expected</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0% 53.8% 41.8% 53.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2 (2, 88) = 10.992, p = .004; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

**The Promotion Process.** This particular section of the survey instrument was derived from the previous section and further searches for an understanding to the preceding hypothesis. Close to one half of the participants (47.7%) collectively agreed with the proposition that they received strong support from their agency during the promotion process. Nearly two out of three participants (64.8%) reported that they took into account what their new shift or assignment would be after promotion. A majority of participants (53.4%) reported that they had to consider childcare and family matters. Nearly one half of participants (46.6%) collectively agreed on the influence of possible
administrative bias. One half of the participants (51.1%) also collectively agreed that they had to determine if they really wanted to be a supervisor or not. Most of them (55.7%) did not support the premise that loss of pay due to reduced overtime hours was influential in their decision as reported in Table 46.

Table 46

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Promotion Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree %</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I received strong encouragement from my department</td>
<td>17.0 (15)</td>
<td>30.7 (27)</td>
<td>26.1 (23)</td>
<td>18.2 (16)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I took into account what my new shift/assignment would be</td>
<td>23.9 (21)</td>
<td>40.9 (36)</td>
<td>5.7 (5)</td>
<td>20.5 (18)</td>
<td>9.1 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to consider childcare and family matters</td>
<td>19.3 (17)</td>
<td>34.1 (30)</td>
<td>18.2 (16)</td>
<td>14.8 (13)</td>
<td>13.6 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I thought about possible administrative bias</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>30.7 (27)</td>
<td>14.8 (13)</td>
<td>27.3 (24)</td>
<td>11.4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to determine if I “really” wanted to be a supervisor</td>
<td>13.6 (12)</td>
<td>37.5 (33)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
<td>25.0 (22)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to consider the loss of pay because of limited overtime hours</td>
<td>10.2 (9)</td>
<td>25.0 (22)</td>
<td>9.1 (8)</td>
<td>39.8 (35)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88
Chi-square analysis revealed that participants who worked for agencies that served populations of 100,001 or more were more likely than those who served populations of 100,000 or less to collectively agree that they took into account what their new assignment or shift would be when deciding to participate in the promotion process \[\chi^2 (2, 88) = 12.653, p = .002\]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count (see Table 47) for those serving larger populations than smaller populations.

Table 47

*When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I took into account what my new shift/assignment would be*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 100K or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of 100,001 or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(\chi^2 (2, 88) = 12.653, p = .002\); 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Further examination of the data using Pearson’s chi-square indicated a statistically significant departure from the null model on this same item depending on level of education. Participants who had a Bachelor’s degree or less were more likely than those with a Master’s degree or greater to collectively agree that they took into account what their new shift or assignment would be when they were deciding whether not to participate in the promotion process \[\chi^2 (2, 88) = 7.120, p = .028\]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count for those who had earned a Bachelor’s degree or less than those holding a Master’s degree or greater as noted in Table 48.
Table 48

*When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I took into account what my new shift/assignment would be*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.6%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2=Master’s Degree or greater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.4%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2$ (2, 88) = 7.120, $p = .028$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

Another statistically significant difference using chi-square analysis was revealed for this item again and current rank. Those having the rank of captain or higher were more likely than those with the rank of lieutenant or lower to collectively agree to the proposition that they considered what their new assignment or shift would be when considering promotions [$\chi^2$ (2, 88) = 10.809, $p = .004$]. Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count (see Table 49) for participants in higher ranks.

Table 49

*When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I took into account what my new shift/assignment would be*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1=Lieutenant or lower</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.3%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further disaggregation of the data obtained for the last item revealed that participants with a Bachelor’s degree or less were more likely than those with a Master’s degree or greater to collectively agree that they considered loss of pay because of limited overtime hours during the promotion process ($\chi^2 (2, 88) = 6.623, p = .036$). As reported in Table 50, there was a higher observed than expected count reported for those who held a Bachelor’s degree or less.

Table 50

*When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to consider the loss of pay because of limited overtime hours*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2 (2, 88) = 6.623, p = .036$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree
suggested that female supervisors consider the promotion process as unfair and preferential to male supervisors. Participants reported that they were mentored and encouraged by their supervisors during the process and also felt that they had been able to advance as much as they wanted in rank. However, they did not support the propositions insinuating that they received less respect after promotion and that female officers have fewer aspirations than male officers.

The second part of this hypothesis (The Promotion Process) centered on decisions made during the promotion process. Participants indicated that there were worries such as childcare and loss of pay because of a decrease in overtime hours. The majority of participants also were concerned what their new shift would be once they were promoted and were less concerned about administrative bias as reported in earlier studies. Not everyone received strong encouragement from their agencies during the promotion process and many had to decide if they really wanted to be a supervisor at all. The next hypothesis will take a look through the glass ceiling and see what kind of effects it had on participants.

Glass Ceiling Effect. It was hypothesized (#3B) that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors in general will have to break through the glass ceiling in order to be promoted. To begin, two out of three participants (64.8%) collectively disagreed with the inversely-worded item that suggested they initially had lower aspirations for promotion compared to their male counterparts (see Table 51). Over one half of them (51.1%) collectively agreed that they had more barriers to face for promotion than male officers. A large percentage of participants (86.4%) felt that women are underrepresented in the upper ranks of the law enforcement profession. The majority
of participants (61.4%) reported that they had been placed in positions before promotion that had adequately prepared them for leadership roles.

Table 51

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Glass Ceiling Effect*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I initially had lower aspirations for promotion than my male counterparts</td>
<td>5.7 (5)</td>
<td>13.6 (12)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>31.8 (28)</td>
<td>33.0 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to face more barriers for promotion than my male counterparts</td>
<td>20.5 (18)</td>
<td>30.7 (27)</td>
<td>9.1 (8)</td>
<td>28.4 (25)</td>
<td>11.4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that females are underrepresented in the upper ranks of the law enforcement profession</td>
<td>54.5 (48)</td>
<td>31.8 (28)</td>
<td>4.5 (4)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
<td>1.1 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was placed in positions before promotion that adequately prepared me for leadership</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>45.5 (40)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>11.4 (10)</td>
<td>11.4 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant difference in the pattern of expected and observed responses for the third item depending on the participant’s education. As reported in Table 52, those participants with Master’s degree or greater were more likely than those with a Bachelor’s degree or less to collectively agree that females are underrepresented in the upper ranks of the law enforcement profession \[\chi^2 (2, 88) = 6.014, p = .049\]. Specifically, there was a higher than expected count reported for those with Master’s degree, Doctoral degree, or a Law degree.
Table 52

I feel that females are underrepresented in the upper ranks of the law enforcement profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $\chi^2$ (2, 88) = 6.014, $p = .049$; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

The pattern of responses obtained from participants for these items showed mixed support for the hypothesis (#3B) proposing that female officers must break through the glass ceiling to be promoted. While a majority of participants reported that they faced more barriers during the promotion process, they also supported the statement that they had been adequately prepared for leadership roles. Participants strongly believed that female officers are underrepresented in the upper ranks and also did not support the proposition that female officers have lower aspirations for promotion than male officers. With only one more hypothesis left to review, the research question (#3) is moving closer to being answered.

Life as a Female Police Supervisor. It was hypothesized (#3C) that the participants would report the perception that female law enforcement supervisors in general make every effort to be effective regardless of resistance. As reported in Table 53, nearly two out of every three participants (62.5%) disagreed with the proposition that they have had good female role models throughout their career. All of the participants
(100.0%) felt that they have tried to be a mentor to their subordinates. The vast majority (98.9%) reported to encourage their subordinates to be innovative and to think on their own. Most participants (96.6%) also collectively agreed that they felt that they were as effective as their male counterparts. A majority of participants (61.4%) reported that they were a “middle-of-the-road” leader, not too aggressive and not too kindhearted, instead somewhere in the middle.

Table 53

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/ Life as a Female Police Supervisor*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had good female role models throughout my career</td>
<td>10.2 (9)</td>
<td>20.5 (18)</td>
<td>6.8 (6)</td>
<td>44.3 (39)</td>
<td>18.2 (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be a mentor for my subordinates</td>
<td>59.1 (52)</td>
<td>40.9 (36)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my subordinates to be innovative and think on their own</td>
<td>67.0 (59)</td>
<td>31.8 (28)</td>
<td>1.1 (1)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am as effective as my male counterparts who are leaders</td>
<td>69.3 (61)</td>
<td>27.3 (24)</td>
<td>3.4 (3)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
<td>0.0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be “middle-of-the-road,” not too aggressive and not to kindhearted</td>
<td>17.0 (15)</td>
<td>44.3 (39)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>20.5 (18)</td>
<td>2.3 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88

Chi-square analysis revealed that participants who held a Bachelor’s degree or less were more likely than those who held a Master’s degree or greater to collectively agree that they try to be middle-of-the-road as a supervisor, by being not too aggressive
and not too kindhearted \( \chi^2 (2, 88) = 8.300, p = .016 \). Specifically, there was a higher observed than expected count for those who had a Bachelor’s degree or less.

Table 54

*I try to be “middle-of-the-road,” not too aggressive and not too kindhearted*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Bachelor’s Degree or less</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>57.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>46.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Master’s Degree or greater</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>57.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>53.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( \chi^2 (2, 88) = 8.300, p = .016; 1=Strongly Agree, Agree; 2=Neutral; 3=Strongly Disagree, Disagree

*Resistance.* To continue the examination of the previous hypothesis (#3C), the four items presented in Table 55 were used to determine where female leaders face most resistance. Participants collectively disagreed (44.4%) with the proposition that they get more resistance from male supervisors than male subordinates. Four out of every ten participants (40.9%) collectively disagreed with the suggestion that female supervisors were more resistant to them than female subordinates. Nearly one half of participants (46.6%) also disagreed with the notion that female supervisors were more resistant to them than male supervisors. Close to one half (47.7%) collectively disagreed with the argument that male subordinates were more resistance to them than female subordinates. Another interesting observation was the number of participants who chose to remain neutral instead of disagreeing or strongly disagreeing when responding to these items about female supervisors.
Table 55

*Frequency Table of Survey Items/Resistance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item Wording</th>
<th>Strongly Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Agree % (n)</th>
<th>Neutral Position % (n)</th>
<th>Disagree % (n)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get more resistance from male supervisors than male subordinates</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>23.9 (21)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>36.4 (32)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get more resistance from female supervisors than female subordinates</td>
<td>4.5 (4)</td>
<td>15.9 (14)</td>
<td>38.6 (34)</td>
<td>30.7 (27)</td>
<td>10.2 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get more resistance from female supervisors than male supervisors</td>
<td>3.4 (3)</td>
<td>8.0 (7)</td>
<td>42.0 (37)</td>
<td>35.2 (31)</td>
<td>11.4 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get more resistance from male subordinates than female subordinates</td>
<td>6.8 (6)</td>
<td>18.2 (16)</td>
<td>27.3 (24)</td>
<td>35.2 (31)</td>
<td>12.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88

No statistically significant departures from the null/chance model were detected through the application of Pearson’s chi-square.

Frequency responses from this section indicate support for the above stated hypothesis (#3C), which predicted that participants would report the perception that female supervisors make every effort to be effective regardless of resistance. The first part (“life as a female police supervisor”) found that, despite a lack of good female role models, participants reported themselves to be mentors, who encourage their subordinates, as well as effective leaders. The majority of them indicated the perception that they take a middle-of-the-road approach. This is similar in nature to transformational leadership, which has been linked to effective management. Results from the second part of this hypothesis (“resistance”) revealed that participants were more willing to disagree
with the statements than to acknowledge that they get resistance from a particular group more so than another one.

*Conclusions on the Promotion Process and Leadership Styles*

Response patterns from the survey items in this section were completed by those participants who classified themselves as supervisors. The findings of the areas of inquiry (road to promotion, promotion process, glass ceiling effects, life as a female police supervisor, and resistance) offer an answer to the third research question which asked “Are the perceptions of study participants regarding the promotion process and leadership styles similar to those previously reported in the available literature?” Varied results from each area of inquiry may be the result of including a wide range of topics. For instance, reviewing the road to promotion, it was discovered that many of the participants had high aspirations as well as encouragement during the process. But then, there was an indication that many felt that they got less respect after earning their rank. The glass ceiling effect seems to still be in place with participants noting that female officers face more barriers and are underrepresented in higher ranks. Finally, study participants reported that they try to be mentors for their subordinates and encourage them to think on their own. They also stayed away from specifying a group of specific co-workers (e.g. female subordinates, male subordinates, female supervisors, male supervisors) that offers most resistance.

*Reliability of the Instrument*

Because the survey items came from a wide range of resources, the researcher wanted to take them and create intuitively similar patterns of questioning that could be used in subsequent research projects. The items’ diverse origins also made it questionable as to whether multivariate analyses could be conducted. The researcher
chose to use a Cronbach’s Alpha procedure before and after factor analysis in order to create reliable factors that could be used for successive research.

To begin, a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient value was computed for selected sections as they were presented in the online survey instrument. This coefficient is a measure of internal reliability and is necessary when using Likert-type scales (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). Although a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is usually preferred, a reliability coefficient of .60 or higher is acceptable when using exploratory factor analysis (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, & Tatham, 2006).

The instrument had a total of 80 survey items divided into 17 sections. Twelve of these sections consisted of 55 survey items completed by all participants without regard to rank. The second section was completed by supervisors only and encompassed the remaining five sections with 25 questions. The three contingency questions, which allowed for acknowledgement of participation, of children, and of supervisory experience, were not included in this count.

Of the 55 survey items representing 12 dimensions applicable to all participants, seven of them were removed because they included dimensions with nominal scale items. Five of the items were discarded because they were applicable to participants with children only. Twenty-one items were lost during the Cronbach’s Alpha procedure.

Six of 12 dimensions were found to have a reliability coefficient of .60 or higher after a Cronbach’s Alpha procedure, leaving 22 items to be included in the factor analysis (Table 56). The items included came from the following sections: acceptance by the public; effects of decision-making; concerns with tokenism; working with policemen; personal life, and pregnancy, children, and childcare issues.
In the section, “Acceptance by the Public,” the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient was improved from .559 to .626 with the removal of the question “I have better communication skills than my male counterparts when dealing with the public.” Also, in the section, “Effects of Decision-Making,” the reliability coefficient improved from .533 to .628 when the question “I try to maintain my femininity while on duty” was deleted.

Table 56

_REliability of the Survey Instrument Preceding Factor Analysis for Subordinates and Supervisors_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Instrument Section</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s ( \alpha ) Coefficient</th>
<th>Improvement of Cronbach’s ( \alpha ) with Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance by Law Enforcement Agency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>I was hired only for diversity purposes. .442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance by the Public</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>I have better communication skills than my male counterparts when dealing with the public. .626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Intervention and Influence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>I feel that biological differences are the “only” differences between male and female officers. .517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Decision-Making</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>I try to maintain my femininity while on duty. .628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns from Tokenism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>I have used my feminine status at times to get out of job details or to get special treatment. .522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differential Experiences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 56 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Instrument Section</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α Coefficient</th>
<th>Improvement of Cronbach’s α with Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with Policemen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Next, Cronbach’s Alpha was again used to note the reliability in the second portion of the instrument which included responses only from supervisors. This part consisted of the final five sections, including the road to promotion, the promotion process, glass ceiling effects, life as a female police leader, and resistance.

Because of the limited number of survey items, all 25 items were included in the factor analysis regardless of the reported reliability coefficients (Table 57). If survey items having a Cronbach’s Alpha reliability coefficient of .60 or higher were kept, only nine items would have been included in the factor analysis. Because the goal of factor analysis is data reduction, having only nine items in the analysis might have rendered it useless. Still, reliability coefficients, which initially ranged from .228 to .645, would have improved to .258 to .760, if certain items were deleted as noted in Table 57.
Table 57

Reliability of the Survey Instrument Preceding Factor Analysis/Supervisors Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Section</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α Coefficient</th>
<th>Improvement in Cronbach’s α if Item was deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road to Promotion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>I have been able to advance as much as I want in rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Promotion Process</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I received strong support from my department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of the Glass Ceiling</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>I initially had lower aspirations for promotion than my male counterparts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life as a Female Police Supervisor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>I try to be “middle-of-the-road,” not too aggressive and not too kind-hearted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>I get more resistance from male subordinates than female subordinates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis, a statistical technique used to reduce a large number of correlated variables into a more practicable number of independent factors, was employed to identify underlying constructs which are not always observable (Norusis, 2006). Highly correlated variables are required for this procedure to be effective. This interdependence technique, meaning there are no independent or dependent variables, can be used as a data reduction procedure and accommodates both metric and dummy-coded non-metric variables (Hair et al., 2006; Walker & Madden, 2009). The goal of factor analysis is to
achieve parsimony by “explaining the maximum amount of common variance in a
correlation matrix using the smallest number of explanatory constructs” (Field, 2009, p.
629).

There are certain assumptions that need to be considered when using factor
analysis. Essentially, the data utilized should be on an interval level, unless it is fully-
ordered ordinal level data like Likert-type data. Dichotomized nominal level data, like
items using “yes” and “no” responses, should not be used with a factor analysis (Walker
& Madden, 2009). Specification error should not be present; relevant variables should
not be excluded and irrelevant variables should not be included. Sample sizes should be
adequate, so that there is ample data to base the analysis. There are arguments that there
should be anywhere from at least 100 observations to five times the number of variables;
yet, some researchers argue that an ample sample size depends on the individual model
and the issues needing to be addressed (Walker & Madden, 2009).

Factor analysis can be conducted for exploratory purposes or for confirmatory
purposes, depending on the goal of a study. Confirmatory factor analysis allows
researchers to confirm previously identified hypotheses about the relationships between
variables (Walker & Madden, 2009). Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) identifies factors
that detect common underlying dimensions with the smallest number of variables, which
is the reason it is being used with this data (Norusis, 2006).

To begin, a correlation matrix of all of the variables included in the factor analysis
is constructed. The researcher hopes to observe variables that are correlated with one
other. If low correlation coefficients are present, removal of certain variables should be
considered (Walker & Madden, 2009). Large correlation coefficients mean that those
variables may be measuring the same latent dimensions, which mean that the data may be ideal for factor analysis (Field, 2009; Walker & Madden, 2009).

To determine if the sample is adequate to utilize factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) is reviewed. The KMO statistic is an “index that compares the sizes of the observed correlation coefficients to the sizes of the partial correlation coefficients” (Norusis, 2006, p. 390). Ranging from zero (0) to one (1), KMO values closer to one mean that the variables are linearly-related, because the correlation patterns are compact in nature (Field, 2009). A KMO value, which is closer to zero, means that correlations detected between variable pairs cannot be explained by the other variables, rendering factor analysis inappropriate. KMO measures below 0.50 are unacceptable, while those ranging from 0.60 to above 0.90 are respectively considered from mediocre to marvelous (Kaiser, 1974; Norusis, 2006).

Another measure, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, can also be used to determine if factor analysis is suitable for the data. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity tests the null hypothesis stating that the observed data are from an identity matrix, where ones (1) form the diagonals and zeroes (0) constitute the off-diagonals. In other words, there is no evidence of correlation between the variables, which also renders factor analysis useless (Walker & Madden, 2009). If the approximate chi-square coefficient for Bartlett’s test is found to be significant, then the null hypothesis can be rejected and it can be concluded that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix (Field, 2009).

To extract the factors from the correlation matrix, there are different statistical algorithms that can be used, but principal component analysis (PCA) is the most common and simplest (Norusis, 2006; Walker & Madden, 2009). PCA forms a linear combination of the observed variables that account for the greatest amount of variance in the sample.
The second component created accounts for the next largest amount of variance with subsequent components accounting for less and less amounts of variance. All of the created components are uncorrelated with each other (Norusis, 2006).

To determine how much variance is accounted for by each component, eigenvalues are presented (Hair et al., 2006). While Kaiser (1960) recommended retaining all components, or factors, with eigenvalues greater than one, other researchers opt for a more lenient approach and suggest using additional considerations like lower eigenvalues, the percentage of variance explained, and scree plot results (Field, 2009; Jolliffe, 1986, Kaiser, 1960; Norusis, 2006). Besides retaining factors with eigenvalues lower than 1.0 but higher than 0.70, a review of the percentage of total variance explained by each factor can be conducted (Jolliffe, 1986; Norusis, 2006). By assessing the eigenvalues and the decrease in percentage of explained variance, the researcher can determine how many factors explain the most total variance as well as see the difference between the eigenvalues get smaller and smaller (Norusis, 2006).

Additionally, a scree plot can be evaluated. A scree plot is a “graphical representation of the incremental variance accounted for by each factor in the model” (Walker & Madden, 2009, p. 332). By reviewing the scree plot, the researcher can visually determine where there is a change in the slope of the plotted line by drawing an imaginary line horizontally as well as vertically and marking the intersection as a point of inflexion. Any factors to the left of this point can be retained, while those to the right are eliminated (Field, 2009). Using these procedures, a researcher can determine how many factors are most appropriate to adequately represent the data.

Next, in the factor extraction phase, the communalities of the factors, or the proportion of common variance of the variables, have to be reviewed. Initial
communalities have communalities of one (1) meaning that all of the variables are included in the model and that the data has been transformed to create the linear variates which now exist (Field, 2009; Walker & Madden, 2009). After extraction, the communalities have values less than one (1) because those factors retained will not explain all of the common variance and because accountability is lost as data is discarded (Field, 2009). Extraction communality coefficients computed are the sum of the squared factor loadings from the factors selected to be included in the model. Factor loadings, which describe how much weight is assigned for each variable on each factor, are initially in an unrotated state. These loadings vary in value from -1.00 to +1.00 and symbolize the variable’s representativeness in each factor. While factor loadings over ±.70 highly desirable, factor loadings as low as ±.30 and ±.40 can be appropriate and meet the minimal level for interpretation (Hair et al., 2006)

To improve interpretation, factor rotation is utilized to rotate the factors so that “variables are loaded maximally to only one factor” (Field, 2009, p. 642). By rotating the ordinate plane, the geometric location of all of the factors can be positioned in the same quadrant (Walker & Madden, 2009). Either orthogonal rotation or oblique rotation can be implemented at this point. Oblique rotation does not require the axes to be perpendicular so that the axes can be at any angle to describe the model. The preferred method is orthogonal rotation, because all factors are kept at right angles and, therefore, remain uncorrelated (Hair et al., 2006; Norusis, 2006).

Of the three methods of orthogonal rotation, including varimax, quartimax, and equamax, varimax rotation is the most popular. It achieves the goal of parsimony by “minimizing the number of variables that have high loadings on a factor” (Walker & Madden, 2009, p. 336). This results in more interpretable factors with fewer intermediate
values and little or no problems of multicollinearity (Field, 2009; Norusis, 2006). The researcher is able to determine which variables load the highest on each component using the rotated loadings.

Labeling the factor can be problematic and needs to be a concern for a researcher. One option could be to identify common themes of those variables that load on a particular factor and help to recognize what the underlying dimensions would be (Field, 2009). Another option is to use the lead factor indicator, which is the highest loading variable of each factor.

**Factor Analysis/Subordinates and Supervisors**

For the subordinate and supervisor section, an EFA was conducted using the 22 survey items from those sections deemed acceptable after the initial Cronbach’s Alpha procedure. These items were subjected to a principal component analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. Rotated factor loadings less than .40 were excluded. Initially, six components were created for the model. As double-loaded items were removed, the six components automatically reduced to five components. One of the five components had only one item loaded on it, so a four-factor solution was attempted. After reviewing the four-factor solution scree plot as well as the percentage of explained variance, it was determined that a three-factor model was most appropriate. Because of missing data, one item (“I have tried to keep my gender from interfering from the duties of my job”) was removed. The resulting three-factor model had a KMO measure of .803, which is considered *meritorious* and quite acceptable; its percentage of explained variance was 55.288%. The Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity chi-square coefficient was found to be significant ($\chi^2 = 1321.033, p < .000$), indicating that the correlation matrix
was not an identity matrix and that at least one correlation in the matrix was statistically significant.

Factor 1 was labeled “Negative Experiences” and consisted of 12 survey items. The lead factor indicator (“I have felt that some male officers really did not like me working with them”) for this factor was not broad enough to cover all of the aspects included and so another label was selected. After rotation, this factor had an Eigenvalue of 6.111, meaning that it was capable of explaining 6.111 parts of the 21 units of total variance and explained 29.098% of the variance. The loading of the items ranged from .795 to .604.

The second factor, “Personal Effects,” was derived from five variables. It also was named using the central idea of the survey items contained within the factor. An Eigenvalue of 2.918 was computed after rotation, meaning that it was capable of explaining 2.918 parts of the 21 units of total variance. The factor was able to explain 13.896% of the overall variance. The loading of the items ranged from .732 to .588.

The third factor, “Confidence,” originated from four survey items and had an Eigenvalue of 2.582 after rotation. This means that it is capable of explaining 2.582 parts of the 21 units of total variance. The factor was able to explain 12.294% of the overall variance. The loading of the items ranged from .923 to .490. The three components created are displayed below in Table 58.
Table 58

*Rotated Component Matrix for Subordinates and Supervisors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1/Negative Experiences (12 items)</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have felt that some male officers really did not like me working with them</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Throughout my career so far, I have had more of a hostile work environment than my male counterparts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I had to figure out which male officers I could trust and which ones I could not</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Throughout my career so far, I have been more critically evaluated by my supervisors than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.795 .000 -.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have had to deal with inappropriate jokes, comments, and/or pictures while at work</td>
<td>.794 .234 .122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Throughout my career so far, I have had more negative work experiences than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.754 .248 .197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) My male counterparts expressed strong concern in my ability to handle a violent subject</td>
<td>.700 .021 .110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have been labeled in a derogatory way at some point in my career</td>
<td>.698 .238 .161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Throughout my career so far, I have experienced more workplace stress than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.678 -.057 -.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have had to worry about my reputation more than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.651 .120 -.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Throughout my career so far, I have experienced more workplace stress than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.638 .352 .252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have had to worry about my reputation more than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.631 .387 .093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I had to gain the respect of my male patrol partners by acting “rough and tough”</td>
<td>.606 .211 -.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Throughout my career so far, I have had fewer promotional and training opportunities than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.604 .337 .152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 58 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2/Personal Effects (5 items)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have higher levels of burnout compared to my male counterparts</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have experienced more minor health problems like head/stomach aches than my male counterparts</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>-.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I have had difficulties in trying to balance this job and my family/friends</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) Female officers who have children are considered not as “dedicated” to the job by male officers</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) As a female officer, I had a hard time deciding if and when I was going to have a child or children</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3/Confidence (4 items)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(+) I have been just as competent as my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I have been just as effective as my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I consider my position to be that of a “professional”</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I have been accepted by the public</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105

Factor Analysis/Supervisors

An EFA was again conducted using all 25 survey items from the five sections completed by only supervisors. These items were subjected to a principal component analysis with an orthogonal varimax rotation and rotated factor loadings less than .40 were excluded. Initially, seven components, or factors, were created for the model. As
blank and multiple loaded items were removed sequentially, the seven components automatically reduced to six components. This six-factor solution had an unacceptable KMO measure, so a five-factor solution was attempted. It too had an unacceptable KMO measure. Finally, a four-factor solution using 18 items was extracted. Its KMO measure was .663, which is considered mediocre yet acceptable, and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity chi-square coefficient was found to be significant ($\chi^2 = 657.661, p < .000$). The four factors offered a percentage of explained variance of 59.560%.

Factor 1 was named “Promotion Support” and consisted of eight survey items. After varimax rotation, this factor had an Eigenvalue of 3.949, meaning it is capable of explaining 3.949 parts of the 18 units of total variance, and was able to explain 21.941% of the variance. A few of the factor loading scores were negative. This was due to the reverse phrasing used for the survey item. For example, the item, “I was not treated fairly after my promotion in comparison to my male counterparts,” had a factor loading score of -.769. A negative factor loading does not matter in factor analysis, and can actually be used to lessen response bias because the items are worded the opposite of what participants expect (Field, 2009). The researcher remained conscious of these reversed-scored items when interpreting results. The loading of the items ranged from .880 to .481.

The second factor created was labeled “Promotion Decisions” and originated from five survey items. This factor had an Eigenvalue of 2.562 after varimax rotation, meaning that it was capable of explaining 2.562 parts of the 18 units of total variance, and explained 14.231% of the variance. The loading of the items ranged from .822 to .444.
Factor 3 consisted of three items and was entitled “Encouragement.” After rotation, this factor had an Eigenvalue of 2.342, meaning that it was capable of explaining 2.342 parts of the 18 units of total variance and explained 13.010% of the variance. The loading of the items ranged from .881 to .761.

Finally, Factor 4 was labeled “Resistance.” Two items formed this factor, which had an Eigenvalue of 1.868. This means that it is capable of explaining 1.868 parts of the 18 units of total variance, and explained 10.378% of the variance. The loading of the items ranged from .943 to .917. The four components can be observed in Table 59.

Table 59

*Rotated Component Matrix for Supervisors Only*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1/Promotion Support (8 items)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I received strong encouragement from my department</td>
<td><strong>.880</strong></td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I was not treated fairly after my promotion in comparison to my male counterparts</td>
<td><strong>-769</strong></td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I got less respect after I was promoted in comparison to my male counterparts</td>
<td><strong>-727</strong></td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I had to face more barriers for promotion than my male counterparts</td>
<td><strong>-705</strong></td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I was encouraged by my supervisors to be innovative and think on my own</td>
<td><strong>.695</strong></td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>-.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I was placed in positions before promotion that adequately prepared me for leadership</td>
<td><strong>.626</strong></td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 59 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1/Promotion Support (8 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I have been able to advance as much as I want to in rank</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I have had good female role models throughout my career</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2/Promotion Decisions (5 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to consider childcare and family matters</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to determine if I “really” wanted to be a supervisor</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I took into account what my new shift/assignment would be</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) When deciding to participate in the promotion process, I had to consider loss of pay because of limited overtime hours</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I try to be “middle-of-the-road,” not too aggressive and not too kindhearted</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>-.216</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3/Encouragement (3 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I encourage my subordinates to be innovative and think on their own</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I try to be a mentor for my subordinates</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(+) I feel that I am as effective as my male counterparts who are leaders</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 59 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4/Resistance (2 items)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) I get more resistance from female supervisors than male supervisors</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) I get more resistance from female supervisors than female subordinates</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88

Post-Factor Analysis Reliability Assessment

Cronbach’s alpha was administered again using the items selected for each factor to confirm the validity of each and ensure that the items were cohesive in nature. First, the factors created for the portion of the survey instrument completed by both subordinates and supervisors were tested. All showed high reliability coefficients indicating the factor analyses were successful. The 12 items composing the “Negative Experiences” factor had a Cronbach’s alpha of .915 as viewed in Table 60. The “Personal Effects” factor with its five items had a Cronbach’s alpha of .731 and the four items composing the “Confidence” factor had a reliability coefficient of .680.

Table 60

<p>| Reliability of the Survey Instrument Post-Factor Analysis/Subordinates and Supervisors |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Label</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Experiences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Effects</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=105
Cronbach’s alpha was run for the portion of the instrument completed only by the supervisors using each factor’s items for validity testing. The “Promotion Support” factor, which was composed of eight items, had a Cronbach’s alpha of .838. As shown in Table 61, the five items making up the “Promotion Decisions” factor had a Cronbach’s alpha of .735, while the three items composing the “Encouragement” factor had a reliability coefficient of .789. Finally, the two items comprising the fourth factor, “Resistance”, had a Cronbach’s alpha of .888. Again, the factor analysis proved successful in creating useful variables, which could be used in further multivariate testing.

Table 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Section</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Support</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion Decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=88
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore the career experiences and perceptions of female officers, who have reached a supervisory rank, using previously reported research and documentation as a guide. This research sought to contribute to the field of information on female supervisors in law enforcement because so little exists on this topic (Archbold et al., 2010; Schulz, 2009; Silvestri, 2006). Understanding why there is still such an underrepresentation of female officers in the upper echelons guided the focus of this research (Garcia, 2003; National Center for Women and Policing, 2001).

Ever since females became involved in the field of policing in the mid-1800s, turmoil has seemed to follow them (Horne, 1975). Initially working with only women or juveniles subjects, female officers would eventually want to have more of an equal presence believing that they were as capable as men to be law enforcement officers. Unfortunately, male officers exhibited negative attitudes and resistance to their presence feeling that women could not do a man’s job (Garcia, 2003; Walker, 1977).

It would not be until 1972 when Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was amended that female officers were able to move up from subordinate positions and have an equal standing in the workplace (Martin, 1989b). Male officers, who had enjoyed their boys’ only club for years, had to let the girls play and most were not pleased about it. The feminization of law enforcement would forever end police patriarchy and would result in decades of hardships for those women willing to stay or enter the field (Poteya & Sun, 2009; Silvestri, 2006). Facing an unreceptive crowd, female officers had to face negative attitudes and harassment from higher-ranking male officers all the way down to
new male recruits (Balkin, 1988; Price, 1982; Vega & Silverman, 1982). Questioning their capability to handle aggressive or larger subjects, most of the men felt that females should remain working in a social service aspect (Bell, 1982).

Overcoming gender difference altogether has been a grim task for female officers. It is ironic that this distinguishing factor that initially allowed women to enter the realm of policing would later complicate their role as modern day police officers (Garcia, 2003). Fortunately, attitudes toward women in law enforcement in general have shifted to a more accepting stance (Austin & Hummer, 1999; Carlan & McMullan, 2009).

These tolerant attitudes regrettably have not been reflective in regard to females in supervisory positions (Garcia, 2003; Garrison et al., 1998). Their underrepresentation is echoed in the fact that in the 21st century there are just over 200 female police chiefs in this country, which only accounts for approximately 2% of all police chiefs (Ritchie, 2009). Research also has found that advancements by women officers are proportionally lower than male officers (Garcia, 2003; Grennan & Munoz, 1987; Martin, 1989a; Martin & Jurik, 1996; National Center for Women and Policing, 2001). Countless explanations from childcare issues to eligibility requirements have been offered for their absence in upper echelon positions (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009; Martin, 1989b).

This study centers on understanding their absence from the higher ranks as well as attempts to document the experiences of those who have made it to the top in order to understand what aspects of the process were the worst and which ones were the best.

Findings and Discussion

The main goals of the study were accomplished by creating a survey instrument using the wide array of topics that coincided with theory and assessments made throughout the most significant times of female police history. Each section developed
utilized survey items that reflected the underlying premise of noteworthy literature which in some aspect was affiliated with female police supervisors. This instrument was then distributed online to members of a national female police organization known as NAWLEE. A discussion of the findings from the analyses will now be presented.

**Differential Status as a Means of Initial Acceptance of Policewomen**

Using their gender status as a means of initial acceptance, women were able to convince critics that their social skills were vital in the field of law enforcement. Their argument that male officers could not meet the special needs of children and wayward females along with the ardent support of powerful women’s groups allowed them to gain access to the male-dominated world of policing (Schulz, 1995b). Initially first used as *prison matrons* in correctional facilities and then as *police matrons* in local lockups in the early 1800s, women would eventually find their way into policing agencies using their maternal traits to work with juveniles and female subjects (Owings, 1925; Schulz, 1995b). Notable pioneers painstakingly worked to prove that women did have a place in law enforcement. Their differential status would later be damaging to future female officers’ quest for equality and acceptance (Garcia, 2003).

**Distinct Presence.** This study confirmed previous literature suggesting that female law enforcement officers may feel *different* only because they are female (Garcia, 2003). Eighty-three percent of participants indicated that during their career they had felt *different* from other officers. It was determined that those holding a Master’s degree or greater were more likely to report this feeling. Another conclusion of this study discussed later found that participants with higher degrees were more likely to have furthered their education beyond that of their male counterparts. These findings suggest
that female officers with more education may intimidate their male co-workers, resulting in a tense work environment and leaving the women feeling *different*.

Additionally, the study found that many of the participants reported to have been the first female of some position or accomplishment at their agency. Veteran participants with 21 years or more of service reported more often to have been the first female of some status as would be expected. It is interesting to consider that most of these veteran officers were starting their careers during the 1980s, showing that their accomplishments were in accord with the advances made by women after the amendment to the Civil Rights Act in 1972.

The hypothesis (#1A) predicting participants would report the perception that female officers still have a distinct presence in the law enforcement field had mixed support. The findings of this section pose a challenge to police administrators who believe that all are equal in the ranks because the majority of participants identified themselves as being *different* when they should not be.

*Establishment of Specialized Policewomen Units*

Specialized units, also called bureaus or divisions, were created by agencies to ensure that female officers and their work were kept separate from the duties of the male officers (Duffin, 2010; Owings, 1925). These units, which highlighted the women’s work with children and female offenders/victims, appeased those who were still critical of a female’s presence in law enforcement, because they defined the distinct boundary between the two genders and their policing responsibilities (Higgins, 1951). The Progressive Era and the concept of police professionalism fueled support for these bureaus until the Great Depression ended their sponsorship by special interest groups and administrative funding, especially since they were considered a non-essential element of
policing (Walker, 1977; Williams, 1946). Many of the specialized units were disbanded, but some remained until as late as the 1970s when a national advisory commission recommended for them to be abolished.

Assignment to Traditional Female Roles. The results of the current study confirmed that participants held the perception that female officers are still being placed into certain specialized sections that focus on women and juveniles as noted in previous literature (Murphy, 2006a, 2006b). Fifty-three percent of the participants felt that females were more likely than males to be assigned to work in sections that deal with juveniles, domestic violence, or sex crimes.

Interestingly, while most indicated that they had worked in a specialized section at their agency, it was determined that the majority of participants had not explicitly worked in a juvenile section, a domestic violence section, or a sex crimes unit. This could possibly be because the participants’ agencies do not have these specifically-named sections. Another reason may be because their agencies offer such a wide array of specialized sections that female officers wanting to transfer have more of a variety of choices than those listed on the survey instrument.

Population size served by the participants was found to be an influencing factor in a number of conclusions regarding specialized sections. Female officers working for smaller agencies (e.g. population of 100,000 or less) were found to be more likely to agree that women are assigned to work in sections that handle juveniles, domestic violence, or sex crimes more often than male officers. It was also determined that this same group was more likely to have worked in a section that specializes in sex crimes than those working with larger agencies. A possible explanation for these findings is that smaller agencies, which have fewer resources, have to place limited personnel where they
feel they would be most effective and feasible. Or, it may be that small-town officers still embrace the chauvinistic mentality that females need to work with these types of cases, while the male officers handle the real police work.

Participants serving larger populations (e.g. over 100,001) appear to have additional transfer opportunities to other sections because they were found to be more likely to have had experience in a specialized section than those serving smaller populations. Larger agencies usually have the funding to offer additional services in terms of specialized areas resulting in more transfer opportunities for their female officers. Also, these agencies typically employ better-educated and experienced officers who have more of a progressive attitude of female officers working wherever they want.

Married participants were more likely to have worked in a domestic violence unit than single participants. This shows that the experience of marriage may offer a better chance of assignment to a potential officer wanting to transfer into a domestic violence section.

It had been hypothesized (#1B) that participants would report the perception that female officers in general are still being assigned to traditional female roles; the findings of this study supported this hypothesis. Even with a wide range of transfer opportunities available, there appears to be an underlying sentiment felt by female officers that gender still plays a distinctive role in duty assignments.

*Acceptance of Policewomen’s Role by Law Enforcement Agencies*

The introduction of women into law enforcement shook the largest boys’ club to its foundation and left male officers with a clear distaste for their presence (Balkin, 1988). Most hoped that their company was just a trend and that the females would eventually return to where they belonged, which was in the home (Hutzel, 1933). The
federal mandates and court orders of the 1960s and 1970s further pushed women into the
front lines of policing and left male officers realizing that these pariahs were not going
anywhere. Efforts by agencies to be accredited also meant tolerating women in their
ranks (Raganella & White, 2004). For the most part, female officers have been accepted
as members of their departments, but recruitment and retention can be a problem
(National Center for Women and Policing, 2001; Platt et al., 1982; Silvestri, 2003).

Acceptance by Law Enforcement Agency. While earlier literature noted that
female officers were not being accepted in the ranks, more recent research indicates that
there is a general tolerance of them (Balkin, 1988; National Center for Women and
Policing, 2001; Silvestri, 2003). In this study, 51% of participants indicated feelings of
acceptance by their first male partners, revealing that even those in the lowest ranks are
willing to work with women. It was revealed that participants from the regions of the
Midwest and the South were more likely to indicate that they had been accepted by their
first male partners than those from the West and Northeast. It is unclear what may have
contributed to this significant difference; further research may uncover the reason.

While 56% of participants agreed that they had been accepted by their first male
supervisor, 52% reported to have felt accepted as a full-fledged member of their agency
when they were first hired. Accountability for decisions and actions increases as rank
increases, so tolerance by supervisors is expected, especially when considering federal
employment laws and funding. Regardless of the reasons, these results confirm that the
majority of participants felt accepted by the members of their department. This is an
indication of the positive shift in attitude toward female officers.

Single participants reported more often that they felt accepted by their first male
supervisor than married participants. A possible explanation for this is that a male
supervisor may be hesitant to be too amiable with a married female officer because he might need to consider her husband’s reactions as well. Another likely explanation is that the male supervisor may feel that a single female officer may be interested in developing an intimate relationship with him more than a married female officer would.

Also covered in this section of survey items were questions regarding recruitment and hiring practices. Sixty-three percent of the participants did not feel to have been heavily recruited by their departments specifically because they were female, while 65% of them did not feel singled-out during the hiring process because of their gender. This was a notable conclusion considering all of the efforts made by law enforcement agencies to recruit and hire female officers and the fact that the participants did not feel that there was an emphasis on only women.

Veteran participants with 21 or more years of service were more likely to disagree that they had been heavily recruited because of their gender. This same group also did not feel that they were hired for diversity purposes. Considering the time span that these women would have been appointed, this finding contradicts what should have been the actions of agencies that were being forced by government mandates to hire more women (National Center for Women and Policing, 2001). Possibly, participants did not want to identify with these administrative orders because they felt that they were more than qualified to be hired by an agency.

Finally, it was discovered that participants working for an agency other than a municipality, including a sheriff’s office, state agency, or federal agency, were more likely to report that they were hired for diversity purposes. Perhaps this is a sign that these agencies basically employ fewer females and, therefore, must concentrate their hiring efforts toward women.
The results of the current study supported the hypothesis (#1C) predicting that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers are not as accepted by their agencies as are male officers. These findings are crucial, because they are evidence that their full acceptance is not yet a reality.

**Acceptance of Policewomen’s Role by the Public**

When females entered the world of law enforcement as patrol officers, there were no guidelines or benchmarks to follow, so researchers used public perception as a way to determine if they could be as effective as male police officers (DeJong, 2004). Numerous studies were conducted throughout the country in places like Washington, D.C. (1974), St. Louis (1975), and New York City (1978), using the public to gauge the efficacy of the females on the front lines of policing. While most of the research results were positive, not all of the findings complimented women’s patrol work (Balkin, 1988; Sherman, 1975). More recent research indicates citizen attitudes have remained positive, but still fall along gender stereotypes in regard to response of specific incidents (Breci, 1997; Leger, 1997).

**Acceptance by the Public.** While earlier researchers used public perception as a way to determine if women had been accepted as police officers, this study used the participants’ perception to determine if they felt accepted by the public. Just as Bloch and Anderson (1974) found that female officers were as effective as male officers, the current research revealed that 99% of participants felt as effective as their male counterparts when handling citizen complaints. This is a strong indication of the confidence felt by the women and their ability to handle their job duties successfully.

The participants’ feelings about their competency with the public was questioned as well, because previous literature suggests that many citizens considered female
officers to be as capable as male officers to fulfill their duties (Sichel et al., 1978). Ninety-nine percent of participants indicated that they felt as competent as their male counterparts to work with the public. Here again is another compelling sign of the confidence of female officers when handling citizen complaints.

It had been suggested that the communication skills of a female officer may be better than those of a male officer (Kerber et al., 1977; Price, 1985; Worden, 1993). This study’s results found that 81% of participants felt that they had better communication skills than their male counterparts, thereby confirming this suggestion. Here, most participants recognize that female officers take more time to listen and talk to their complainants, which may be why their reception by the public is so welcoming.

Finally, a general question of acceptance was presented to participants; 92% reported that they felt the public had accepted them. Like previous research, recent studies point to the positive attitude that those in the community have toward female officers (Breci, 1997; Leger, 1997). The findings of this study confirm this optimistic outlook and delineate the participants’ high confidence level when working with citizens.

The hypothesis (#1D) presenting the proposition which suggested that female officers in general have been accepted by the public is thus supported. This may indicate that most of the difficulties of the job for women in law enforcement are not from public interactions, but, instead, may be from the interactions within the department itself.

Government Intervention and Influence

Government involvement altered the attitudes of administrators by requiring them to hire more females and allow them to work in all aspects of the field including patrol (Harriman, 1996; Scarborough & Collins, 2002; Schulz, 2003). The 1967 Crime Commission emphasized the need for new kinds of recruits like women and minorities to
diversify the ranks in order to better serve the community (Darien, 2002; Platt et al., 1982). Besides the changes in 1972 to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the judicial branch played a role by enacting laws and issuing court decisions and mandates that further compelled administrators to conform to the changes. Cases like Reed v. Reed (1971), when the Supreme Court ruled that gender discrimination was a violation of the 14th Amendment, reinforced judicial influence on the dynamics of law enforcement agencies (Scarborough & Collins, 2002). With time, pressure from the courts and legislation has waned, resulting in a slowdown in the effort to hire females with their current meager numbers as proof.

Government Intervention and Influence. Attempting to determine the participants’ feelings about the government’s influence on their career, two survey questions were presented. When asked if government intervention should be amplified in order to increase the numbers of female law enforcement officers, 45% of participants disagreed, while 31% remained neutral. While this establishes that many of the participants did not support this proposition, it also shows that a number of them did not oppose or support it. Perhaps this is a sign that some would consider government intervention but would be hesitant because they know that their male counterparts might see this as favoritism, contradicting their struggle for equality. In the next item, the rejection of government assistance was again supported by most; 55% of the participants agreed that affirmative action policies hurt female officers because of the perception of preferential treatment.

The results indicate that most of the participants do not want the government to get involved in their careers and support the hypothesis (#1E) that they feel that the
federal government has done all it can to ensure an equal opportunity for women in law enforcement.

*Gender Issues and Females in Law Enforcement*

The early work of female officers was aligned with what researchers call *doing gender* (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Because women were *different* from men in their social behavior, they were allowed to work in the male-dominated world of policing. What acceptance they did get was due to the fact that they were doing what women were supposed to do in society, which is to care for children and others in need of help, thereby meeting social expectations. But police work, even in recent times, contrasts with the gender expectations of women. To understand why the role of gender is so important in policing, Steffensmeier and Allan’s (1996) *organization of gender* theory was utilized. It provided a basis of review for the social and behavioral differences between male and female officers.

*Gender Expectations.* Five research items were developed that coincided with Steffensmeier and Allan’s (1996) theory and its five areas of life. The first area of life was defined as *gender norms.* Sixty-seven percent of participants indicated that they felt to be violating society’s gender norms by being a police officer. This finding indicates that female officers are willing to defy cultural gender standards to work in the career field they want.

Supporting the second area of life, which is listed as *moral development and amenability to affiliations,* 59% of participants agreed that they are more receptive to the needs of the public than male officers. As previously noted in the section, “Acceptance by the Public,” participants were especially confident about their work with the citizens they serve. This strong support for their receptivity of the public illustrates their belief
that females officers try more than male officers to develop a particular connection with their complainants.

The sample of this study refuted the *social control* area of the theory with 72% indicating that they do not fall under society’s attempt to control what a woman should be or should do. The participants assertively identified their place outside of the gender norms of society, knowing that they are *doing gender differently* than expected.

The perception about *physical strength and aggression* of female law enforcement officers was next reviewed. Sixty-one percent of participants reported to feel at times that their male counterparts did not want to work with them. Feelings of rejection as well as reservations about their ability to handle a violent offender can add to the stress of working in a male-dominated setting.

The fifth area of life, *sexuality*, concentrates on the biological distinctions between males and females (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). With 69% of the participants disagreeing with the proposition that the only difference between the sexes are biological differences, it is possible that the women of this sample feel that female officers can bring something distinctive and essential to the world of law enforcement. Veteran participants (e.g. 21 years or more of service) were more likely to agree with the suggestion of biological differences than those with 20 years or less of service. A possible explanation for this is that female officers from decades ago were so adamant that they were equal in ability to male officers that their only difference was biological in nature.

The findings supported the hypothesis (#2A) predicting that participants would report the perception that female law enforcement officers in general violate the gender code of society. These results are an indication that women in law enforcement know that they are countering society’s gender norms, but still feel that they bring something
extra to the table, even if they cannot fulfill their duties in exactly the same way that male officers do.

PoliceWOMEN vs. POLICEwomen

Susan E. Martin (1979) introduced the concept of policewomen and policewomen as a means to understand the role options facing female officers and the consequences of their selection. While policewomen choose a path of traditional police norms and behaviors and work hard to keep their sex role from interfering with the job, policewomen focus more on their femininity, have fewer aspirations, and fit into the mold of the weak female.

Effects of Decision-Making. Using Martin’s (1979) theory, the researcher developed six survey items to determine the participants’ perceptions about the consequences of deciding to work as a policewoman or policewoman. Because 100% of participants agreed that they considered their position to be that of a professional, the perspective of the policewoman was believed to influence responses.

With 83% of participants indicated that they had been labeled in a derogatory way at some point during their career, labeling still appears to be a problem. Eighty-eight percent also noted that they had to worry more about their reputation than male officers. Regardless of whether they engage in behavior that warrants any type of label, the findings offer strong support that female officers deal with these extra stressors while working in a male-dominated setting.

Responses were split on the proposition that the participants had to gain the respect of their male counterparts by acting rough and tough; 45% agreed with the statement, while 39% disagreed. The division noted in participants’ answers may be an indication of two very different agency types. Those agreeing with the proposition may
be working for agencies that are not culturally diverse, not properly trained, and not supportive of females’ presence in law enforcement. Those who noted that they did not have to act *rough and tough* may be working for agencies that are culturally diverse, offer diversity training, and support female officers.

Working hard to be seen as equal to male officers, 84% of participants indicated that they have tried to keep their gender from interfering with their duties as a police officer. But, even with their determination to be equal, 49% of the women reported that they still try to maintain their femininity while on duty. This conundrum of blocking their gender but preserving their femininity indicates that participants do not want the fact of being female to interfere with their job, but, at the same time, they did not want to give up their womanhood for it.

The findings of this study offered mixed support for the hypothesis (#2B) that the participants would report the perception that female officers in general will have to make a decision regarding how to approach their job. It appears that, regardless of whichever route they choose to take, there are no fewer problems that must be dealt with throughout their career. Even so, female officers may be attempting to prevent their gender from affecting their job, because concerns like their reputation and labeling are so prevalent.

*Female Officers as Tokens*

Offering an explanation for the different representations of organizational groups, Rosabeth M. Kanter (1977) presented the concept of a skewed group, consisting of tokens and dominants. Using the organization itself as the source of obstacles for its employees, this concept offered the proportional ratio of 85:15 as a way to account how dominants constitute the majority of the workforce, while tokens represent the minority (Kanter, 1977). They are allowed to work only because the dominants are forced to hire
them. In the male-dominated world of law enforcement, female officers are tokens. This theory offers a way to understand the experiences of tokens and why the effects of tokenism are magnified as female officers are promoted to higher ranking positions (Kanter, 1977; Sanders et al., 2009).

Concerns with Tokenism. To determine the effects of the token status on the sample, five survey items were developed. While 47% of participants did not agree that they had more negative work experiences than male officers, 46% indicated to have experienced more workplace stress than their male counterparts. This division of perception between participants about workplace events again suggests two very different types of agencies. One accepts female officers; the other is still intolerant of their presence.

The existence of a more hostile work environment was a reality for many of the participants; 56% reported having one. This is a notable finding because it confirms Kanter’s (1977) argument that tokens (female officers) have a more difficult work setting because they are so visibly different from the status quo of officers. It was determined that participants holding lower ranks (e.g. lieutenant or lower) reported having a hostile work environment more often than those in the upper echelons. A possible explanation for this is that, as an officer is promoted, there is often less harassment and pressure from others, as rank gives them more of a privileged status.

Another negative experience noted by participants was the feeling of being more critically evaluated by their supervisors compared to male officers. Fifty-two percent of the participants indicated this perception. Unfavorable and unfair annual reviews can leave a female officer feeling not only ostracized but also inadequate, resulting in fewer ambitions or departure from the agency. Participants with 21 years or more of service
were more likely to report being critically evaluated by their supervisors than those with fewer years of service. This negativit y reported by veteran officers might be the result of earlier resistant and pessimistic supervisors who had not yet gotten accustomed to female officers as regular patrol members.

Promotions and training appear to be equally distributed most of the time for male and female officers because 55% of participants advised that they had the same opportunities as their male counterparts. This is notable, especially with the previous reporting of hostile work environments and critical evaluations. Yet, in retrospect, these opportunities have to be equivalent for male and female officers because of federal regulation requirements.

The results of this study both confirmed and contradicted the token theory presented by Kanter in 1977. While most of the participants indicated that their work experiences and promotional opportunities were the same as male officers, they also reported the experience of a hostile work environment as well as being more critically evaluated by their supervisors. The results of the study offer mixed support for the hypothesis (#2C) that proposed that the participants would report the perception that female officers in general are considered tokens in their occupation.

*Differential Experiences*

Even after decades of progress, a female officer should anticipate enduring a different career experience than a male officer (Fletcher, 1995). From their beginning in police history, women have withstood everything from different hiring standards to different pay scales to different training (Horne, 1975; Schultz, 1995a). Although present female officers do not have to face such inequities, they can face problems that are unique to women, even when compared to the female pioneers of the past (Martin,
1989a). Because of federal guidelines, employees are supposed to have equal opportunities, but the rules cannot influence everything, especially in a male-dominated work setting like policing.

**Differential Experiences.** To determine if the participants perceived their career experiences to be different from male officers, seven survey items were presented. Responses to the first item, which questioned participants if they felt that their career experiences were distinctive from those of male officers, were split with 42% of participants agreeing to the proposition and 42% disagreeing with it. This finding is comparable to other findings where the sample is respectively divided. It could be an indication that not all female officers are enduring the same career experiences and that the type of agency they work for may play a part.

Coinciding with the participants’ strong opinion of being *professionals*, 97% reported that they had not used their gender to get special treatment or to avoid certain job details. While there is evidence that some female officers take advantage of their feminine status, the sample of this study again indicates that they do not want to be considered policewomen nor be shown favoritism (Martin, 1979).

Proving oneself seems to be a concern for some female officers; 49% of participants agreed that one of their struggles, while on duty, was to show that they were equal to male officers. This demonstrates that there is at least some evidence that women in law enforcement are still trying to prove their value in the field.

Sixty seven percent of participants reported to have more education than their male counterparts. This finding is comparable to early female officers, who were required to have a college degree, even though male officers did not need one (Schultz, 1995a). Participants with a Master’s degree or more, with 21 years or more of service, or
with the rank of lieutenant or lower were more likely to report having more education than their male counterparts. Because most law enforcement agencies do not even require a college degree for employment, it is not surprising that those with a Master’s degree or more noted that they had more education. Veteran participants (e.g. 21 years or more) may have earned their degree at an early age, during a time in the 1970s and 1980s when their employment at a policing agency might have been questionable, and they wanted to make themselves more appealing as potential employees. It was surprising, though, that participants holding the rank of lieutenant or lower reported to have more education than their male counterparts. Because it can be assumed that these would be younger officers, it is remarkable with the number of criminal justice programs available, both in the classroom and online, that females would still be able to state that they had more education than male officers. It is unclear what may have contributed to this finding; further research would be needed to understand this.

Countering the class status of previous policewomen, 64% of participants noted that they had come from a lower-class to middle-class background. The forerunners of women in law enforcement were from very affluent families; they had to be in order for them to be college-educated during that time in history (Schultz, 1995a). It appears that modern female officers come from a much more humble setting.

Previous research had reported that females had easier testing standards than males for the initial physical fitness assessment but a tougher time at the training academy (Fletcher, 1995). Sixty-two percent of participants indicated that they did not have a harder time than male recruits passing the initial fitness test, while 76% reported that they did not have a harder time at the police academy than their male counterparts. While the less stringent standards at the time of their hiring may explain the first finding,
the general acceptance of female officers may explain the second finding, as the experiences of the training academy are not considered as dreadful as they once were. Participants with a Master’s degree or higher were more likely to report that they had a harder time passing the initial physical fitness assessment than their male counterparts. Considering the years it sometimes takes to complete a higher degree, it is possible that these applicants may be older or may not be in their best physical shape to easily pass this assessment.

The findings in this section indicate that the hypothesis (#2D) that predicted participants to report the perception that female officers in general do not go through the same career experience as do male officers was found to have mixed support. These results are an indication that, even with the progress made in the law enforcement field regarding gender issues and employment, there is still room for improvement.

Working with Policemen

Thanks to government intervention and a positive shift in attitude, most female officers now work without having the open rejection from their male counterparts that former female officers had (Fletcher, 1995; Platt et al., 1982). Yet, just because it is not obvious, hostility still exists, leaving many to decide which male officers they can trust and which ones are questioning their abilities. By working in an environment that is male-dominated, women additionally face pictures, jokes, and language that have a sexual undertone. This can result in the female officer becoming uncomfortable and embarrassed in her work setting. While government initiatives limit forms of sexual harassment, everything cannot be monitored, leaving them having to decide whether to tolerate it or to complain resulting in negative consequences (Fletcher, 1995).
Working with Policemen. Four survey items were developed to determine if participants of this study had similar negative experiences working with male officers as had been previously documented for female officers (Bloch & Anderson, 1974; Fletcher, 1995; Martin, 1989c; Sherman, 1975). Seventy-one percent of participants indicated that they had felt that some male officers did not like working with them because they were female. With this sentiment in mind, it is not surprising that 78% of them felt that they had to decide which male officers they could trust. These results may be just a few of the reasons why the majority of participants reported having a hostile work environment. No one enjoys working where they are not wanted or with those that they cannot trust.

Outright feelings of skepticism by male officers do not seem to be necessarily vocalized, as only 52% of the participants indicated to never hearing strong expressions of concern on their handling of a violent subject from their male counterparts. Still, these results lend some support to past literature that details a still present, yet quiet dislike of female officers and their abilities (Fletcher, 1995; Martin, 1989c).

Even with government directives limiting sexual harassment at the workplace, 80% of the participants indicated that they have had to deal with inappropriate pictures, jokes, and comments while at work, exposing another area of concern for women working in a male-dominated setting. Even if the unsuitable materials are not directed toward them specifically, female officers can interpret their presentation as an indication of the true feelings of women by their male counterparts.

The findings of this study offered mixed supported for the hypothesis (#2E) predicting that participants would report the perception that female officers are not viewed as equals by their male counterparts. Discovering the perceptions and feelings of
the participants on this topic make it apparent how much the workplace environment and working with male officers contribute to the negative experiences of female officers.

**Personal Life**

The effects of a law enforcement career will be felt in the personal life of a female police officer. Family and social relationships may suffer as well as her health (Ellison & Genz, 1983; More, 1992). The demands of the job can easily filter into the lives of these women and threaten all that they have worked so hard to attain. In order to prove their dedication to the job, female officers are expected to work a tremendous number of hours as well as holidays and weekends at times. Loyalty has to be shown to either the department or the home because it can be very demanding to do for both what is needed (Brown & Fielding, 1993; Maume, 2001).

**Personal Life.** To determine how their career had affected their personal life, participants were presented three questions in the survey instrument. Fifty-six percent of the participants reported that they did not have more minor health problems than male officers. Also, 63% did not feel that they had experienced higher levels of burnout in comparison to their male counterparts. The results from this sample contradict earlier findings that female officers experience more health and stress-related problems (Ellison & Genz, 1983; More, 1992). The participants appear to have been able to handle the pressure and stay healthy. It was determined that those working with an agency other than a municipality (e.g. sheriff’s office, state agency, or federal agency) were more likely to agree that they had experienced additional health problems in comparison to their male counterparts. Here, another instance is seen where municipal officers may have the advantage, just like they did when considering stress levels for work-home-child
obligations. Perhaps this is a sign that city agencies offer better work environments as well as better health care plans for women.

Responses were split on the proposition about the difficulties of trying to balance their job with family and friends; 45% of participants agreed that there were difficulties, while 43% disagreed. This division may be the result of different work environments, better benefits, or unusual family issues. Regardless, the findings of this study point to a balance in the personal lives of many of the participants that are not reflective in earlier literature (Brown & Fielding, 1993; Maume, 2001).

The findings from this study supported the hypothesis (#2F) that predicted participants would report a perception of negative family life transformations as a result of being a police officer. This may explain why some female officers are very successful in their law enforcement career, while others are not.

Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues

Females with children working in the law enforcement field can face additional problems, like day care issues because of shift work or concerns about their professionalism by those who question their dedication to the job (Cowan & Bochantin, 2009). Unfortunately, this can result in added pressures to an already stressful career (Silvestri, 2006). In a display of dedication, a new mother may sideline family obligations in order to return back to work as soon as possible. The decision of what to do can weigh heavy on her (Silvestri, 2006). Besides this, domestic duties like cooking and cleaning usually fall onto the shoulders of the woman in a household. Balancing home and work obligations, along with motherhood, can be exhaustive for women in policing with sacrifices resulting (Archbold & Hassell, 2009).
Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues. To determine participants’ attitudes about issues regarding pregnancy, children, and childcare issues, two survey items were presented. Previous literature notes the battle of motherhood and career choices faced by female officers (Silvestri, 2006). In this study, 41% of participants indicated that they did not have a hard time deciding if and when they were going to have children. This finding indicates that the choice to have children, while working in law enforcement, might not be as difficult for women as once believed. It was also determined that participants with fewer years of service (e.g. 20 years or less) were more likely to disagree that their decisions on motherhood and career were problematic. A possible explanation for this might be the transitions that have been made by female workers over the last half century. Not only is there an expectation to handle a full-time job but also motherhood and household duties. Female officers appear to have made this adjustment as well.

Participants were split on the suggestion that female officers with children are considered less dedicated to their job by male officers. Forty-six percent disagreed with the statement, while 41% agreed with it. This finding suggests that support exists in the ranks for females to have a normal life outside of the department without questionable consequences about their loyalty to their career.

Using a contingency question, the researcher identified 66 participants who had children. Married participants were found to be more likely to have children than single participants. Mothers were then asked five additional questions specifically related to parenthood and their career. Fifty-six percent of the participants disagreed that they had problems finding reliable childcare, while 58% of them indicated that they had not had problems with sick leave because of an ill child. This may be an indication that these
women have the support of others, who respect their career as well as are dependable to help them when needed.

Still, handling their duties at work and home could lead to certain pressures. This was confirmed when 73% of those responding agreed that work-home-child obligations result in more stress for them. These findings are similar to previous literature that had documented the demanding life of a female police officer who has children (Archbold & Hassell, 2009; Cowan & Bochantin, 2009). Participants with children working with a sheriff’s office, a state agency, or a federal agency were more likely to indicate additional stress at home due to work-home-child obligations. One possible explanation for this is that these types of agencies may offer fewer opportunities in terms of shift work or day care options. Or, another explanation may be because of high work demands, causing the women to feel overstressed.

Most of the participants of this study with children were clearly determined to work in law enforcement as well as enjoy motherhood. Fifty-two percent indicated that they did not plan their pregnancies so that it would not interfere with their job. Also, 67% disagreed that they had considered leaving their job because of the problems associated with working in law enforcement and motherhood. These women were able to find the balance between these two worlds regardless of questions about their dedication.

The findings of the study from the survey items answered by all of the participants offered support for the hypothesis (#2G) that predicted the perception that female officers in general have additional worries at work because of pregnancy, children, and childcare issues. Participants with children, who answered five additional survey items, supported the hypothesis, only noting that additional stress can arise
because their work-home-child obligations. These results suggest that necessary adjustments have to be made in order to have both a career and a family.

*Doing Time and Moving Up the Promotional Ladder*

After the initial stress of hiring, training, and transfer has ended, the next hurdle to cross for many female law enforcement officers is the decision to become involved in their agency’s promotion process. Numerous considerations have to be made including personal barriers as well as organizational barriers (Murphy, 2006b; Whetstone & Wilson, 1999). Because of these obstacles, many feel the pressures and inconveniences of working at a male-dominated workplace and surrender their aspirations for promotion, settling instead for their current position and rank (Archbold et al., 2010).

*Road to Promotion.* Using a contingency question, it was revealed that 88 out of the 105 participants reported that they held a supervisory position, which encompassed the rank of sergeant or higher. These women were more likely to be married than single and held the rank of lieutenant or sergeant than captain or higher. This revealed that most of the supervisors fell in the mid-range of supervisory rank and appeared settled in their personal life.

Earlier findings about the lack of mentors for female officers were contradicted, as 63% of the participants of this study indicated that they had an advisor who strongly encouraged them (Gaston & Alexander, 1997; Murphy, 2006a). The support of a mentor may be the key to what has been absent in the careers of so many female officers and may be a link to the underrepresentation of women in supervisory positions.

Previous literature also reported that female supervisors got less respect and were not treated as fairly as male supervisors (Archbold et al., 2010). Contradicting these
findings, just over half of the participants did not agree that they were respected less than their male counterparts after promotion.

Interestingly, it was discovered that those supervisors who had served 20 years or less reported more often of getting less respect after promotion than veteran officers. This finding was surprising because those more recently promoted should have male partners who are accustomed to working with women. This could possibly be evidence of a still present, yet hidden animosity of female officers or another indication of two differently administered policing organizations.

Additionally, supervisors were split on their perception about fairness after promotion. While 43% agreed that they had not received fair treatment, 48% disagreed indicating that they were treated equally. This finding suggests that even with equal employment requirements, not all workers have the luxury of being treated alike.

Supporting the premises of the transformational leadership style, 68% of the participants indicated that they were encouraged to be innovative and think on their own by their supervisors (Eagly, 2007). This finding suggests that this leadership approach is effective because a large majority of the women noted the influences of their mentors, stemming now to their achievement as supervisors.

It was determined that those serving populations of over 100,001 were more likely to report that they had been encouraged by their supervisors to be innovative and to think on their own than those serving smaller populations. A possible explanation is that larger departments usually have more resources and better trained supervisors, who need their subordinates to be autonomous to handle the volume of incidents dealt with in more populated areas.
Sixty-one percent of the supervisors indicated that they had advanced as much as they wanted to in rank. While Silvestri (2006) reported that female officers were not seizing the opportunities for promotion that were available to them, the findings of this study indicated otherwise. Participants with the title of lieutenant or lower agreed more often that they had been able to advance as much as they wanted. This is a notable conclusion because it is an indication that some of the barriers to promotion, whether personal or organizational, are diminishing for women.

Finally, 63% of the supervisors did not agree with the statement that female officers have fewer aspirations than male officers after years on the job. Earlier findings indicated that veteran female officers were less likely to seek higher ranks (Gaston & Alexander, 1997). These results contradicted those previous conclusions. With all of the encouragement and guidance this sample had as subordinates, it is no wonder that they did not agree with this proposition. Education was found to be a significant factor in the consideration of future ambitions by those responding. Participants with a Master’s degree or higher were more likely to agree that female officers have fewer aspirations than male officers. Perhaps this is a sign that those with higher degrees consider female officers with little or no advanced education in their background to be less ambitious and less motivated toward higher goals in their career.

*The Promotion Process*

What actually keeps female officers from involvement in the promotion process can be debated, because so many issues must be considered. Organizational as well as personal barriers might only be compounded by the fact of working in a male-dominated organization that is set up in a bureaucratic structure (Archbold & Hassell, 2009; Eagly et
Regardless of the circumstances, it is important to determine what exactly is keeping female officers from wanting to earn a higher rank.

The Promotion Process. Six survey items were developed by the researcher to question participants about the influences of their decision to participate in the promotion process. The basis for the items were the five reasons listed by Whetstone and Wilson (1999) explaining why female officers fail to take part in promotional opportunities.

First, a general question about the help they received for promotion was presented. It was discovered that only 48% of participants were strongly supported by their agency during the promotion process. This is a strong indication that some agencies are making strides to offer encouragement and guidance to their female officers, while others are not.

Next, shift or assignment was seen as important to most with 65% reporting that they had taken it into account. It is not surprising that so many of the participants agreed with this statement. A new shift can mean working nights, weekends, and holidays; this would be especially difficult for a female officer who also has the responsibilities of being a mother. Another assignment can also mean a more dangerous position or a job duty that allows for the female to be home every evening.

Supervisors holding a Bachelor’s degree or less found that a change in their shift or assignment was a significant consideration in comparison to those holding a Master’s degree or higher. A possible explanation for this is that those with lesser degrees may not qualify for the additional pay that those with higher degrees get and being transferred to a new section mean less pay because of limited overtime opportunities.

Those reporting the rank of captain or higher were more likely to note that their new assignment or shift was influential to their decision to accept a higher rank. Moving
up the bureaucratic ladder not only means fewer available positions, but it also means an increase in the amount of responsibility. By the time an officer reaches the rank of captain, many are worn down after years of working for the system, or are close to retirement and do not want the new obligations usually associated with a higher rank.

Participants working for larger agencies with populations of 100,001 or more indicated as well that a new shift or assignment was more of a concern than those working for smaller agencies. A reason for this may be that promotions in larger agencies can sometimes result in a transfer back into the patrol division, which means working on a shift rotation, and that is something most officers do not want.

As reported in earlier findings, childcare and family matters may play a smaller role than what is believed and is reflected in fact that just 53% of participants noted they contemplated this. While these concerns may not strongly contribute to the finding, they may have contributed to the strong support of shift and assignment considerations.

Possible administrative bias was a concern of only 47% of participants. This finding is important, because it is an indication that the top executives are not necessarily the source of apprehension for many female officers because less than half of the participants supported it. Administrators may realize that these individuals have earned their place in rank and are not worried about who becomes a supervisor, as long as the responsibilities of the position are met.

Deliberating future changes, 51% agreed that they had to determine if they really wanted to even be a supervisor. New training, responsibilities, and work assignments usually result from a promotion to a higher rank. The majority of the participants noted that these concerns were not taken lightly.
Fifty-six percent of participants indicated that loss of pay due to loss of overtime hours was not a concern for them. A promotion not only means a new assignment, but it also means a pay raise. Sometimes these raises are enough to offset the money made working extra shifts. Also, by this time in their career, female officers want a more settled lifestyle and consider that the pay they may make is not worth it. Supervisors holding not more than a Bachelor’s degree were more likely to consider loss of pay because of limited overtime hours. A possible explanation for this is that some agencies offer their employees extra pay for college degrees, which increases as the degree increases. Those with a Master’s degree or more may make more than enough to balance out any loss in pay, so overtime is not as important to them.

The findings of this study supported the hypothesis (#3A) that proposed that female supervisors consider the promotion process unfair and preferential to men. A chief concern of the process, administrative bias, was supported by less than half of the participants. Apprehensions about their transfer assignment were revealed to be most important to participants.

*The Glass Ceiling Effect*

The concept of the glass ceiling has been used for nearly three decades as a visual portrayal of the scenario where women can see the higher ranks of an organization, but they cannot get to them (Hymowitz & Schellhardt, 1986). Even without extant and precise numbers, it is still apparent that women are underrepresented in the upper echelons of their agencies (Eagly et al., 2003; Murphy, 2006a). Many cite the glass ceiling as the reason why female officers cannot seem to move more steadily into higher-ranking positions and note that leadership roles, especially in male-dominated settings, are expected to be filled by males, not females (Agars, 2004; Eagly & Carli, 2007).
The Effects of the Glass Ceiling. To determine if participants felt that the glass ceiling had limited their pursuit of higher ranks, the researcher developed four survey items. Sixty-five percent of the supervisors disagreed that they initially had lower aspirations for promotion than their male counterparts. This finding countered earlier research stating that only male officers had higher promotional aspirations after years on the job (Gaston & Alexander, 1997; Poole & Pogrebin, 1988).

Fifty-one percent noted that they had to face more barriers during the process than their male counterparts. Previous literature had noted that one of the reasons female officers had fewer aspirations for advancement was because of the barriers they faced (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Maume, 2004). The results of this study show that most participants did have more obstacles to face than male officers, yet that did not keep them from aspiring to higher positions.

The proposition of the underrepresentation of women in the higher ranks of law enforcement was supported by 86% of the responding supervisors. Most participants recognize how uncommon it is to see a woman in a leadership role at a policing agency. This may be one of the motivating factors behind their efforts to do a good job as a female leader. Those holding a Master’s degree or greater were more likely to feel that women are underrepresented in the upper echelons. A possible explanation is that those with higher degrees may be more knowledgeable about the low number of female officers because they are in higher administrative positions or have studied the subject.

Although the supervisors felt that they had more obstacles for promotion than male officers, 61% noted that they had been adequately prepared for their leadership roles. Earlier research had found that female officers felt less competent and ready to be
supervisors, but the majority of participants of this study noted that they had been sufficiently trained for their management duties (Wexler & Quinn, 1985).

There was mixed support for the hypothesis (#3B) predicting that the participants would report that female officers have to break through the glass ceiling in order to be promoted. Although the supervisors agreed that women are underrepresented and have more barriers to overcome than male officers, they reported that they had just as strong ambitions as their male counterparts and were effectively prepared for their supervisory assignment. These findings indicate that progress has been made to break the glass ceiling and permit at least some females to move up the promotional ladder.

*Life as a Female Police Supervisor*

Shattering the glass ceiling and becoming a police supervisor prompts a whole new set of problems for a female officer. Now, scrutiny and accountability by others can intensify the pressures of the new position. Research has found that women are responding by handling these demands successfully, but what exactly makes a leader effective is still questionable (Eagly & Carli, 2007). The *transformational leadership* approach has been recently supported as one of the most useful ways to manage a group (Andreescu & Vito, 2010; Eagly, 2007; Silvestri, 2007). This type of leadership style pushes aside the social generalization that men make better leaders and argues that performance, not gender, define the successfulness of a leader (Eagly & Carli, 2007). Women have a tendency to utilize this type of approach causing some experts to conclude that they can be effective leaders (Eagly, 2007).

*Life as a Female Police Supervisor*. Five survey items were developed to determine if the supervisors tended to display transformational leadership tactics. Previous literature described one of the barriers hindering female officers as the shortage
of role models (Archbold et al., 2010; Murphy, 2006a). Sixty-three percent of the supervisors reported the lack of good female role models throughout their career. Although it was noted earlier that most of the sample had someone to support them at one time, here it is reported that there was an absence of female advisers. This may explain why 100% of them indicated that they try to be a mentor to their subordinates, which is one of the aspects of transformational leadership.

Another feature of this leadership approach is the encouragement of subordinates by their superiors to be transformed into leaders themselves by developing solutions and making decisions on their own (Eagly, 2007). The results of the study suggest that the supervisors are implementing these aspects of this leadership approach because 99% of them reported to encourage innovative thinking from their subordinates.

The responding supervisors were confident in their abilities as a leader; 97% of them reported feeling as effective of a leader as male supervisors. What is so reassuring is that this confidence in their own ability to be a good leader is not shaded by the negativity that has seemed to follow many of them throughout their career.

Finally, 61% indicated having a middle-of-the-road attitude, by being not too aggressive, or overly male, but not too kind-hearted, or overly female (Eagly, 2007). This suggests that the responding supervisors are attempting to balance gender expectations in what has been termed a hybridized way of managing (Silvestri, 2007). Participants having a Bachelor’s degree or less were more likely than those with a Master’s degree or higher to indicate that they were a middle-of-the-road leader. Even though they have the rank, those with lesser degrees may possibly feel that they do not have the influence and skills needed to present a stronger leadership approach as those with a higher degree do.
Resistance

Being a female police supervisor has its moment of elation as well as those of frustration. After all of the turmoil of getting through the promotion process, a female supervisor has to prepare for more negative attacks from those she works with as well as those she serves. The resistance of co-workers felt by female police leaders has been a rarely covered topic in past literature. What has been found from previous research is that new female supervisors can expect more resistance and less support than new male supervisors (Cohn, 2000; Wexler & Quinn, 1985). This struggle can negatively affect a new female supervisor’s performance further throwing into question her effectiveness.

Resistance. To determine which co-workers offered the most resistance to the sample, four survey items were developed. While it has been noted that female supervisors should anticipate encountering more resistance, the interesting question is “who are the ones resisting them?” (Cohn, 2000; Wexler & Quinn, 1985).

Participants were more likely to disagree with each statement on resistance, although none of these findings were over 50%. Forty-four percent of participants disagreed that they got more resistance from male supervisors than male subordinates. This finding suggests that younger male officers might not be too keen about having a female supervisor, while the male supervisors are not as opposed because they do not have to deal with a woman telling them what to do.

Forty-one percent of participants disagreed that that female supervisors were more resistant to them than female subordinates. Again, the results show that those in subordinate positions were more resistant for the most part. It is possible that this may be the result of a power issue and not a gender issue. Still, there appears to be an understanding of respect among supervisors regardless of gender.
Forty-seven percent of the participants disagreed that female supervisors were more resistant to them than male supervisors. While not even half agreed to the statement, it is important to consider that this is a strong indicator of where some of the resistance may originate. Because other female supervisors know what they have been through to get to their rank, the last thing they would probably want to do is struggle with another female who has rank. Instead, it appears that it is the male supervisors who are harder to work with than female supervisors.

Finally, 48% disagreed that male subordinates were more resistant to them than female subordinates. A possible explanation for this finding is that subordinate females want to be seen as competent as male subordinates and can feel that having a female supervisor may not offer the same admiration as having a male supervisor. Still, this is a noteworthy result because it would be assumed that female subordinates would firmly support female supervisors.

The hypothesis (#3C), which predicted that participants would report the perception that female supervisors make every effort to be effective regardless of the resistance toward them, was supported by the results of the study. Despite the obstacles and resistance, it appears that the supervisors of this study have been able to make strides ahead while being confident in their abilities. Their tendency to utilize the facets of the transformational leadership style also points them into a direction of positive assessments of effectiveness by experts searching for the best types of leaders.

**Subsequent Findings**

Because of the vast array of survey items included on the instrument, Cronbach’s Alpha was first utilized to identify the sections that displayed higher levels of internal reliability with a reliability coefficient of .60 or higher. In the first part of the survey
completed by all of the participants, the following sections, which consisted of 22 items altogether, were identified as reliable: “acceptance by the public,” “effects of decision-making,” “concerns with tokenism,” “working with policemen,” “personal life,” and “pregnancy, children, and childcare issues.” Each of these was found to have a Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of over .60. In the second part of the survey, which was completed only by supervisors, all of the sections were included because of the limited number of survey items, regardless of its Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient.

Using exploratory factor analysis, three factors were identified for the first part of the survey completed by both supervisors and subordinates. The three factors were labeled the “Negative Experiences Factor”, the “Personal Effects Factor”, and the “Confidence Factor”. The “Negative Experiences Factor” was created from 12 of the survey items that included issues like hostile work environments, critical evaluations, inappropriate comments, labeling, and other negative work experiences. This factor encompassed those events that were most troubling and stressful to the participants. The “Personal Effects Factor” included those measures that touched on the private lives of the participants and how their career in policing influenced them. This factor was comprised of five variables that questioned health and burnout problems, as well as issues with family, friends, and children. The “Confidence Factor” consisted of four items that linked the participants’ perception with their effectiveness, competency, professionalism, and acceptance.

In the section completed only by supervisors, four factors were identified from the remaining 18 items; they included the “Promotion Support Factor”, the “Promotion Decisions Factor”, the “Encouragement Factor”, and the “Resistance” factor. The “Promotion Support Factor” was created using eight of the survey items. These items
focused on the events surrounding the promotion process and included matters like encouragement, fairness, respect, preparation, and role models. The “Promotion Decisions Factor” consisted of items that touched on the influences of promotion. Five variables created this factor and assessed how childcare and family matters, new shift or assignment, loss of pay, and leadership style affected their decision-making. The “Encouragement Factor” included those measures that covered the approaches used by the supervisors with their subordinates like their role as mentors. It consisted of three survey items. The “Resistance” factor only had two items and focused on the resistance gotten from other female supervisors.

Cronbach’s alpha was again administered to confirm the internal validity of each of the factors created. Post-factor analysis results indicated high reliability coefficients for the factors ranging from .680 to .915 for the three factors generated from the first part of the survey instrument. In the section completed only by supervisors, Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranged from .735 to .888. The created factors, or variables, offer countless opportunities for future research because they should be compatible with multivariate testing techniques.

Limitations

A limitation of this study was the utilization of the members of NAWLEE as a sample pool. Maxwell and Babbie (2012) caution using convenience samples, such as this, as additional bias may be seen in the results. Using a select group like NAWLEE also limits the generalizability of the research to the thousands of female officers who are not members of this organization. Also to consider is that NAWLEE members are accustomed to completing surveys because requests are sent on a regular basis for their involvement in research studies. This familiarity with research participation may result
in some testing effects in that the participants could possibly contribute in a way that other women in law enforcement might not.

Another limitation was the small sample size, which may have affected the external validity of the study. Considering there were only 105 participants included in this research, it would be difficult to take these results and apply them to the over 79,000 female officers in this country (*Uniform Crime Report*, 2013). In other words, additional testing of other women in law enforcement may result in an entirely different set of results. Still, the contribution made by the participants is valuable because there has been so little research in this area.

Restrictions limited participation to those members of NAWLEE who were or had been sworn law enforcement officers. Retired members were allowed to participate because of the valuable experiences they could offer to the study as well as the necessity to connect with as many female officers who had supervisory experience.

**Recommendations for Policy or Practice**

One of the goals of this study was to explore the career experiences of female law enforcement officers in an effort to understand what has kept them from reaching the higher ranks of their agency. What was revealed has important implications for law enforcement organizations as well as current and future female officers in that these findings offer an in-depth look into the life of a policewoman.

**Implications for All Female Officers**

The results of this study revealed what the world of a female officer entails. On a positive note, it was determined that the women of this sample felt accepted by their agency and their co-workers for the most part. They were extremely confident about their work with the public because they felt as effective and competent as male officers
when handling citizen complaints. Recognizing their perceptions of acceptance while working in the community and with other officers should offer administrators reassurance of the female officers’ abilities to be productive and valuable employees.

The sample also revealed that their personal life was not as stressful as one would believe. The women indicated that they had been able to restrict most of the negative influences of their career on their family and health. Those with children, though, indicated higher levels of stress because of increased responsibilities. But, these mothers were adamant that the extra worries did not affect their career or make them want to leave it. The findings indicate that female officers are taking care of themselves and keeping their work away from their life at home. Administrators should take note that women in the ranks do not necessarily bring their personal lives with them to work, just as they appear not to bring their work obligations home with them. Also, current lower-ranking and aspiring female officers should be made aware that a successful career in law enforcement along with having a happy family life is very possible, but they must be particularly determined to make it happen.

Gender issues to the women themselves did not seem to have a significant influence on their career. Basically, as female officers, participants knew that they were violating society’s gender norms and controls and did not seem to be concerned about it. They wanted to work as police officers and were not worried about any pessimistic feedback. All of the women wanted to be seen as a professional, yet some wanted to maintain their femininity. It is apparent that a number of female officers wanted to be seen as true officers, yet not lose their identity as women in the mix of things essentially linking policewoman and policewoman concepts. Understanding women’s unique identity in the law enforcement field, administrators may find themselves in a perplexing
position. While they must recognize the needs of female officers, they must also ensure that the women are treated equally to male officers; it is a balance that must be found, especially with the requirements of the law.

But not all is well for female officers. Despite noting their acceptance, participants still felt different at times. When working in a male-dominated setting, this is understandable, because it is hard to be one of the boys when you are not one. The feeling of being an outsider was so compelling that most reported a hostile work environment as well as working with male officers whom they could not trust. Besides these concerns, the participants indicated how they had to worry about their reputation and being labeled by their male counterparts. Actions like this place a female officer in a very awkward work environment, leaving her to question how much or how little respect her co-workers really have for her. Facing inappropriate comments and publications were also noted by the sample; seeing how male colleagues perceive some women can leave a female officer feeling uncomfortable. Responsibility falls on an agency’s administration to endorse a zero-tolerance policy regarding discriminatory practices, which will define the tone of a department filtering down from the highest ranks to the lowest positions. These policies should not only be currently in place but should also be tirelessly implemented.

Overall, it appears that most of the problems for female officers are not external (e.g. family, children, public) but are from within the department itself. What acceptance has been noted may basically be the result of federal law and judicial mandates, which compel administrators to be tolerant with women in their ranks. This is not to say that there has not been some shift in the attitudes of male officers. Instead, an argument is presented that gender norms and behaviors may have a deeper role in law enforcement
settings. For the women of this sample, it seems that the toughest part of their job is not working with the public or handling family obligations; the hardest part is working in a male-dominated setting.

To improve the workplace environment for policewomen, departments should offer various forms of diversity training that could increase all officers’ knowledge about different groups and, thereby, improve workgroup relations. Also, law enforcement agencies should support off-duty activities, like baseball games or afternoon barbecues, so that the officers could develop the camaraderie needed to perform effectively together while on duty. Holiday gatherings with officers and their families could generate the right type of cohesion to bring male and female officers to the conclusion that they are collectively joined. While zero-tolerance employment policies pressure personnel to follow the law, it may be more advantageous for an organization to strive for their workers to get along because they want to, not just because they have to.

Recruitment efforts should be concentrated toward females, especially those in college settings, because the majority of the participants had either a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree. Information offered should highlight the successes of policewomen as well as present encouraging arguments that counter any reservations an applicant may have. Having one or more female recruiters, especially those holding higher ranks, available for job fairs would be an indication to potential applicants that women are not only accepted, but encouraged to apply; plus, there would be less of an intimidating factor if only male recruiters were present at these settings. Agencies must recognize that one of the ways to improve the minimal representation of women in the upper ranks is to increase their numbers in the lower ranks; that is done by employing more females.
Finally, besides having a recruiting officer, law enforcement agencies may want to consider having a retention officer as well. Considering the investments in their employees, efforts could be concentrated to keep qualified officers, especially women, from leaving their job. For instance, a retention officer could work with a female officer who is having short-term problems (e.g. child care, harassment by a fellow officer) but considering long-term choices to fix it; instead, a solution could be devised, keeping her from resigning her position.

*Implications for Female Supervisors*

This study’s main purpose was to document the experiences of female police supervisors in order to better understand their underrepresentation in the upper echelons of law enforcement agencies. What was discovered was not so much what was missing from their experiences, as what was present. While the female supervisors of this study faced similar problems and worries as other participants, they noted something that is not always seen in the law enforcement field by women; they noted that they had mentors. The sample reported that they were strongly supported by their supervisors, who were mostly men. So even without female mentors to encourage them, the participants saw their potential and advanced to higher ranks. They also felt adequately prepared for their leadership roles and were able to advance as much as they wanted to at their agency. With the support of effective leaders, this finding suggests that female officers can circumvent the negativity, the disrespect, and the stress of working in a male-dominated environment and reach higher ranks.

To increase the number of female officers in supervisory positions, mentoring programs should be developed and led by veteran female officers to assist novice female officers with all of the difficulties of their career. Because most of the pressures of being
a female officer come from the law enforcement organization itself, having someone for
guidance through all of the ups and downs as well as to offer valuable advice could only
seem to benefit the younger officer. How helpful would it be for a new policewoman to
know that she should keep her work away from home and her home away from work?
What about knowing suggestions on how to successfully handle both family and children
while moving up in rank at her department? Or having someone to help her balance the
stresses of being a female in a male-dominated setting? This information could be very
useful, and possibly be what is missing from many agencies that have few females as
supervisors. Having a mentor may be the adjustment needed to transform the
underrepresentation of women in supervisory positions in law enforcement.

Recommendations for Future Research

While there is an adequate amount of research for female law enforcement
officers in general, research on female supervisors in this field is a rarity (Archbold et al.,
2010; Schulz, 2009; Silvestri, 2006). Most of the studies are either outdated or center on
qualitative data. The results of the current study offered some quantitative analyses, but,
with the assortment of item topics, multivariate techniques were not able to be performed.
Still, there were a number of areas identified where future research could be centered in
order to understand the results more thoroughly.

The first area was the finding that officers from the Midwest and South were more
likely to report of their acceptance by their first male partners than those from the West
and Northeast. It is unknown whether these regions of the country approach law
enforcement with a different perspective or if social expectations contribute. Regardless,
a study conducted in each of the four regions could identify administrative or behavioral
patterns that are not currently understood.
The next matter where additional research was advocated focused on lower-ranking officers (e.g. lieutenant or below) reporting more often of having higher degrees in education than their male counterparts. With the number of criminal justice programs offered throughout the country, it is questionable why this should even be an issue. Is it because females, using their education as a crux, still feel that they need to prove to an agency that they could be a valuable employee? Or is it because females interested in the law enforcement field value education more than males? Emphasis on future research could be geared toward gender and higher education with participants being current law enforcement officers or criminal justice students who want to work in policing.

Previous research documented the resistance encountered by female police supervisors (Cohn, 2000; Wexler & Quinn, 1985). While the participants of this study were more likely to disagree that they were challenged by anyone, this disapproval was documented by less than half of the participants for all four survey items; also, many of them chose to remain neutral on the subject. This could be an indication of an unfamiliar organizational barrier not thoroughly covered by past literature. Especially with the impact that mentoring and acceptance has, the concept of resistance would definitely qualify as an area needed to be reviewed in future studies on female police supervisors. Understanding this may be another piece of the puzzle in comprehending their underrepresentation.

Also, the question of the existence of two different types of law enforcement organizations was mentioned, as there were a number of survey items that were nearly equally split in approval/disapproval responses. Future research could help to explain why participants were divided in their responses on their need to act rough and tough as well as in their perception about the different career experiences of male and female
officers. In addition, a look into understanding why nearly half of them disagreed to having more negative work experiences, while nearly that same amount mentioned that they had more workplace stress. Not even a majority of participants indicated that they were supported by their agency during the promotion process. Why is there such a sharp contrast in these results, which cover some very critical questions? Subsequent examination could determine if the theory of two different law enforcement types is factual or not.

Identified in this study were two areas of demographics, categorized as a type of agency and education, noted as having a number of distinctive relationships. Participants working for a municipality reported having fewer health problems as well as lower work-home-child stress than those working for a sheriff’s office, state agency, or federal agency. Additional research could determine how these agencies differ in their management approach and which offer the most effective model. This could mean a more positive work setting and an upsurge in the number of women working at each of these departments.

The research uncovered the significance of higher education, especially those with a Master’s degree or greater. This group of participants specified some key aspects of their job that were not always positive in nature. For instance, those with advanced degrees were more likely to note that they felt different and were enduring an entirely different career experience in comparison to their male counterparts. It appears that having a Master’s degree, doctoral degree, or law degree may actually have drawbacks for women in law enforcement. Considering that the majority of participants (47%) had Master’s degrees, subsequent study should be directed into understanding this
phenomenon because it may be another reason why female officers do not want to participate in the promotion process, thereby further explaining their underrepresentation.

Prior to the exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in this study, the survey items were too broad in subject area and had no cohesiveness. After EFA, these items were reduced into practicable independent factors, which were shown to be reliable using a Cronbach’s alpha procedure. With the created factors, multivariate analysis, such as a multiple regression model, can now be performed.

A qualitative aspect could be added to enhance the data gathered and to offer a more in-depth and personal look at female police supervisors and their experiences. This may also help with understanding the inconsistencies that exist within some of the topic areas. Because it seems that some of the participants of this study were torn between choices in regard to their perception about certain issues, a qualitative approach may provide the route needed for clarification to be formulated.

Finally, a follow-up study utilizing a random sample could be attempted in order to improve generalizability. Finding female police supervisors might be problematic, but it could be done. Although this effort would be time-consuming, as well as costly, it would be important to confirm the validity and reliability of the research. With the futile amount of current research available on female police supervisors, any attempt to gather information is valuable.
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SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Consent Form

The research project centers on the experiences of female law enforcement officers and their advancement into the upper ranks of an organization. The research is being conducted by Jennifer Taylor, a doctoral student at The University of Southern Mississippi (USM). The survey questions will cover various areas that you as a female officer may have experienced at one point or another in your career. You have been invited to participate in this project because you are a member of NAWE.

Your participation is voluntary, and, if you do choose to begin the survey, you may withdraw at any time by clicking the "exit this survey" box in the upper right-hand corner. If you decide to complete the survey, you will need approximately 20 minutes to do so.

To protect your confidentiality, no personal identifying information is requested during the survey. Also, your IP address will not be collected.

If you have any questions about this project, please contact the researcher at jennifer.l.taylor@cogeco.usm.edu. This research project is being used for scholarly purposes only and has been approved by USM's Institutional Review Board.

By clicking on the "agree" button below, you are indicating that you have read the above information, that you are at least 18 years of age, and that you agree to voluntarily participate in this study:

1. If you do not wish to participate in this research project, please decline by clicking on the "disagree" button. If you want to participate, please click the "agree" button.

☐ Agree
☐ Disagree
2. Initial Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have felt “different” at times from other officers because I am female.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Acceptance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been the “1st” female of some position or accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Experience in Specialized Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female officers are more likely to be assigned to work in sections that deal with juveniles, domestic violence, or sex crimes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. I have worked...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...in a specialized section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in the juvenile section of my department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...in a section that specializes in sex crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...with the domestic violence unit of our department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I was...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...accepted by the male officers I was first assigned to work with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...accepted by my first male supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...accepted by my department as a full-fledged member when I first joined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...heavily recruited by my department only because I was female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...treated only for diversity purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. I have...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...been just as effective as my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...been just as competent as my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...better communications skills than my male counterparts when dealing with the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...been accepted by the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8. Government Intervention & Influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that more government intervention should be taken to increase the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of female police officers in this country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that affirmative action policies hurt female officers because of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the perceived preferential treatment bestowed upon them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. As a female officer...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... I feel at times that I have violated the gender norms that society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has about women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel that I have been more receptive to the needs of the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than my male counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel that I do not fall under society's attempt to control what a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman should be or do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I have felt at times that my male counterparts did not want me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... I feel that biological differences are the &quot;only&quot; difference between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male &amp; female officers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 10. Effects of decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been labeled in a stereotypical way at some point in my career.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had to worry about my reputation more than my male counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consider my position to be that of a &quot;professional&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to gain the respect of my male patrol partners by acting &quot;tough &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tried to keep my gender from interfering with the duties of my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to maintain my femininity while on duty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Experiences of Female Law Enforcement Officers

### 11. Throughout my career so far, I have...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...had more negative work experiences than my male counterparts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...experienced more workplace stress than my male counterparts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...had more of a hostile work environment than my male counterparts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...been more critically evaluated by my supervisors than my male counterparts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...had fewer promotional &amp; training opportunities than my male counterparts</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 12. Differential Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am enduring an entirely different career experience compared to my male counterparts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used my feminine status at times to get out of job details or to get special treatment.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have struggled to prove that I am equal to male officers.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more education than most of my male counterparts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I come from a lower- to middle-class background.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a harder time passing the initial physical fitness test than my male counterparts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had a harder time in the police academy than my male counterparts.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Working with Policemen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have felt that some male officers really didn't like me working with them</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to figure out which male officers I could trust &amp; which ones I could not</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My male counterparts expressed strong concern in my ability to handle a violent subject.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had to deal with inappropriate jokes, comments, and/or pictures while at work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Pregnancy, Children, and Childcare Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a female officer, I had a hard time deciding if and when I was going to have a child or children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female officers who have children are considered not as “dedicated” to the job by male officers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I have children.

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
## Experiences of Female Law Enforcement Officers

### 16. I am having or had...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...problems finding reliable childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...problems with sick leave from work because of a sick child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...additional stress because of work-home-child obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to plan my pregnancy so that they did not interfere with my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...to consider leaving my job because of problems associated with being a &quot;cop mom&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Experiences of Female Law Enforcement Officers

#### 17. Personal Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have experienced more minor health problems like headaches or stomachaches than my male counterparts.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have higher levels of burnout compared to my male counterparts.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have had difficulties in trying to balance this job and my family/home.</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 18. I am currently in a supervisory position.

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No
## Supervisor's Section

### 19. Road to Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had a mentor who strongly encouraged me with my endeavors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got less respect after I was promoted in comparison to my male counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not treated fairly after my promotion in comparison to my male counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was encouraged by my supervisors to be innovative and think on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been able to advance as much as I want to in rank.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female officers have fewer aspirations after years on the job than male officers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20. When deciding to participate in the promotions process...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...I received strong encouragement from my department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I took into account what my new shift/assignment would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I had to consider childcare and family matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I thought about possible administrative bias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I had to determine if I 'really' wanted to be a supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...I had to consider the loss of pay because of limited overtime hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 21. Glass Ceiling Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I initially had lower aspirations for promotion than my male counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to face more barriers for promotion than my male counterparts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that females are underrepresented in the upper ranks of the law enforcement profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was placed in positions before promotion that adequately prepared me for leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 22. Life as a Female Police Supervisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have had good female role models throughout my career.</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be a mentor for my subordinates.</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I encourage my subordinates to be innovative &amp; think on their own.</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I am as effective as my male counterparts who are leaders.</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be &quot;middle-of-the-road&quot;, not too aggressive and not too kindhearted.</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 23. I get more resistance from...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral Position</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...male supervisors than male subordinates</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...female supervisors than female subordinates</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...female supervisors than male supervisors</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...male subordinates than female subordinates</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
<td>🟦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Number of years as a law enforcement officer.

25. Number of years at current agency.

26. State in which your agency is located.

27. Type of law enforcement agency you work for.

- Municipal Police Department
- County/Parish Sheriff's Department
- State Police Agency
- Federal Enforcement Agency
- Other (please specify)

28. Current Rank:

- Chief of Police or Sheriff
- Deputy Chief of Police or Undersheriff
- Inspector, Commander, Colonel
- Major, Deputy Inspector
- Captain
- Lieutenant
- Sergeant
- Officer, Deputy Sheriff, Corporal
- Other (please specify)

29. Population size your agency serves:

- Rural area
- Less than 2,500
- 2,501 to 10,000
- 10,001 to 25,000
- 25,001 to 50,000
- 50,001 to 100,000
- 100,001 to 250,000
- 250,001 to 500,000
- 500,001 to 1 Million
- Over 1 Million
30. Your Race/Ethnicity:
- African-American
- Asian
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Caucasian
- Hispanic or Latino
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander

Other (please specify):

31. Your Marital Status:
- Single
- Married
- Separated
- Divorced
- Cohabitation
- Widow
- Common law marriage

Other (please specify):

32. Highest level of education:
- High school diploma or GED
- Some college, but no degree
- Associates Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Doctoral Degree
- Law Degree

33. Additional comments are welcomed.
Thank you for your participation.

Your participation is appreciated. Once the research project is complete, findings will be made available to NAWLEE’s Board of Directors and members.
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