Chapter 2

The Changing Law Enforcement Agency: A Microcosm of Society

OVERVIEW

The ethnic, racial, gender, and lifestyle composition of law enforcement agencies is changing in the United States. In this chapter we address the increasingly pluralistic workforce and provide examples of racism and cultural insensitivity within the law enforcement agency. We present suggestions for defusing racially and culturally rooted conflicts and address issues related to women, gay men, and lesbians in law enforcement. The chapter ends with recommendations for all employees who work within a diverse workforce and particularly emphasizes the role of the chief executive.

COMMENTARY

The changing law enforcement environment, both internal and external, is strikingly evident in today’s diverse society:

It would be naïve to say women have finished the gender battle in law enforcement. Women make up a scant 13 percent of major police agencies nationwide, according to the National Center for Women and Policing, a division of the Feminist Majority Foundation. Women do face some unique challenges, including the attitudes of society and of some of their male co-workers and bosses. (“Women Still Underrepresented,” 2003, p. A32)

In what is described as the most comprehensive analysis of women in policing, authorities say women remain grossly under-represented in the ranks; they are routine targets of gender bias and sexual harassment; and they have largely been unable to punch through a virtually bullet-proof glass ceiling. (“Female Cops,” 1998, p. 1)

Last week they celebrated gay pride day at the CIA. The most stuffy and insular of all government institutions, the intelligence community routed out gay employees in the 1950s on the theory that they could easily be blackmailed and therefore pose a security risk. But last week, gay Central Intelligence Agency employees and a busload of employees from the National Security Agency gathered at CIA headquarters in Virginia for the gay pride event, and even the director of the CIA showed up. (“America Accepting Gays Easier,” p. A27)
Eight current or former Secret Service agents who are black charged . . . that
top officials are dragging their feet on ridding the agency of deep-rooted racial
discrimination, which they said has also infected Vice President Al Gore’s pro-

INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 1, we presented the evolution of multicultural communities and the demo-
ographic changes that the United States has experienced in recent decades. The most no-
table demographic changes mentioned involve the increases in racial, ethnic, and
immigrant populations in our country. Diversity is becoming so commonplace in com-
munities that terms such as “majority group” and “minority group” are almost obso-
lete. There has been a negative reaction to the term “minority,” which critics find not
just outmoded, but offensive. The term leaves nonwhites feeling diminished—almost
second-class. The word carries overtones of inferiority and inequity. The word, techni-
cally, is used to describe numerical designations, but over the years, it has come to
have much larger implications.

The range of reactions to these changes by society as a whole is no different from
the range within law enforcement agencies. Members of police communities across the
country have demonstrated both tolerance of and resistance to the changing society and
workforce. Some officers dislike the multicultural workforce and the involvement of
women in policing, although the latter is becoming a nonissue in law enforcement.
They may resent diversity because of their own prejudices or biases. This resentment is
due in part to perceived or actual advantages others receive when competing for law
enforcement positions, either entry level or promotional. In addition, because of past
inept affirmative action hiring (i.e., management rushed to fill quotas but did not focus
on competence), some officers perceive that affirmative action (where still being used)
means the lowering of standards. Indeed, where standards have been lowered, everyone
suffers, especially less-qualified employees hired because of affirmative action. (This
issue is discussed further in Chapter 3.)

Leading positively and valuing the diversity within an agency are the keys to meet-
ing the challenge of policing multicultural communities. As discussed in Chapter 1,
racial and ethnic tensions still exist in the law enforcement community. Agency person-
 nel must first address the conflicts in their own organizations before dealing with com-
 community racial and ethnic problems. For example, in the “Commentary” section of this
chapter there is a reference to accusations of discrimination by eight black Secret Ser-
vice agents. In the article quoted, the journalist continued: “But the Secret Service is in
complete denial and [it is] stonewalling us.” Some agents reported racial harassment
and a hostile work environment. Others said they were “routinely denied” the opportu-
nity to take management training courses that were necessary for promotion. These al-
legations must be addressed on a timely basis or they fester and result in lawsuits, court
injunctions, and unhappy employees who do not remain with the organization.

The action or inaction of police departments determine whether social problems
that manifest themselves in law enforcement agencies are resolved. Across the United
States the national press has reported numerous cases in which police departments did
nothing or took the wrong action. Whether they like it or not, police officers are pri-
mary role models for citizens and are judged by a higher standard of behavior than are
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others. While supervision of police officers is important to ensure that a higher standard of behavior is maintained, no supervision of officers working with the public, no matter how thorough and conscientious, will prevent some officers from violating policies; there simply are too many police officers and too few supervisors. Thus, it is important that police officers have integrity and a stable set of core moral virtues. These virtues must include the ability to remain professional in protecting and serving a diverse public.

As stated in Chapter 1, those concerned with peacekeeping and enforcement must accept the realities of a diverse society, as well as the heterogeneity in their workforce. The irony is that the peacekeepers sworn to uphold laws pertaining to acts of bias sometimes themselves become perpetrators, even with their own peers. If police departments are to be representative of the populations served, police executives must effect changes. These changes have to do with the treatment of peers as well as recruitment, selection, and promotion of employees who have traditionally been underrepresented in law enforcement. The argument (Chapter 1) that the United States has never really been a melting pot applies also to the law enforcement community. In some cases relationships within the law enforcement workplace, especially as diversity increases, are characterized by disrespect and tension. Although many in the police subculture would argue that membership implies brotherhood (and therefore belonging), this membership has traditionally excluded certain groups in both subtle and obvious ways.

CHANGING WORKFORCE

As microcosms of their communities, law enforcement agencies increasingly include among their personnel more women, ethnic and racial minorities, and gays and lesbians. Although such groups are far from achieving parity in most agencies in the United States, advances have been made (see Chapter 3). In many regions of the country, today’s law enforcement workforce differs greatly from those of the past; the profound shift in demographics has resulted in notable changes in law enforcement.

Law Enforcement Diversity: A Microcosm of Society

According to a Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) report, as of June 2000, local police, sheriffs’ offices and State governments in the United States operated 17,784 full-time law enforcement agencies. The total included 12,666 general-purpose local police departments, 3,070 sheriffs’ offices, the 49 primary State law enforcement agencies, 1,376 State and local agencies with a special geographic jurisdiction or special enforcement responsibilities, and 623 constable offices in Texas. Overall, these State and local agencies employed 1,019,496 persons on a full-time basis. This total included 708,022 full-time sworn personnel (69 percent) and 311,474 nonsworn (or civilian) personnel (31 percent) (BJS Report, October 2002). The same report established the overall percentage of racial and ethnic minority-group representation among full-time sworn personnel nationwide as of June 2000. The percentage of change in minority representation between 1990 and 2000 was as follows:
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- Among local police officers, minority representation increased from 14.5 percent to 22.7 percent.
- Among sheriffs’ offices, minority representation increased from 13.4 percent to 17.1 percent.

With increases came a corresponding reduction in the number of white officers and deputies in law enforcement workforces. Exhibits 2.1 and 2.2 provide more details on the percentages by ethnic and racial groups in local police and sheriffs’ departments.

Exhibit 2.1 Female and minority officers in sheriff’s offices, 1990–2000

Exhibit 2.2 Female and minority local police officers, 1990–2000

Some major law enforcement agencies have achieved parity in terms of the percentage of diverse groups in their workforce compared to the percentage in the community; most have not, but the numbers are improving. For example, using a ratio based on the percentage of sworn personnel in local police departments who were members of a racial or ethnic minority relative to the percentage of city residents who were members of that minority group indicates that, on average, police departments in large cities were slightly more representative of the cities they served in 2000 than in 1990. From 1990 to 2000, the average ratio increased from .59 to .63 for minorities overall. This means that, on average, police departments in large cities had 63 minority police officers per every 100 minority residents in 2000, compared to 59 for every 100
in 1990. For blacks or African Americans, the average ratio increased from .64 in 1990 to .74 in 2000, for Hispanics or Latinos from .54 to .56, and for other minority groups (such as Asians and American Indians) from .26 to .37 (BJS, 2002). Law enforcement is still a predominantly white male occupation, and there must be an expansion of efforts in the recruitment, hiring, and promotion of women and people of other races and ethnicities nationwide. This issue is discussed further in Chapter 3.

**Measuring Responsiveness to Diversity**

A manual produced by the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police includes a 10-question checklist and scoring method for law enforcement organizations to determine how responsive they are in adapting to diversity. It is reproduced here (Exhibit 2.3) for use in rating your own agency.

Circle and count the number of initiatives that your police service has undertaken. See how you rate.

1. Are members of ethnic/cultural communities participating in your community and crime prevention programs?
2. Do your programs provide for community input into the development and implementation of local policing programs?
3. Does your organization have a race relations policy that is integrated into your overall mission?
4. Do your patrol officers use foot patrols in areas of high concentrations of ethnic minorities?
5. Do you use translators or interpreters from within your police department or from local immigrant service agencies or ethnic community organizations in your contacts with linguistic minorities?
6. Are your ads and brochures multilingual, and do they depict a multicultural community?
7. Do you have a recruitment campaign that actively targets ethnic and visible minorities?
8. Have your hiring and promotional practices been evaluated to see if they recognize and value knowledge and skills related to community policing, especially with ethnic/cultural communities?
9. Have your in-service training programs dealt with the issue of diversity?
10. Have your officers participated in programs in multicultural or race relations training for trainers?

**Scoring:**

0–3, Don’t panic. The fact that you did the checklist shows that you are interested. Start small, but start today!

4–6, Good start. You are part of a community-based policing movement. You are beginning to tackle some of the issues that face police services in a multicultural environment.

7–9, Well done. It is obvious that you understand and value the benefits of ethnically sensitive and community-based policing. You’re on the right track, keep up the good work!

10, Congratulations. Your challenge is to maintain the momentum and evaluate the effectiveness of your initiatives.


**Exhibit 2.3** How responsive is your organization?
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ETHNIC AND RACIAL ISSUES WITHIN THE WORKFORCE

Racism

Racism within law enforcement agencies has been documented for decades. An African American history display at the New York Police Academy contains the following written account of the experiences of one of the first black officers in the New York Police Department:

Seven years before the adoption of the charter creating New York City, Brooklyn, then an independent city, hired the first black policeman, Wiley G. Overton was sworn in March 6, 1891. . . . His first tour of duty was spent in civilian clothing because fellow officers breaking with tradition refused to furnish him with a temporary uniform. . . . Officers in his section refused to sleep in the same room with him. . . . The officers in the precinct ignored him and spoke only if it was necessary in the line of duty.

The New York Police Department is not alone. Racism can occur in police departments regardless of size or region. The Dallas police strike in 1992, with its racial overtones, polarized the department—cop versus cop. The New York Daily News in 1993 had bold headlines: “Racism on the Job: Black N.J. Troopers Charge Harassment, Bias, and Discrimination” (p. C3). In May 2000, the federal government concluded that there was sufficient evidence of civil rights violations within the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) to file a so-called pattern and practice discrimination suit. The LAPD faced the possibility of intervention by the federal government. The department was warned to make changes in police training and procedures to avoid a lawsuit. Similar accusations could be heard in other communities and state patrols across the nation in reaction to accusations of racial profiling in traffic stops (see Chapter 14) and police brutality directed toward persons of color. Unfortunately, racism has been an issue for decades. In 2003, the highest-ranking Arab American agent in the FBI filed a discrimination lawsuit against the bureau alleging that he was excluded from the investigation into the September 11 attacks and denied promotion because of his ethnicity. As long as racism exists in society, the potential exists for police agencies to reflect these attitudes.

We spoke with several officers from different states about racism in their departments. Those interviewed requested that their names not be included, because they felt they might face repercussions. One African American officer recalled almost coming to blows with a white officer who used a racial slur against him; the use of such slurs was commonplace for the white officer and his friends. A Cuban American officer recounted the story of a nonresistant Latino suspect who was caught in the commission of a minor crime and beaten by the white arresting officers, who used racial epithets. One major city in Massachusetts suspended a deputy superintendent of police for using the word “nigger” directed toward one of his own officers. An African American officer in a large city in Florida was fired after using racial epithets against other blacks in violation of a strict citywide policy. In this particular case, the African American officer’s conduct was reported by another officer at the scene. In yet another city, an African American officer was overheard telling a white prisoner, “Wait until you get to central booking and the niggers get a hold of you.”
Defusing Racially and Culturally Rooted Conflicts

Racism exists within our law enforcement organizations; police are not immune to social ills. One of the greatest challenges for police officers is dealing with their own racism. The first step in addressing the problem is for police department personnel, on all levels, to admit that racism exists rather than denying it. One reads an account, for example, of an African American police officer, off duty or on plainclothes assignments who is an instant suspect in the eyes of some white officers. If this occurs in one city or county, it can occur in another. Police researcher David Shipler, after 2 years of interviews across the country, maintained that he encountered very few black officers who had not been "hassled by white cops.” He was quick to point out, however, that not every white police officer is a bigot and not every police force a bastion of racism; in fact, some agencies have made great strides in improving race relations.

Shipler recommends that law enforcement should combat and defuse racism by using the U.S. Army model developed during a time of extreme racial tension in the military in the early 1970s (“Report Recommends Using Military Model,” 1992, p. A17). Obviously, no model of training will bring guaranteed success and alleviate all acts of prejudice and racism. However, professional groups can build on each other’s attempts, especially when these have proven to be fairly successful. Shipler recognizes that police officers are not identical to soldiers, because the former have constant contact with the public (where they see the worst) and must use personal judgment in dangerous and ambiguous situations. Nevertheless, he suggests that some military approaches are adaptable to law enforcement. According to Shipler, the basic framework for combating and defusing racism in the military has been:

- **Command commitment:** The person at the top sets the tone all the way down to the bottom. Performance reports document any bigoted or discriminatory behavior. A record of racial slurs and discriminatory acts can derail a military career.

- **Training of advisers:** Military personnel are trained at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute in Florida as equal opportunity advisers. The advisers are assigned to military units with direct access to commanders. They conduct local courses to train all members of the unit on race relations.

- **Complaints and monitoring:** The advisers provide one channel for specific complaints of racial and gender discrimination, but they also drop in on units unannounced and sound out the troops on their attitudes. Surveys are conducted and informal discussions are held to lessen racial tensions.

Sondra Thiederman (1991), cultural diversity consultant and author, provides nine tips that will help organizational managers or leaders identify and resolve conflicts that arise because of cultural (not only racial) differences in the workplace. She says that the following guidelines are applicable no matter what cultures, races, religions, or lifestyles are involved:

1. Give each party the opportunity to voice his or her concerns without interruption.

2. Attempt to obtain agreement on what the problem is by asking questions of each party to find out specifically what is upsetting each person.
3. During this process, stay in control and keep employees on the subject of the central issue.

4. Establish whether the issue is indeed rooted in cultural differences by determining:
   a. If the parties are from different cultures or subcultures.
   b. If the key issue represents an important value in each person’s culture.
   c. How each person is expected to behave in his or her culture as it pertains to this issue.
   d. If the issue is emotionally charged for one or both of the parties.
   e. If similar conflicts arise repeatedly and in different contexts.

5. Summarize the cultural (racial, religious, or lifestyle) differences that you uncover.

6. State the negative outcomes that will result if the situation is not resolved (be specific).

7. State the positive outcomes that will result if the situation is resolved (be specific).

8. Negotiate terms by allowing those involved to come up with the solutions.

9. Provide positive reinforcement as soon as the situation improves.

Thiederman’s approach is based on conflict resolution and crisis intervention techniques training that many police and correctional officers receive in either their academy or in-service training. Police department command must encourage the use of conflict resolution techniques by officers of all backgrounds as a way of handling issues prior to their becoming flash points. With professionalism and patience, the use of conflict resolution techniques to reduce racial and ethnic problems will work within both the workforce and neighborhoods.

John Sullivan and Henry DeGeneste, in a July 1997 article for *Fresh Perspectives* (a Police Executive Research Forum publication), wrote:

Police play a pivotal role in the life of communities. As the most visible branch of civil government, police agencies are called on to mitigate and resolve conflict among both groups and individuals. This intimate relationship with conflict resolution and management is a natural extension of the primary police duty to preserve the public peace and prevent crime. The recent focus on community policing and problem solving strengthens these traditional police roles, highlighting the importance of police interaction with the diverse communities they serve. Communities, however, are not static collections of people. Rather, communities are dynamic and constantly changing. The ethnic, social and class composition of nations and individual communities shifts over time.

As a result of allegations of racism against it, the Alameda, California, Police Department developed a series of general orders as one approach to remedy the problem. Violation of the department general orders (DGOs) carries progressive disciplinary ramifications up to and including termination. The general orders deal with control of prejudicial conduct based on race, religion, ethnicity, disability, sex, age, or sexual orientation and are as follows:
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1. **Code of ethics:** Commits to personal suppression of prejudice, animosities, malice, and ill will, as well as respect for the constitutional rights of all persons.

2. **DGO 80-1:** Specifically addresses discrimination and racial remarks and requires courtesy and respect for all persons. It states: “Discrimination or racism in any form shall never be tolerated.”

3. **DGO 80-1:** Requires impartiality toward all persons and guarantees equal protection under the law. Prohibits exhibition of partiality due to race, creed, or influence.

4. **DGO 90-3:** Deals with harassment in the workplace based on race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, disability, marital status, sex, age, or sexual preference. (Chief R. Shields, 1993.)

The Alameda Police Department also produced the following as an in-service training guide and a posted announcement within the agency:

**Alameda Police Department Mortal Sins**

1. Racism, racial slurs, racial discrimination.
2. Sexism, offensive sexual remarks, sexual harassment, sexual discrimination.
3. Discrimination or harassment for sexual orientation.
5. Untruthfulness and falsifications.
6. Unnecessary or excessive force.
7. Use of illegal drugs.

This department sent a clear message to its employees that its leaders will not tolerate discriminatory behavior. The same department adapted a San Diego Police Department attitude assessment survey instrument on perceptions regarding contact with the multicultural community and workforce. The survey instrument is reproduced in Appendix A.

**Police Fraternal Organizations**

Police fraternal, religious, and ethnic organizations offer members social activities, fellowship, counseling, career development, resources, and networking opportunities with persons of common heritage, background, or experience. The New York Police Department, for example, has many clubs, societies, and associations to address the needs of its pluralistic organization. The Irish are represented by the Emerald Society, African Americans by the Guardians Association, Christian officers by Police Officers for Christ, those of Asian or Pacific Islander heritage (which includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino, and Asian Indian officers) by the Asian Jade Society, Italian officers by the Columbia Association, and so on. The police subculture can be a stressful environment, so it is only natural that persons different from the majority workforce members seek emotional comfort zones with those of similar background. Membership in these groups provides emotional sanctuary from the stereotypes, hostility,
indifference, ignorance, or naïveté that members encounter within their organizations and communities.

Occasionally, one hears of criticism within a department or by the public that such organizations actually highlight the differences between groups of people. At a National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE) conference, a white female (nonattendee) asked the meaning of the acronym NOBLE. When given the answer, she asked: “Is it ethical for blacks to have their own organization? Could whites have an organization called the ‘National Organization of White Law Enforcement Executives’ without being referred to as racists? Why can’t the multicultural, social, and professional organizations that already exist satisfy the needs of everyone?”

The woman’s concern was brought up directly with one of the conference participants, Sergeant Thomas Hall, an African American, who at the time was a Virginia state trooper. Sergeant Hall explained:

In America, we need independent black institutions...to foster cultural pride, and have a place where we can go and feel comfortable. We cannot express ourselves in society. We cannot assimilate in society. We cannot even assimilate like some Hispanic groups can because of their complexions. I can’t assimilate on a bus. As soon as I step on the bus, you are going to realize there is a black guy on the bus. I can’t assimilate in a police organization... so without these black institutions, I cannot survive. We all have survival mechanisms. I have cultural needs and I have to be around people that share my needs and frustrations. I cannot do that in organizations that are predominantly white. The whites don’t suffer from the racial pressures and tensions that I suffer from. So how can they [mostly white organizations] meet my interests and needs? It is impossible. (Hall, 1992)

Hall stressed that African American law enforcement organizations provide him with a network of persons with similar interests, concerns, and backgrounds.

The racial, ethnic, religious, and lifestyle organizations within law enforcement are not meant to divide but, rather, to give support to groups that traditionally were not accepted in law enforcement fully and had no power in the organization. Yet the sentiment expressed by the white female who inquired into the meaning of NOBLE is a common sentiment among some police officers. Police command officers and supervisors must not ignore this debate (whether expressed or not). They must address the issues underlying the need for the support groups within the department. They must also foster dialogue and shared activities between all formalized groups within the organization. All officers must hear from the officers of different ethnic, racial, and lifestyle perspectives what benefit they receive from membership in the groups. Officers must be willing to discuss ways to guard against divisiveness, either real or perceived, within their agencies.

**Assignments Based on Diversity**

There has been limited research on the assumption that an increase in the proportion of any underrepresented group in a police agency would have a positive effect in the community. Some believe that an increase in Hispanic, African American, or Asian
officers in a neighborhood of the same race or ethnicity would improve police-community relations. The same argument could be made regarding gay and lesbian officers. One can speculate that there would be a more sensitive response of “like folks” who are aware of needs and issues of “their kind.” In fact, historically, immigrants (Irish, Italians, and Germans) were hired by police departments because they could communicate and operate more effectively than could nonimmigrant officers in neighborhoods with immigrants.

Although citizens appreciate having officers of their own color or national origin work their area, this deployment strategy may result in unfairness. Studies have concluded that this practice can result in a career path for minorities that may be a very different path than that of white officers in agencies that follow this practice (Benson, 1992; Ross, Snortum, & Beyers, 1982; Wells, 1987). For example, instead of receiving specialized assignments in traffic, investigations, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team, and so on, the minority officer who is working effectively in the minority community may have an extended tour of duty in that function. In addition, the area to which this officer is assigned is often a tougher, high-crime area, which means that he or she is exposed more frequently to violence.

Officers of the same background as the predominant ethnicity or race in the neighborhood do not necessarily make the best crime fighters or problem solvers there. Not all racially or ethnically diverse officers may have the skills or desire to work with their own cultural or racial group. Assignments based on diversity alone, therefore, are generally unfair and may be a disservice to both the officer and the neighborhood. Officers should not be restricted to work in specific areas based on the notion that police-community relations will improve automatically. In addition, it cannot be assumed that an officer of the same background as the citizens will always show sensitivity to their particular needs.

Ron Hampton, a Washington, D.C., peace officer and executive director of the National Black Police Officers Association, illustrated this point at a 1992 NOBLE conference when he discussed the reasons why a new African American recruit wanted to work the black areas of Washington, D.C. The recruit said that he could tell people of his own race what to do and could not always do so in predominantly white neighborhoods. Hampton noted that the young recruit “called people from his neighborhood ‘maggots.’ ” Hampton made the point that supervisors must hold subordinates accountable for their conduct, and the chief executive must make it known that inappropriate behavior will be disciplined no matter what the neighborhood. We present this example here also to illustrate how some officers may have internalized the hatred society has directed toward them and, consequently, are not automatically the most effective officers in certain neighborhoods.

When Chief Robert Burgreen was the top executive of the San Diego Police Department, he, like many other law enforcement managers, did not deploy officers according to color or ethnicity. Deployment was based on the best fit for the neighborhood and was related to an officer’s competence and capabilities. However, Chief Burgreen had four community relations sergeants, one acting as a liaison for each major group in the city: Hispanic, African American, Asian, and gays and lesbians. He describes these sergeants as his “eyes and ears” for what is going on in the various communities. Some cities use cultural affairs committees made up of people from diverse groups in the community and the officers who provide them service.
WOMEN IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

Historically, women have always been part of the general workforce in American society, although usually in jobs that fulfilled traditional female employment roles, such as nurses, secretaries, schoolteachers, waitresses, and flight attendants. In 1845 New York City hired its first police “matron.” In 1888 Massachusetts and New York passed legislation requiring communities with a population over 20,000 to hire police matrons to care for female prisoners. According to More (1992), during the first half of the 19th century a number of police practices were challenged, thus allowing for the initial entry of women into the police field. In 1922 the International Association of Chiefs of Police passed a resolution supporting the use of policewomen. The first major movement of women into the general workforce occurred during World War II. With men off to war, women entered the workforce in large numbers and successfully occupied many nontraditional employment roles. After the war, 30 percent of all women continued working outside the home (*History of Woman in Workforce*, 1991, p. 112). By 1990 almost 55 percent of women in the United States worked outside the home.

Barriers to female entry into the police field, however, included separate entrance requirements, limits on the number of women who could be employed, and lower pay (More, 1992). Women police officers were given duties that did not allow or require them to work street patrol. Assignments and roles were limited to positions such as juvenile delinquency and truancy prevention, child abuse, crimes against women, and custodial functions (Bell, 1982). It was not until 1968 that the Indianapolis Police Department made history by assigning the first two female officers to patrol on an equal basis with their male colleagues (Schulz, 1995). This delay was due, in part, to role perceptions. The predominant belief is that law enforcement agencies function to exercise authority and use force is accompanied by the idea that women are not capable of performing the necessary functions.

In 1972 the passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Act applied to state and local governments the provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The EEO Act prohibited employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Selection procedures, criteria, and standards were changed or eliminated and/or made “job related.” The law played an important role in opening up police departments to women. Adoption of affirmative action policies, now illegal in many states, along with court orders and injunctions, also played a role in bringing more women into law enforcement.

Considering how long organized police departments have existed in the United States, women entered relatively late into sworn law enforcement positions within them. A 1986 Police Foundation study reported the following findings: “In those agencies under court order to increase the representation of women and minorities, women made up 10.1 percent of the sworn personnel in 1986; in those with voluntary affirmative action policies, women made up 8.3 percent of the personnel; and, in those without affirmative action plans, women constituted only 6.1 percent of the personnel” (Martin, 1990, p. 1).

The number of women in law enforcement remains small and is increasing very slowly. The most recent research shows that nationally only 14.3% of sworn personnel are female, with an annual increase of only 0.5% over the last several years (National Center for Women and Policing, 2001). At this rate, women will not achieve parity.
within the police profession for at least another 70 years, and many have cautioned that time alone is not sufficient to substantially affect this rate (Garrison, 1998). Researchers in the late 1980s had made various predictions of the numbers of women expected to be in law enforcement professions by the turn of the 21st century, ranging from 47 to 55 percent of the workforce, but those predictions never materialized. The Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) report, issued by the U.S. Department of Justice in 2001, established the overall percentage change of sworn women in local and sheriffs’ departments nationwide for the 10 year period from 1990 to 2000 (see Exhibits 2.1 and 2.2) as follows:

- Local women police officers increased from 8.1 percent to 10.6 percent.
- Women sheriffs’ deputies decreased from 15.4 percent to 12.5 percent.

The reason for the decrease (1,200 women officers, or 5.5 percent) in the number of women sheriffs’ deputies has not been explained by any research known to the authors, but hypotheses are suggested in Chapter 3.

McCoy (1992) conducted enlightening research that is still useful to law enforcement executives today. His study concluded that, at the time of his research, the organizational structure of most police departments did not support a positive work environment for policewomen. He recommended that police executives create an organizational culture that values the diversity of women within law enforcement, one that recognizes the complex role and competing interests that policewomen face in society and in the workplace. Such an environment would not view women as an intrusion into the male-dominated profession of law enforcement, but instead would appreciate that the personal traits that women bring to law enforcement will foster a more service-oriented approach to the organization and a more flexible approach to the policing ranks. His recommendations included the creation of support programs for women in policing to assist in family responsibilities, including child care, the development of mentoring and network programs, and specific programs designed to reduce stress created by gender-related issues.

In November 1998 the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) released the results of a study it had commissioned entitled “The Future of Women in Policing.” The stated purpose of the survey was to query IACP members on their perspectives and opinions about the following issues:

- Status and roles of women in policing.
- Recruitment and selection of women officers.
- Supporting and mentoring women officers.
- Training and supervision as correlates of tenure, success, and promotion of women officers.
- Attrition and resignation of women officers.
- Gender discrimination and sexual harassment.
- Whether a glass ceiling exists as a barrier to promotions.
- Future directions for women in policing.

The study confirmed that although the number of women in law enforcement is growing and women are progressing through the ranks, the following are also true:
• There are fewer women than men in policing.
• Women officers still face bias from male officers.
• Many departments lack strategies for recruiting women.
• Women officers may face gender discrimination and a glass ceiling that inhibits promotion.
• Sexual harassment still occurs in many departments.
• Although the need is great, there are very few mentoring programs for women officers.

According to research conducted both in the United States and internationally, studies:

. . . demonstrate that women police officers rely on a style of policing that uses less physical force. They are better at defusing and de-escalating potentially violent confrontations with citizens and less likely to become involved in problems with use of excessive force. Additionally, women officers often possess better communication skills than their male counterparts and are better able to facilitate the cooperation and trust required to implement a community-policing model. In an era of costly litigation, hiring and retaining more women in law enforcement is likely to be an effective means of addressing the problems of excessive force and citizen complaints. As an additional benefit, female officers often respond more effectively to incidents of violence against women—crimes that represent one of the largest categories of calls to police departments. Increasing the representation of women on the force is also likely to address another costly problem for police administrators—the pervasive problem of sex discrimination and sexual harassment—by changing the climate of modern law enforcement agencies. Because women frequently have different life experiences than men, they approach policing with a different perspective, and the very presence of women in the field will often bring about changes in policies and procedures that benefit both male and female officers. All of these factors can work to the advantage of those in the police profession and the communities they serve. (National Center for Women & Policing, 2001)

The integration of women into policing has led many chief executives to grapple with gender issues within their departments.

Gender Issues

Research on gender issues confronting women in law enforcement focus on discrimination and sexual harassment, role barriers, the “brotherhood,” a double standard, differential treatment, and career versus family.

Discrimination and Sexual Harassment. Although sexual harassment exists in both private and public sectors, we believe it is particularly problematic in law enforcement—an occupation that is still mostly male. The predominantly male makeup and macho image of law enforcement lead to problems of sexual harassment in the workplace. Harassment on the basis of sex is a violation of Section 703 of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (29CFR Section 1604.11[a][1]) and is defined as unwelcome or unsolicited sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:
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- Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly, or implicitly, a term or condition of an individual’s employment; or
- Submission to, or rejection of, such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or
- Such conduct has the purpose, or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

The majority of women officers interviewed for this book (who requested that their names not be used) said they had been sexually harassed in the workplace. Few of the recent national studies on sexual harassment have examined sexual harassment in police agencies, but those that have done so indicate that the problem is pervasive. In a 1995 survey of female officers in a medium-sized department, 68 percent responded “yes” to the question, “Have you ever been sexually harassed while on duty by a member of your agency?” (Nichols, 1995). Most of the women indicated that when they were exposed to offensive behavior by male officers, they remained quiet for fear of negative male backlash. Those interviewed revealed that sexual harassment occurs at all levels of an organization and is not limited to male harassment of women. Women, too, can be offenders when they initiate sexual jokes or innuendoes and use provocative language with men. This kind of behavior usually results in men countering in a similar fashion, which contributes to and escalates the problem. In these instances, women must be held accountable. The questions of what is offensive and where the line should be drawn are frequently the central issues and must be addressed. Rather than simply stating, “We don’t have a harassment problem here,” command officers must first model acceptable behavior and then set very clear guidelines for what constitutes acceptable behavior.

Department executives must institute a zero-tolerance sexual harassment policy and send that message throughout the department. Police-specific training must also be provided on sexual harassment and its prevention. Some departments have revised their promotional exam to include questions on the department’s sexual harassment policies and procedures. The Albuquerque, New Mexico, Police Department went so far as to move the investigation of sexual harassment complaints from within the department to an external city agency with expert Equal Employment Opportunity investigators on staff. According to Albuquerque PD, this approach tends to speed up the process, ensure impartiality, and increase confidence in the procedures. Officers who make a complaint do not have to go through the chain of command. Also of value, the Institute for Women in Trades, Technology and Science (IWITTS) developed an 8-hour police-specific training course for sworn supervisors on preventing sexual harassment. It is presented in a case-study format that analyzes police legal cases, and has been highly rated by those who have attended. IWITTS can be found on their website, listed in the “Website Resources” section of this chapter.

When harassment takes place, the results can be devastating in terms of the involved employees’ careers, the internal environment of the organization, and the department’s public image. The importance of training all law enforcement employees (sworn and nonsworn) on the issues of sexual harassment cannot be stressed enough. With policies and procedures as well as training, sexual harassment is expected to decrease in the law enforcement workforce as the once male-dominated occupation...
makes its transition to mixed-gender, multiethnic, and multilifestyle organizations—a microcosm of the society served. Discrimination and sexual harassment training should deal not only with legal and liability issues but also with deep-seated attitudes about differences based on sex.

**Role Barriers.** Barriers based on gender have diminished, both in the general population and within law enforcement. For example, ideas about protection differ by gender—who protects whom? In American society, women may protect children, but it has been more socially acceptable and traditional for men to protect women. In the act of protecting, the protectors become dominant and the protected become subordinate. Although this gender-role perception has not completely broken down, especially in the law enforcement and corrections workforce, it is subsiding due to the number of women and young male officers in law enforcement today. There are now fewer veteran male officers who have never worked with women. Many veteran police and correctional officers initially had difficulty with the transition as women came into the dangerous, male-dominated occupations that men felt required “male” strength and abilities. The result has been described as a clash between cultures—the once male-dominated workforce versus the new one in which women are integral parts of the organizational environment. The veteran male police or correctional officers, socially conditioned to protect women, often feel that in addition to working with inmates or violent persons on the streets, they have the added responsibility of protecting the women officers with whom they work. These feelings, attitudes, and perceptions can make men and women in law enforcement positions uncomfortable with each other. Women sometimes feel patronized, overprotected, or merely tolerated rather than appreciated and respected for their work. Again, these attitudes and perceptions are diminishing as many in the new generation of male officers are more willing to accept women in law enforcement. In our numerous interviews with veteran officers we found that, with few exceptions, women were generally accepted by men, but the acceptance was related to how well a specific woman performed her duties. Those who favored women in law enforcement recognized that even some men were not suited for such an occupation.

The Christopher Commission, assigned to investigate the LAPD in the wake of the Rodney King beating, observed that although female officers in the department were performing effectively, they were still not fully accepted as part of the workforce on an equal basis (Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department, 1991). Another one of its conclusions was that women officers are better equipped to peacefully resolve situations of potential violence. None of the 120 LAPD officers who were most frequently charged with excessive use of force were women. Women’s advocacy groups and law enforcement administrators also say that female officers get involved in fewer physical confrontations than male officers. Women officers tend to be good communicators, which is a prized attribute in any police employee because of the current emphasis on community policing. In this regard, women prove themselves to be as effective as male officers.

**The Brotherhood.** Women who are accepted into the “brotherhood” of police or correctional officers have generally had to become “one of the guys.” (Refer to Chapter 4 for more information on how language used in the brotherhood excludes women.) However, a woman who tries to act like one of the guys on the street or in a jail or
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prison is considered too hard, too coldhearted, or too unemotional and may be criticized by peers and supervisors. Karen Kimball, the women’s coordinator in the LAPD, says that she has seen some “Jane Waynes” in the department who swagger, spit and are so aggressive they make many testosterone-charged men seem tame” (“Jane Waynes in Law Enforcement,” 1993, p. A12). If she is too feminine or not sufficiently aggressive, men will not take her seriously and she will not do well in either police or correctional work. Women are confronted with a dilemma: They must be aggressive enough to do the job but feminine enough to be acceptable to male peers, and they must also be able to take different approaches to problems. Pat Ellis, a police officer with the Lothian and Borders Police, headquartered in Edinburgh, Scotland, was a 26-year veteran of the force as of September 2000. Noting that attitudes toward women in policing are the same in Great Britain as in the United States, she described her experience on the force:

I had to work hard at being as good or better than my male counterparts on a daily basis. I also made sure I maintained my feminine side by always looking feminine. Hair done, makeup, perfume. I know a lot of males are really put off by women who not only act like men, but look like them (Ellis, 2000).

When women feel compelled to behave like men in the workplace, the results can be counterproductive and can even result in disciplinary action. To succeed, women have to stay within narrow bands of acceptable behavior and exhibit only certain traditionally masculine and feminine qualities. Walking this fine line is difficult. This phenomenon is not unique to law enforcement. An article on a woman ironworker reported that “today’s female ironworkers are still pioneers. . . . [N]o matter how skilled she becomes, she’s got to prove herself over and over again. ‘What it is, is attitude,’ [one woman ironworker] says. ‘I know that I’m on male-dominated home turf’ ” (“Male Dominated Occupation” 2000, p. A3).

Sue Jones, Chief of Police of the Healdsburg, California, Police Department, says that the term “brotherhood” still exists along with the associated behaviors. She hopes that one day there will be just the “family of law enforcement” (Jones, 2003).

A Double Standard. Interviews with women officers for the first (1995) and second (2002) editions of this book showed clearly that the majority felt they had to perform better than male officers just to be considered equal—a double standard. These women spoke of how they imposed pressures on themselves to perform up to or exceed the expectations of their male peers. (Note that minority employees often express the same sentiment.) One woman officer explained that many women were using a community policing philosophy long before it became the practice of their agency. She mentioned that when she tried to do problem solving, she was criticized in her evaluations. Her supervisor rated her negatively for “trying too hard to find solutions to complainants’ problems” and said she “spends too much time on calls explaining procedures” and “gets too involved” (Jones, 1993). Today, however, women police officers report that the double standard is less common because of the emphasis that law enforcement places on Community-Oriented Policing. Now this approach is seen as the norm and is expected of all officers (Jones, 2003).

Differential Treatment. Many women in law enforcement have indicated that they are treated differently by staff members than are men and they are frequently held back
from promotions or special assignments in areas like Special Weapons and Tactics, homicide investigations, and motorcycles because of the perception that these are “male” jobs. They report feeling that they were also held back from training for these assignments and are not promoted at the same rate as men. A 2002 Census Bureau report indicated that in private corporations, “Women hold nearly half the executive and managerial jobs in the United States, up from only about a third in 1983” (“Women land more top jobs,” 2003, p. A16). This is far from the case in law enforcement.

Police executives must determine if their female officers are receiving opportunities for assignments and training that will provide the groundwork and preparation for their eventual promotion. They need to determine if female officers are applying for promotions in numbers proportionate to their representation in the department. If not, perhaps women officers need encouragement from their supervisors. It is also possible that the promotion process disproportionately screens out female officers. Research shows that the more subjective the process is, the less likely women are to be promoted. The use of assessment center, “hands-on” testing is said to offer some safeguards against the potential for the perception of bias against women. Utilizing structured interviews and selecting interview board members who represent different races and both sexes can also minimize this risk. Many departments are now training interview board members on interviewing techniques. The Institute for Women in Trades, Technology and Science has developed a well-received half-day training session for supervisors, “Creating a Supportive Work Environment,” to address issues of integration and retention of women.

**Career versus Family.** Women in law enforcement are faced with another dilemma—trying to raise a family and have a successful career, two goals that are difficult to combine. Women, especially single parents, who had children when they entered law enforcement frequently find that they have difficulty balancing their commitments to family and work. If they had children after entering the occupation, they may be confronted with inadequate maternity-leave policies. In both cases, women often have a sense of guilt, stress, and frustration in trying to both do well in a job and maintain a family. As an International Association of Chiefs of Police 1998 study indicated, this is one of the top reasons for women leaving the profession. Progressive criminal law enforcement organizations have innovative work schedules, modified duty assignments during pregnancy, child care programs, mentoring and support groups, and a positive work atmosphere for women. Such programs benefit all employees within the organization. Today, men are taking a more active role in parenting and family; therefore, child care, creative work schedules, and even maternity leave should be of importance to them as well.

**Mentor and Support Programs**

A national study of women in law enforcement concluded that policewomen have a significantly higher rate of divorce than do male officers and have a lower rate of marriage as a group than the national female rate (Pogrebin, 1986). Research also revealed that although both male and female officers were affected by burnout, females experienced higher levels of emotional burnout, while males showed higher levels of de-personalizing citizens (Johnson, 1991). As already mentioned, issues of child care,
maternity leave, family responsibilities, flexible work schedules, job sharing, mentoring and support programs, and promotional opportunities are all important to women peace officers and must be addressed adequately by law enforcement agencies. If not, frustration and stress result. Many of these issues are seen as barriers to women and their ability to work and advance in law enforcement. Women’s performance and attitudes can be enhanced if they have access to support and mentoring programs.

Why are mentors important? Marrujo and Kleiner (1992) found that “women who had one or more mentors reported greater job success and job satisfaction than women who did not have a mentor” (p. 13). A mentor is described as an experienced, productive supervisor or manager (usually 8 to 10 years older than the employee) who relates well to a less experienced employee and facilitates his or her personal development for the benefit of both the individual and the organization. Usually, mentoring occurs in a one-on-one coaching context over a period of time through suggestions, advice, and support on the job. Several associations provide an organized voice for the interests of women in policing: the International Association of Women Police (IAWP), the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE), and the National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP). The NAWLEE focuses on helping women to strengthen their leadership roles in policing, while the NCWP focuses on growth and leadership. However, these organizations cannot take the place of departmental, in-house mentoring programs for women. A report (“Advancing Asian Women in the Workplace”) released in 2003 by Catalyst, a nonprofit group that studies women and business trends, stated that Asian-American women face difficult challenges in the workplace. “Many have trouble finding mentors or feel their managers don’t understand their culture” (“Obstacles hinder minority women,” 2003, p. C1). The report mirrors one released earlier in 2003 about Latinas in business. Latinas and Asian American women are among the fastest-growing groups in the U.S. labor force.

In the study, 413 women of Asian decent were broken into two groups—those who grew up in the United States and those who immigrated as adults. Regardless of their acculturation, many said their Asian cultural values are frequently at odds with their ability to successfully navigate the corporate landscape. “We are taught in our culture to let good work speak for itself and that it’s not becoming to bring attention to yourself or your work,” said Quinn Tran. (p. C1)

In both Catalyst surveys, Latinas and Asian American women said they encounter stereotypes in the workplace. Asian women said they often feel overlooked by their companies’ diversity programs, in part, because they are labeled “overachievers” who don’t require specific diversity efforts. Both reports suggest managers should encourage more experienced Asian American women and Latinas to serve as mentors for younger women and make more of an attempt to understand the cultural background of their diverse workforce.

The Transition

A survey containing 43 questions was administered by Seklecki and Allen of the University of Minot randomly to 2,000 female police officers across the United States in 2003. The questions were designed to collect information about employment motivations, experiences and attitudes of women who became law enforcement officers. The
response rate to the scientifically designed survey was approximately 27%. The summary of their findings were:

Our research indicates that female law enforcement officers have made a promising transition from their professional status some thirty years ago. While still a minority, they view themselves quite often as equally, if not more capable than their male peers and upon completion of training, the overwhelming majority of women officers are intent to stay on their present career path. In addition, we must note the perception of working conditions has clearly improved as agencies have become more harassment conscious, while remaining undeniably male influenced. The study respondents confirm the continued presence of the traditional “male behaviors”; however most female officers, surprisingly, do not take great exception to them. This suggests the female officers entered the profession expecting to encounter these behaviors and consider such behavior normal to the work setting.” (2004, p. 39) “A National Survey of Female Police Officers: On Overview of Findings,” A paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Conference in Las Vegas, Nevada, March 2004. Presented by Dr. Richard Seklecki and Dr. Rebecca Allen, Associate Professors, Criminal Justice Department, Minot State University, ND

GAY MEN AND LESBIANS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT

For the purposes of this discussion, the terms lesbian, homosexual, gay, bisexual, and transgender will be used to describe the sexual orientation of underrepresented groups in law enforcement agencies. These terms are defined here as follows: gay: a male homosexual; homosexual: characterized by sexual attraction to those of the same sex as oneself; lesbian: a homosexual woman; bisexual: the ability to be sexually attracted to both men and women. The term transgender covers a range of people, including heterosexual cross-dressers, homosexual drag queens, and transsexuals who believe they were born in the wrong body. There are also those who consider themselves to be both male and female, or intersexed, and those who take hormones and believe that is enough to complete their gender identity without a sex change.

Most authors and police administrators group “gay” and “lesbian” together as if the experiences of the two genders are synonymous. However, nowhere is the dichotomy more visible than within law enforcement. Stemming from persistent sexism, many officers assume that “macho” women are lesbians, and that stereotypically “feminine” women are heterosexual, although such mapping of gender roles onto sexual orientation is frequently erroneous. This is discussed later in this chapter.

Policy versus Practice

As the issue of sexual orientation has come of age in the public consciousness, due in part to movies and television shows (such as Will & Grace and HBO’s Six Feet Under, which featured a gay police officer), so have gay and lesbian individuals become more willing to stand up against discrimination. Fearful of litigation and negative publicity, most police agencies have removed discriminatory language from their hiring criteria. However, most law enforcement administrators have maintained the ban on hiring gay men and lesbians, some covertly. Consider the following:
The Dallas, Texas, Police Department, which was sued for refusing to hire a qualified woman who was a lesbian, continues to ask applicants if they have ever had sex in a public place. While this question is lawful, the follow-up is a query where male applicants are asked if the “girl” they had sex with was at least 18 years of age. (Grobeson, 2003)

The Los Angeles Police Department, which was repeatedly sued for antigay discrimination between 1988 and 1996, continued throughout 2000 to ask male applicants about drugs that were specifically used within the gay community (inhalant “poppers” with names such as “locker room”). The LAPD also asked “the nature of the relationship” with roommates who were of the same gender. (Grobeson, 2000)

Many law enforcement agencies give the public impression of nondiscrimination, but in fact discriminate by disqualifying lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender applicants. (Grobeson, 2003)

The past decade has seen the removal of the explicit ban against the hiring of gay men and lesbians by most law enforcement agencies. Despite this apparent dramatic paradigm shift, the reality remains that the vast majority of law enforcement agencies, including those within many urban areas with large, openly gay populations, find ways to surreptitiously avoid hiring openly gay men. To a lesser extent, this includes openly lesbian individuals. Some law enforcement agencies have used sodomy laws to disqualify applicants for being individuals with a “propensity” to violate the law. On June 26, 2003, the United States Supreme Court issued a ruling regarding the 1998 arrests by Houston police officers of two men engaged in consensual sexual activity in the privacy of their own bedroom. The ruling overturned the sodomy laws of the 13 states that still had such laws on the books, stating that they violated the constitutional right to privacy.

The rejection of homosexuals in law enforcement by some agencies continues despite recent studies that have shown that the presence of openly lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender personnel enhanced service, and did not negatively impact morale or unit cohesion, in integrated police departments (e.g., San Diego Police Department; Belkin & McNichol, 2002) and armed forces (e.g., Israel, Britain, and Australia; Belkin & McNichol, 2002).

**Public Relations versus Recruitment**

According to Grobeson, many urban law enforcement agencies engage in public relations campaigns as substitutes for actual recruitment efforts. His observation is that many city or county personnel departments place recruitment advertisements in the gay and lesbian media or assign officers to attend gay and lesbian events such as gay pride festivals. However, he believes that these agencies are only providing “lip service” while avoiding actual recruitment. Law enforcement administrators seeking to have a workforce on parity with their community need to be cognizant of artificial barriers. To ensure equal opportunity, it is important to conduct applicant tracking, in which applicant information is taken at an event, and contact with the applicant is maintained to determine if the applicant is hired or where in the process he or she is disqualified. If a disproportionate number of these applicants are failing during a specific part of the hiring process, such as oral interviews, background investigations, or polygraph exams,
then administrators must be able to capture this information starting from the original point of contact. Further, this approach can help determine if funding for these events or advertisements is an effective use of resources.

Other areas to monitor to determine if a department provides equal opportunity are the number of openly gay officers who voluntarily participate in events with the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities and the number who are willing to be named when interviewed by the mainstream media. Department personnel who cite numbers of gays and lesbians on a police force are usually viewed skeptically by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community organizations.

The Controversy

Some police officers view openly gay and lesbian individuals as extremist militant types who publicly display their sexuality in offensive or socially unacceptable ways. This is a stereotype; the majority of heterosexuals do not draw attention to their sexual preference, and neither do most homosexuals. Concerns about homosexuals in the military or in law enforcement include beliefs that gay soldiers or police officers will walk hand in hand, dance together at clubs, make passes at nongay colleagues, and display aspects of their private lives (as well as seek benefits for gay marriages). These arguments for bans are not based in reality, however, since the majority of gays in the military and the criminal justice system are as work-oriented as their heterosexual colleagues. They do not wish to provoke anyone in the system; rather, like the majority of other officers, homosexual officers want to accomplish their missions, work special assignments, promote and avoid confrontation. In fact, gay and lesbian officers and military personnel are much less likely than their heterosexual counterparts to engage in even such mundane acts as putting a picture of their partner on their desk or posted inside their locker. Gay and lesbian officers are no different from others in wanting to support the disciplinary processes, and they believe that any inappropriate conduct should be handled with proper discipline. Research on the subject of homosexuals in the military and in law enforcement at the beginning of the 21st century concluded that the presence of gays and lesbians has not caused morale to drop in either setting. The research also determined that there were no negative consequences in urban police departments that adopt nondiscrimination statutes and actively recruit and hire homosexual officers. One comprehensive study of gays and lesbians in a large police agency was designed to discover whether the integration of open gay and lesbian officers has undermined the organizational effectiveness of the San Diego Police Department (SDPD).

Based on an analysis of prior research and a 3-day site visit, our findings are that a quiet process of normalization has reduced much of the emotional charge that heterosexual officers originally anticipated. Although integration has proceeded largely uneventfully, subtle forms of discrimination do persist, and gay officers who do not already enjoy respect may face challenges. Despite these uneven effects, integration has enhanced cohesion as well as the SDPD's standing with the communities it serves. (Belkin & McNichol, 2002, p. 63)

The report indicates that the integration of gay men and lesbians into law enforcement has been similar to the earlier experiences of women and minorities: Initial reactions among officers within the organization and some prominent community members were
often negative, and longstanding work cultures were slow to change (Belkin & McNichol, 2002). Research on police culture through the early 1990s depicts a work environment that was seeking to reinforce traditional notions of masculinity and describes casual remarks ridiculing or stereotyping homosexuals as being commonplace in formal and informal settings (Belkin & McNichol, 2002, p. 64). The report’s key finding is that

... the increasing participation of self-disclosed homosexuals in the SDPD has not led to any overall negative consequences for performance, effectiveness, recruiting, morale, or other measures of well-being. Even though incidents of harassment and discrimination continue and new internal tensions have arisen concerning the integration of homosexuals, self-disclosed gay personnel, their peers and commanders, and outside observers all agree that disruptive incidents continue to decline in frequency and are usually handled effectively through both informal and formal channels. (Belkin & McNichol, 2002, p. 65)

The researchers noted that complaints by gay and lesbian officers at the San Diego Police Department about harassment or discrimination are extremely low, resulting in underestimates of the actual number of occurrences. They hypothesize that the low number is related to the fact that closeted personnel fear being identified as gay and are reluctant to complain. The study also suggests, however, that another reason might be that, like most departments, the work culture of the SDPD strongly emphasizes the informal and discreet resolution of problems at the unit level. According to the study, the number of self-described gay and lesbian officers in the department has grown from about five in 1992 up to 50 out of 2,100 in 2003, scattered among patrol, investigations, the SWAT team, community relations, and training. The report concludes that

... concern over working with openly gay men and lesbians has subsided as day-to-day interactions with gay colleagues become more commonplace. In many divisions, for straight and gay people alike, sexual orientation issues are relatively unimportant vis-à-vis the daily challenges of being a cop. Although isolated comments and misconduct may occur, the professional working environment and strong support for equal treatment from headquarters tend to diffuse their frequency and significance. ... Virtually all respondents believe that the increasing, taken-for-grantedness [sic] of gay cops reflects in part the more tolerant values of new recruits coming into the department. Younger cohorts of recruits have brought with them more diverse views and greater comfort levels with gay issues than in years past, and EEO policies and training programs are allowing for more candid give-and-take as recruits wrestle with uncertainties over how to work with gay people. (Belkin & McNichol, 2002, p. 76)

Differences in Treatment of Gay versus Lesbian Officers

Many law enforcement professionals have voiced opinions that, because of the “macho” requirements of police work, a double standard exists with respect to the way gay and lesbian officers are viewed. The traditional male dominance of the profession has made it difficult for many male officers to accept that women or gay men are equally able to perform the same tasks they do. They view their work as an occupation for only the “strongest and the toughest.” Male officers’ self-esteem can be threatened by the ability of women and gay men to do “their” job. (This issue is discussed further in this chapter under “Women in Law Enforcement.”)
According to Grobeson, there has been a trend of acceptance of “macho” lesbians into law enforcement. Many male officers are more accepting of lesbian officers, particularly those who are not openly homosexual, than they are of heterosexual women. It appears that male officers are more fearful that “feminine” women will not provide them with sufficient backup where physicality is required. They are more willing to rely on lesbian officers, whom they stereotype as being macho and athletic. Grobeson believes that there is still a great deal of discrimination directed toward women who break the cultural mores and choose to be open or apparent about their sexual orientation.

In addition, the pervasive stereotype of gay men as effeminate remains a factor in most officers’ bias against the hiring of and working with gay men. Allowing openly gay men to serve as officers is perceived by many as threatening to the “macho” image of police work: if a gay man can successfully complete the necessary tasks, their job is therefore less “macho.” Further, those officers whose self-image is based on their job, perceiving themselves as “John Wayne,” are generally the most uncomfortable with the concept of working with gay officers.

Significantly, within those urban agencies that actively seek to hire gay men and lesbians, lesbians are frequently used to insulate management against accusations of discrimination and homophobia. When gay men are disqualified, their background investigations are often conducted by lesbian (or “butch” women perceived to be lesbian) officers. The same holds true for gay officers accused of misconduct; invariably a lesbian investigator, or if none are in the agency, then a woman, usually from a minority group, will be used to conduct or participate in the disciplinary process.

Grobeson asserts that gay men are relegated to the least desirable status of any minority group in terms of acceptance in police culture. Homophobic jokes and nicknames, for example, are still prevalent locker room banter, whereas racial epithets have been mostly eliminated. One stereotype characterizes effeminate men as unworthy of trust as partners, despite the fact that many gay officers are military combat veterans with awards and accolades for bravery, heroism, and service under fire. For example, many gay officers in New York and San Francisco have received medals for their valor (“Policeman with Pride,” Cybersocket, 2000). Officers suspected of being gay are often teased, belittled, or openly harassed with little or no intervention from supervisors or managers. Some newly hired gay officers have reported that they believe it is important to stay “in the closet” until they have proven to their peers and supervisors that they are effective officers.

Gay officers often identify more readily with their fellow officers than they do with members of the gay community. Even as late as 2000, many gay men and lesbians viewed law enforcement as society’s arm of social control. With many law enforcement officers still hostile toward gay men and lesbians, gay officers are forced to choose a side, particularly when it comes to the issue of vice enforcement. Therefore, gay and lesbian officers are often accepted neither by the gay community nor by their peers.

The Transition

Problems will inevitably surface within law enforcement agencies as gay and lesbian officers “come out of the closet.” Many organizations and employees will be hesitant to welcome such a major change, and may resist it unless measures are taken to allay their fears. Officers thought to be or who are openly gay or lesbian may encounter
discriminatory treatment and/or hostility because of other employees’ negative stereotypes and attitudes. People without proper education on acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), for example, may be afraid of AIDS transmission. This and other fears may mean that gay men will have an even more difficult time in assimilating into departments than ethnic or racial minorities, heterosexual women, or lesbians.

Gay and lesbian officers are often placed in a position of having to prove themselves on the job. This may be through a physical confrontation with an arrestee or a test that includes confidential information regarding the personal conduct of patrol officers. As openly gay and lesbian officers are recruited and hired, however, the organizational comfort level will undoubtedly become more tolerant. Individual and group prejudices and assumptions, for example, will be challenged. Law enforcement agencies should have written policies to assist gay and lesbian officers’ transition into the department as well as operational plans to promote employee acceptance of these officers.

Because of the small number of openly gay and lesbian officers in law enforcement, there are currently no policies dealing specifically with inappropriate displays of sexuality; obviously, discipline would have to be applied equally to both gay and lesbian and heterosexual officers who behave unprofessionally. Among gay and lesbian law enforcement officers, however, there is a strong desire to conform to the norms of the organization and to prove their worth as members of that organization. They seldom engage in behaviors that would challenge those norms or shock or offend fellow officers.

These new challenges confronting law enforcement must be addressed in a timely manner. Otherwise, agencies will be ill prepared to deal with the complex, controversial issues that are certain to arise, nor will they be able to address the negative attitudes of certain officers.

Policies against Discrimination and Harassment

Unfortunately, there have been many incidents in which gay and lesbian officers have been subjected to discrimination or harassment by fellow officers. A few examples follow:

A gay Manhattan Beach, California police sergeant sued the city and police chief alleging that the chief told another senior officer, “Don’t send that fag an application” when an openly gay man sought to join the force. The night after making a complaint against a fellow officer, someone threw three steaks laced with strychnine over the fence of the sergeant’s home, poisoning his cocker spaniel. Then, the tires of his personal car were slashed while in the Police Department parking lot. (“Gay MB Police officer alleges harassment,” 2002)

In June 1999, a former Long Island, New York police officer was awarded $380,000 by a federal jury for antigay harassment. A superior had threatened the officer with a knife, telling him, “I kill queers. All faggots deserve to die.” This verdict was perhaps the first time in the nation that a police agency was held liable for antigay harassment. (“Gay Officer Wins Harassment Suit,” 1999)

A New York police officer filed a suit accusing his fellow officers of placing posters throughout the city announcing his sexual orientation and also for at-
tackling him in the presence of supervisors, physically forcing him inside his locker. (*ABC News 20/20*, April 16, 1999)

The chief executive must establish departmental policies and regulations regarding gay and lesbian officers. These policies must clearly state that discrimination, harassment, or failure to assist fellow gay and lesbian officers are unacceptable and will result in severe discipline. The chief executive must obtain the support of his or her supervisors and managers to ensure that the intent of these rules, policies, and procedures is clear and that all employees adhere to these regulations. All employees must be held accountable, and those who do not support these antidiscrimination policies will not be promoted nor awarded special assignments. Evaluations of employees should reflect how supportive they are of departmental policy that protects gay and lesbian officers. Department executives must be aware that gay and lesbian officers might not report victimization by other employees. For example, an independent investigation conducted in late 2000 determined that within the LAPD, 64 percent of gay and lesbian employees interviewed stated they would fear retaliation if they made a departmental complaint against another officer for discrimination or harassment (“LAPD Confidential,” 2000).

If the state does not have one, the city, county, or law enforcement agency should adopt an antidiscrimination policy with regard to gays and lesbians in the workplace. As of June 2003, 14 states have passed laws prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation. Four of these laws also prohibit gender identification–based discrimination. City or county officials must support and possibly even champion such legislation. The policy should establish that:

- Sexual orientation is not a hindrance in hiring, retention, or promotion.
- Hiring is based solely on merit as long as the individual meets objective standards of employment.
- Hiring is done on the basis of the identical job-related standards and criteria for all individuals.

Law enforcement managers and supervisors must routinely check to ensure that this policy is being carried out as intended.

**Training on Gay, Lesbian, and Transgender Issues**

Cultural awareness programs that train department personnel on diversity within communities and in the workforce must also educate employees on gay, lesbian, and transgender issues. The training should address and show the falsehoods of stereotypes and myths. It must cover legal rights, including a discussion of statutes and departmental policies on nondiscrimination and the penalties for violating them. These penalties include liability for acts of harassment and discrimination. Often, involving openly gay or lesbian officers (from other agencies, if necessary) in these training programs provides the best outcome. Ideally, this training will enable employees to know the gay or lesbian officers they work with as human beings, reduce personal prejudices and false
assumptions, and thus change behavior. This type of training further the ideal of respect for all people. A secondary benefit of this training is the decreased likelihood of personnel complaints and lawsuits by gay or lesbian employees or community members against a city, county, or individual officer.

For a nondiscrimination policy to be implemented effectively, managers must provide regular and ongoing training at all levels of their department (see curricula in Instructor’s Manual). This nondiscrimination policy must be articulated and communicated clearly and enforced consistently. Because homophobic attitudes are present among the rank and file, and because sensitivity training and similar programs usually provoke resentment rather than tolerance, the emphasis on training is most successful when it focuses on strict standards of professional conduct and behavior (RAND’s National Defense Research Institute, 1993).

Cultural diversity training, which is much more confrontational than sensitivity training but is not abrasive, challenges officers’ current attitudes without being condescending. In measuring officers’ attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and knowledge, this type of training has been shown to have a positive impact. The training uses simulated situations in which officers deal with partners who are gay. Managers and supervisors are required to handle situations in which a fellow officer is being harassed for perceived homosexuality. Such presentations are most successful when conducted by gay or lesbian officers who are experienced diversity trainers, but this is not to suggest that trainers will be qualified or successful merely because of their sexual orientation.

It is recommended that the training include discussion panels made up of local gay and lesbian community members, business owners, service providers, and community groups, as well as gay youth and gay youth service providers. For supervisors and managers, additional panels comprising attorneys, including municipal attorneys who prosecute hate crimes and who specialize in defense work dealing with homosexual arrestees, HIV issues, and sexual orientation employment discrimination, should be provided.

Successful training programs about gay, lesbian, and transgender issues have been completed at the San Francisco, Alameda, and Sacramento Police Departments and the Santa Clara Sheriff’s Department. The San Francisco Police Department is a good source of information about transgender people. San Francisco probably has the largest population of transgender residents with an estimated 15,000 to 18,000 people. The city has attracted transgender people from all over the world (“S.F.’s Transgender Gain Visibility,” 2001, p. A33). (For more information on conducting diversity training, refer to the Instructor’s Manual available for this textbook, which offers suggestions for a cultural diversity training program that includes gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender awareness.)

Police officers are the protectors of individuals in a diverse society that includes gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people. Although we recognize that police officers are human and entitled to their own personal beliefs, they cannot display biased behavior or engage in discriminatory actions. Police officers who are prejudiced against gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender people must still uphold their rights. When prejudice or bias by an officer results in an overt discriminatory act, he or she must be appropriately punished for harassment. Officers also cannot remain silent if they witness a discriminatory act of homophobic crime committed by fellow employees. These same officers must maintain a good working relationship with peers who
may be different than themselves. Police officers represent the entire community. Any act they commit while on duty (or off) can bring dishonor not only to them but also to their agency, the community they serve, and the entire profession of law enforcement. Repercussions of an act of discrimination could be the “shot heard ’round the world,” as happened in the Rodney King case.

Many managers and supervisors need to change their leadership style to meet the challenges and requirements of a culturally diverse society and workforce. Management experts suggest that modern leaders must have two important traits: vision and the ability to communicate their visions and values to others within the workforce and the community who come from diverse backgrounds, including different ethnicity, race, religion, gender, and sexual orientation.

Support Groups for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Officers

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) officers benefit from support groups and peer counselors in their own or neighboring police agencies. In the early 1980s, openly gay and lesbian officers formed networks of support within the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department. In the late 1980s, the San Francisco and New York City Police Departments, along with other agencies, assisted gay and lesbian officers in forming support groups. In the early 1990s, chapters of the Golden State Peace Officers Association (founded in San Francisco) and the Gay Officers Action League (founded in New York) were established in southern California to assist them. In addition to networking, the groups provide mentoring and support for their members. Heterosexual employees who support the rights of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender personnel have also joined as members and associate members of these organizations.

The Need Remains

With notable exceptions such as the San Francisco Sheriff’s Department, the San Francisco Police Department, and the New York Police Department, the presence of openly gay and lesbian officers within law enforcement is relatively new. As such, it is still critically important that agency officials establish openly gay and lesbian liaisons to the LGBT community. This assignment provides role models to qualified LGBT persons who may desire a career in law enforcement. Critically, with the increasing prevalence of hate crimes, it also gives an agency the ability to provide victims with LGBT officers, whose expertise and compassion will likely elicit both cooperation and information that could impact the outcome of the investigation. Police officials realized years ago the invaluable service of providing women rape victims the comfort of female officers in conducting the interview. That need is duplicated when it comes to LGBT hate crime victims. Moreover, with the reticence of LGBT crime victims to come forward due to the real or perceived bias of law enforcement personnel, the ability for them to approach an LGBT officer negates the fear of “double victimization.” In the end, both the community as a whole, as well as the law enforcement agency, benefit from the presence of such forthright and honest personnel.
THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The chief law enforcement executive should follow specific guidelines to meet the challenge of policing a multicultural and multiracial community. As emphasized previously, he or she must first effectively manage the diversity within his or her own organization. Progressive law enforcement executives are aware that before employees can be asked to value diversity in the community, it must be clear that diversity within the organization is valued. Managing diversity in the law enforcement workplace is therefore of high priority.

Executive leadership and team building are crucial to managing a diverse workforce and establishing good minority–community relations. The chief executive must take the lead in this endeavor by:

- Demonstrating commitment
- Developing strategic, implementation, and transition management plans
- Managing organizational change
- Developing police–community partnerships (community-based policing)
- Providing new leadership models

Demonstrate Commitment

The organization must adopt and implement policies that demonstrate a commitment to policing a diverse society. These policies must be developed with input from all levels of the organization and community. Valuing diversity and treating all persons with respect must be the imperative first from the chief executive. His or her personal leadership and commitment are the keystones to implementing policies and awareness training within the organization and to successfully building bridges to the community.

One of the first steps is the development of a “macro” mission statement for the organization that elaborates the philosophy, values, vision, and goals of the department to foster good relationships with a diverse workforce and community. All existing and new policies and practices of the department must be evaluated to see how they may affect women, members of diverse ethnic and racial groups, gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgender employees on the force. Recruitment, hiring, and promotional practices must be reviewed to ensure that there are no institutional barriers to different groups in an agency. The chief executive stresses, via mission and values statements, that the agency will not tolerate discrimination, abuse, or crimes motivated by hate against protected classes within the community or within the agency itself. The policy statements should also include references to discrimination or bias based on physical disability or age.

The executive must use every opportunity to speak out publicly on the value of diversity and to make certain that people inside and outside the organization know that upholding those ideals is a high priority. He or she must actively promote policies and programs designed to improve community relations and use marketing skills to sell these programs, both internally and externally. Internal marketing is accomplished by involving senior management and the police association in the development of the policies and action plans. The chief or sheriff can use this opportunity to gain support for
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the policies by demonstrating the value to the department’s effectiveness and to officer safety of having community support. External marketing is accomplished by involving representatives of community-based organizations in the process.

Police leaders must institute policies that develop positive attitudes toward a multicultural workplace and community even as early as the selection process. During background interviews, polygraphs, and psychological exams, candidates for law enforcement employment must be carefully screened. The questions and processes can help determine candidates’ attitudes and beliefs and, at the same time, make them aware of the agency’s strong commitment to a multicultural workforce.

Develop Strategic, Implementation, and Transition Management Plans

Textbooks and courses that teach strategic, implementation, and transition management planning are available to law enforcement leaders. The techniques, although not difficult, are quite involved and are not the focus of this book. Such techniques and methodologies are planning tools, providing the road map that the organization uses to implement programs and to guide the agency through change. An essential component is the action plans that identify specific goals and objectives. Action plans include budgets and timetables and establish accountability—who is to accomplish what by when. Multiple action plans involving the improvement of police–community relations in a diverse society would be necessary to cover such varied components as policy and procedures changes; affirmative action recruitment (where legal), hiring, and promotions; cultural awareness training; and community involvement (i.e., community-based policing).

Manage Organizational Change

The department leadership is responsible for managing change processes and action plans. This is an integral part of implementation and transition management, as discussed previously. The chief executive must ensure that any new policies, procedures, and training result in increased employee responsiveness and awareness of the diversity in the community and within the organization’s workforce. He or she must require that management staff continually monitor progress on all programs and strategies to improve police–community relations. Additionally, the chief must ensure that all employees are committed to those ideals. Managers and supervisors need to ensure application of these established philosophies and policies of the department, and they must lead by example. When intentional deviation from the system is discovered, retraining and discipline should be quick and effective. Employees (especially patrol officers) must be rewarded and recognized for their ability to work with and within a multicultural community. The reward systems for employees, especially first- and second-line supervisors, would recognize those who foster positive relations with individuals of different gender, ethnicity, race, or sexual orientation both within and outside the organization. As we have illustrated, the chief executive, management staff, and supervisors are role models and must set the tone for the sort of behavior and actions they expect of employees.
Develop Police–Community Partnerships

Progressive police organizations have adopted community-based policing as one response strategy to meet the needs and challenges of a pluralistic workforce and society. The establishment of community partnerships is a very important aspect of meeting the challenges. For example, a cultural awareness training component will not be as effective if police–community partnerships are not developed, utilized, and maintained. The chief executive establishes and maintains ongoing communications with all segments of the community. Open lines of communication are best established by community-based policing (discussed in detail in Chapter 1).

Provide New Leadership Models

In the past all methods or models of management and organizational behavior were based on implicit assumptions of a homogeneous, white male workforce. Even best-sellers such as The One-Minute Manager and In Search of Excellence that continue to be useful management tools are based on that traditional assumption. Managers must learn to value diversity and overcome personal and organizational barriers to effective leadership, such as stereotypes, myths, unwritten rules, and codes (one of those being that the organizational role model is a white male). New models of leadership must be incorporated into law enforcement organizations to manage the multicultural and multiracial workforce.

Jamieson and O’Mara (1991) address the topic of motivating and working with a diverse workforce, explaining that the leader must move beyond traditional management styles and approaches. They indicate that the modern manager must move from the traditional one-size-fits-all management style to a “flex-management” model. They describe flex management as not just another program or quick fix but one that is “based on the need to individualize the way we manage, accommodating differences and providing choices wherever possible” (p. 31). The flex-management model they envision involves three components:

1. **Policies**: Published rules that guide the organization.
2. **Systems**: Human resources tools, processes, and procedures.
3. **Practices**: Day-to-day activities.

The model is based on four strategies: matching people to jobs, managing and rewarding performance, informing and involving people, and supporting lifestyle and life needs. Five key management skills are required of the modern manager to use this model successfully:

1. Empowering others.
2. Valuing diversity.
3. Communicating responsibly.
4. Developing others.
5. Working for change.
Good leaders not only acknowledge their own ethnocentrism but also understand the cultural values and biases of the people with whom they work. Consequently, such leaders can empower, value, and communicate more effectively with all employees. Developing others involves mentoring and coaching skills, important tools for modern managers. To communicate responsibly leaders must understand the diverse workforce from a social and cultural context and flexibly utilize a variety of verbal and nonverbal communication strategies with employees. Modern leaders are also familiar with conflict mediation in cross-cultural disputes.

Jamieson and O’Mara (1991) explain that to establish a flex-management model, managers must follow a six-step plan of action that includes:

1. Defining the organization’s diversity.
2. Understanding the organization’s workforce values and needs.
3. Describing the desired future state.
4. Analyzing the present state.
5. Planning and managing transitions.

They contend that to be leaders in the new workforce, most managers will have to “unlearn practices rooted in old mindsets, change the way their organization operates, shift organizational culture, revamp policies, create new structures, and redesign human resource systems” (p. 25).

The vocabulary of the future involves leading employees rather than simply managing them. Hammond and Kleiner (1992) wrote about the distinction between the two:

One of the first things companies must look at in multicultural environments is the leadership vs. management issue. Leadership, in contrast to management, deals with values, ethics, perspective, vision, creativity and common humanity. Leadership is a step beyond management; it is at the heart of any unit in any organization. Leadership lies with those who believe in the mission and through action, attitude, and attention pass this on to those who have to sustain the mission and accomplish the individual tasks. People want to be led, not managed; and the more diverse the working population becomes the more leadership is needed. (p. 3)

Hammond and Kleiner (1992) explain that in a multicultural and multiracial society and workforce, “the genius of leadership” is

1. Learning about and understanding the needs of the diverse people you want to serve—not boss, not control—but serve
2. Creating and articulating a corporate mission and vision that your workers can get excited about, participate in, and be a part of
3. Behaving in a manner that shows respect to and value for all individual workers and their unique contributions to the whole. Those you can’t value, you can’t lead. (p. 13)

This approach to leadership was echoed in the introduction to Transcultural Leadership—Empowering the Diverse Workforce:
Transcultural leadership addresses a new global reality. Today productivity must come from the collaboration of culturally diverse women and men. It insists that leaders change organizational culture to empower and develop people. This demands that employees be selected, evaluated, and promoted on the basis of performance and competency, regardless of sex, race, religion, or place of origin. Beyond that, leaders must learn the skills that enable men and women of all backgrounds to work together effectively (Simons, Vazquez, & Harris, 1993).

Management, to build positive relationships and show respect for a pluralistic workforce, needs to be aware of differences, treat all employees fairly (and not necessarily in identical ways), and lead. The differing needs and values of a diverse workforce require flexibility by organizations and their leaders. Modern leaders of organizations recognize not only that different employees have different needs but also that these needs change over time. The goal of law enforcement leaders is to bridge cultural and racial gaps within their organizations.

**SUMMARY**

Officers who traditionally worked in predominantly white male workforces must learn to work with increasing numbers of women, gay men and lesbians, blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and others within our diverse society. In this chapter we have suggested that to be effective in this new environment, officers must have a knowledge of conflict resolution techniques to reduce racial and ethnic problems.

The chapter focused on concerns and issues of members of underrepresented ethnically and racially diverse groups as well as women and gay men and lesbians in law enforcement. The importance of support and mentoring programs for women and diverse groups was stressed. Such programs help them make transitions into organizations, cope with stress, and meet their workplace challenges more effectively.

In the chapter we provided suggestions for law enforcement executives whose jurisdictions are pluralistic and whose workforces are diverse. Law enforcement leaders must be committed to setting an organizational tone that does not permit bigoted or discriminatory acts and must act swiftly against those who violate these policies. They must monitor and deal quickly with complaints both within their workforce and from the public they serve.

**DISCUSSION QUESTIONS AND ISSUES***

1. **Measuring Responsiveness to Diversity.** Using the check-off and scoring sheet (Exhibit 2.3), determine how responsive your police department has been to the diversity of the jurisdiction it serves. If you are not affiliated with an agency, choose a city or county police department and interview a command officer to determine the answers and arrive at a score. Discuss with the com-

*See the Instructor’s Manual accompanying this text for additional activities, role-play activities, questionnaires, and projects related to the content of this chapter.
mand officer what initiatives his or her department intends to undertake to address the issues of community diversity.

2. **Defusing Racially and Culturally Rooted Conflicts.** What training does the police academy in your region provide on defusing racially and culturally rooted conflicts? What training of this type does your local city or county law enforcement agency provide to officers? What community (public and private) agencies are available as referrals or for mediation of such conflicts? Discuss what training should be provided to police officers to defuse, mediate, and resolve racially and culturally rooted conflicts. Discuss what approaches a law enforcement agency should utilize.

3. **Women in Law Enforcement.** How many women officers are there in your local city or county law enforcement agency? How many of those women are in supervisory or management positions? Are any of the women assigned to nontraditional roles such as special weapons and tactics teams, motorcycle enforcement, bomb units, hostage negotiations, or community relations? Have there been incidents of sexual harassment of women employees? If so, how were the cases resolved? Has the agency you are examining implemented any programs to increase the employment of women, such as flextime, child care, mentoring, awareness training, or career development? Has the agency been innovative in the recruitment efforts for women applicants? Discuss your findings in a group setting.

4. **Diversity in Law Enforcement.** Comment on the diversity in your local city or county law enforcement agency. What is the breakdown in your agency’s hierarchy? For example, who holds supervisory or management positions? Have there been reported acts of discrimination against people of diverse backgrounds? Has the agency you are examining implemented any programs to increase the employment of minorities? Discuss your findings in a group setting.

### WEBSITE RESOURCES

Visit these websites for additional information related to the content of Chapter 2.

**International Association of Chiefs of Police:** [http://www.theiacp.org](http://www.theiacp.org)


**International Association of Women Police (IAWP):** [http://www.iawp.org](http://www.iawp.org)

A website for information about training conferences, careers, jobs, publications, and research pertinent to women in law enforcement.

**Institute for Women in Trades, Technology and Science (IWITTS):**
[http://www.womenpolice.com](http://www.womenpolice.com)
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This website features fact sheets, news articles, and publications for departments on women and policing, including a free women in policing e-newsletter, which provides best practice information.

National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP): http://www.feminist.org

This website provides information concerning regional training seminars on recruiting and retaining women. It also is a resource for the latest research about women in policing and other critical issues. The organization has consultants to help agencies identify and remove obstacles to recruiting and retaining women.

National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE): http://www.nawlee.com

The website contains resources, news, member directory, conference and training information, seminars, and an information exchange for women executives in law enforcement.

Vera Institute of Justice: http://www.vera.org

The Vera Institute of Justice works closely with leaders in government and civil society to improve the services people rely on for safety and justice. Vera develops innovative, affordable programs that often grow into self-sustaining organizations, studies social problems and current responses, and provides practical advice and assistance to government officials around the world. They have publications on many law enforcement subjects.
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