ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: GENDER AND THE BLUE CODE OF SILENCE

Elliott L. Idol, Bachelor of Arts, 2024

Thesis Directed By: Associate Professor, Bianca Bersani, Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

The modern era of policing is filled with criticism, to the point where many do not perceive the police as a legitimate organization which serves communities (Jones 2020; Noppe, Verhage, and Van Damme 2017). These criticisms commonly include issues such as sexual harassment, excessive force, systematic racism, and much more (Garner et al. 2018; Rucker and Richeson 2021; Taylor et al. 2022). One of the proposed methods of addressing numerous police issues is to increase the number of female officers (Lonsway 2003; The Policing Project 2021), but there are mixed results as to whether or not this is an effective tactic at addressing police criticisms (Boehme, Metcalfe, and Kaminski 2022; Brown and Reisig 2019; Brown and Silvestri 2019; Lonsway 2003; Schuck, Baldo, and Powell 2021; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2005; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2021). The code of silence, the aspect of police culture which encourages officers to not 'snitch' on each other's misconduct, is a barrier against police accountability (Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2022; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022), and Schuck and Rabe-Hemp (2021) suggest that since female recruits are shown to value integrity more than male officers, female officers may be more

likely to break the code of silence, but this is still unexplored. This thesis looks to explore if gender identity impacts the likelihood to report misconduct. However, gender not only refers to identity, it also refers to performance, and so this thesis also explores if the extent to which officers perform masculinity has any impact on the likelihood to report misconduct.

Key words: blue code of silence, women in policing, gender performance, police integrity, police culture

GENDER AND THE BLUE CODE OF SILENCE

by

Elliott L. Idol

Thesis submitted to the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts
2024

© Copyright by
Elliott L. Idol
2024

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank Dr. Bianca Bersani for her guidance and support throughout my time at the CCJS Honors Program. This thesis was the first long-term project I tackled in an academic setting, and I am forever grateful for her unerring support. I am also very grateful to Casey Kindall, awesome TA of this CCJS Honors cohort, who supported me not only in the process of writing this thesis but also in the process of applying to graduate school. I also am so thankful to my fellow classmates of the 2024 cohort. Having the opportunity to brainstorm and workshop ideas together was so crucial to me in the early stages of this thesis, and having the moral support from the class during the defense was priceless. I would also like to thank the friends who came to support me during my defense, and to thank my mother for listening to my endless rambling about this topic and for being the Guinea pig audience for my defense presentation.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS II

TABLE OF CONTENTS III

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 4

THE CODE OF SILENCE 4
GENDERED ORGANIZATIONS 9
POLICING IS MASCULINE 10
WOMEN IN POLICING 13
ENGAGING WITH FEMININITY 13
ENGAGING WITH MASCULINITY 14
DISENGAGING FROM GENDER 17
THE CURRENT STUDY 18

CHAPTER 3: DATA AND METHODS 20

SAMPLE 20
SURVEY DESIGN 21
SECTION 1 22
SECTION 2 23
SECTION 3 23
SECTION 4 23
MEASURES 24
DEPENDENT VARIABLES 24
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES 24
CONTROLS 25
ANALYTICAL METHOD 27
LIKELIHOOD TO REPORT MISCONDUCT (BY GENDER IDENTITY) 27
LIKELIHOOD TO BE REPORTED ON (BY GENDER IDENTITY) 27
LIKELIHOOD TO REPORT MISCONDUCT (BY MASCULINITY PERFORMANCE) 27

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS 29

LIKELIHOOD TO REPORT MISCONDUCT (BY GENDER IDENTITY) 29
LIKELIHOOD TO BE REPORTED ON (BY GENDER IDENTITY) 29
LIKELIHOOD TO REPORT MISCONDUCT (BY MASCULINITY PERFORMANCE) 30

CHAPTER 5: LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS 31

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION **35**

APPENDICES **36**

APPENDIX A **36**
SECTION 1 36
SECTION 2 41
SECTION 3 43
SECTION 4 45

TABLES **47**

TABLE 1 **47**
RECRUITS IN BASIC TRAINING PROGRAMS IN STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING ACADEMIES, BY TYPE OF TRAINING ENVIRONMENT, 2011-13 AND 2018 47

REFERENCES **48**

Chapter 1: Introduction

The modern era of American policing has been heavily criticized for issues such as excessive use of force, sexual harassment, systematic racism, and more (Garner et al. 2018; Rucker and Richeson 2021; Taylor et al. 2022). With this criticism comes extremely low levels of police legitimacy, where there is this perception among civilians that police do not serve the people or their communities, resulting in a strong division between civilians and police (Jones 2020; Noppe, Verhage, and Van Damme 2017). The blue code of silence is a manifestation of this division, and can be interpreted to be a demonstration of police valuing loyalty to each other over their duty to maintain lawful integrity. The code of silence is the police social norm which prohibits officers from reporting fellow officers' misconduct, misconduct being any behavior which violates official police policy (Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2022; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022). There is this expectation among officers that other officers will not 'snitch' on any officer who does something against the formal rules — all officers are expected to remain silent and loyal.

To address the various underlying issues of low police legitimacy, one solution proposed is to further diversify police departments through gender (Lonsway 2003; The Policing Project 2021). The gender diversity of police departments has slowly increased over the years; in 1972 women only counted for 3% of police officers, and as of 2020, that percentage has risen to 15% (Brooks 2022). Women are not only shown to be just as capable as men to serve as effective police officers, but often bring unique skill sets and tactics male officers may not always have. There is evidence to suggest that female officers are more likely to implement community-oriented policing (COP) methods (Lonsway 2003); are less likely to use force, instead focusing on de-escalating the situation (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2005; Lonsway 2003); and are less likely to abuse their

positions of power (Brown and Silvestri 2019). Additionally, female recruits report feeling more serious about police misconduct than male recruits, implying that they may be more likely to report officer misconduct and break the code of silence (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2021).

Schuck, Baldo, and Powell (2021) find that having more female officers in a police agency is associated with higher perceptions of police legitimacy, but simply adding more women into the police force is not a fix-all, as there are mixed results as to how increasing gender diversity changes a police department (Brown and Silvestri 2019). Having more female officers in a police agency is associated with greater police legitimacy, but individual female officers are often perceived as less legitimate than their male counterparts (Brown and Reisig 2019). Individual female officers may be less likely to use force, but higher percentages of women in an agency is not related to decreased amounts of excessive force used overall in an agency (Boehme, Metcalfe, and Kaminski 2022). It is also relatively unexplored why female officers value police integrity more, and there are no studies which have directly examined how likely women are to adhere to the blue code of silence in comparison to men, particularly studies which measure actual behavior rather than attitudes (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022).

Other than gender identity (we here use the term 'gender identity' to refer to gender prevalence), gender *performance* is important to discuss in policing. Firstly, gender is inescapable. Modern sociology literature agrees that gender is a performance everyone is expected to partake in, and a performance for which everyone is judged by (Archer 1990; West and Zimmerman 1987). Individuals are held up to the standards of the gender they are perceived to be – women must be feminine, men must be masculine, and gender non-conforming individuals must be completely androgynous. However, individuals can perform gender outside of their identity, as seen in women

who partake in more masculine tasks (e.g., military service) and men who partake in more feminine tasks (e.g., ballet).

Gender itself is also found to be a fundamental part of formal organizations, including policing (Acker 1990; Rabe-Hemp 2009; Silvestri 2017). Policing itself is an inherently masculine organization, where the ideal officer is assumed to be male and to possess traditionally masculine traits, such as physical strength and capability for aggression (Chan et al. 2010; Silvestri 2019). As police organizations are not a gender-neutral space, it is not only important to address gender identity, but important to explore how individuals *perform* gender. As described above, female officers may be shown to behave differently than male officers, but this is not established to be true for *every* policing-relevant behavior. Women are fully capable of performing to the physical standards of policing (Lonsway et al. 2003), and while women may be shown to use less force on average, that does not mean that they do not use any force at all (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2005).

Considering how increasing gender diversity in policing has been utilized as a solution to numerous policing issues, it is important to evaluate how effective it actually is. The blue code of silence is one of the main mechanisms which prevents officers from reporting misconduct, and it has been studied quite extensively, but almost all of the literature does not address the impact of gender on adherence to the code of silence (Hochschild 1989; Horne, Johnson, and Krahn 2017; Prokos and Padavic 2002; Sanders et al. 2022; Silvestri 2017). This paper seeks to further explore how women (and specifically, the overall concept of gender) engage with the code of silence and impact the likelihood of reporting misconduct.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

THE CODE OF SILENCE

Klockars and colleagues (2006) position police integrity and police misconduct as inverse concepts. To measure police misconduct, one may measure the inverse of police integrity, and vice versa. Police integrity is “the normative inclination among police to resist temptations to abuse the rights and privileges of their occupation” (Klockars et al. 2006:21), and it is important to note that this definition does not refer to the unique individual officer, but instead refers to police as a whole and highlights how police work often occurs without supervision, and so involves large amounts of discretion and many opportunities for misconduct. Misconduct is typically defined as any violation of official police policy, and may include things such as physical assault and sexual misconduct (Civil Rights Division 2023). The code of silence is the social norm which prohibits officers from reporting on other officers’ misconduct (Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2022; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022), and as a part of police culture, it functions more as a resource officers can choose to draw upon based on the situation, rather than as an explicit rule (Campeau 2015).

The code of silence is a by-product of the intense solidarity police officers are socialized into, a process which commonly takes place in police academies or when newly joining the force as a sworn officer. This solidarity, sometimes referred to as the Brotherhood (Sanders et al. 2022), is an expectation among officers to ‘have each other’s backs’ and to depend on one another as officers navigate a world perceived to be “intensely hostile” (Stoughton 2015:227) (Campeau 2015; Lanza-Kaduce 2010; Sierra-Arévalo 2021; Wieslander 2019). Essentially, officers are socialized into a belief that police can only ever trust other police. The socialization process begins early and happens quickly, typically in police academies, where police recruits are encouraged to

not only rely on each other, but to also identify less with non-police and view any non-police individual as potentially threatening (Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010; Conti and Nolan 2005).

Police academies follow one of two models: the stress based or non-stress training model. This is a stated framework used by much of the literature and by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) (Cohen 2021; Buehler 2021). The non-stress model is more similar to a college environment where there is more emphasis placed on academic achievement. In contrast, the stress based model aligns with the quasi-military structure of police agencies, where in addition to traditional academic coursework, cadets undergo intense physical training, and the education goes beyond explicit training hours (Cohen 2021).

Buehler (2021) measures the degree to which police academies in the US follow the stress or non-stress model, coding each academy as having an environment which is "all or mostly stress," "slightly more stress than nonstress," "balanced stress and nonstress," "slightly more nonstress than stress," or "all or mostly nonstress" (see Table 1 for full BJS table) However, each academy's environment is measured through self-report, and not evaluated by researchers. According to academies self-reporting, Buehler (2021) reports that 74.8% of all police academies in 2018 have an environment which includes the stress based model to some degree, whether that be through having a balanced stress / non-stress model or having a completely stress based academy environment. Buehler (2021) also notes that the percentage of recruits trained in stress based environments has decreased since 2013, where in 2013, 81.5% of all recruits were trained in an environment which included the stress model to some degree, but in 2019, that number dropped to 75.8%. A good amount of this decrease seems to be due to the decrease in the percentage of recruits which received training in a *completely / mostly* stress based environment, which dropped from 23% to 11% between 2013 and 2018. However, there has been a significant

increase in the percentage of recruits which are trained in an environment which balances the stress based and non-stress based models, where in 2018, 48.9% of all recruits are trained in a 'balanced' environment (and about 52% of all academies follow a 'balanced' model).

Research which explores how police academies socialize recruits into police culture does not mention what model the academy of interest follows (as many identifying details of academies studied are often left out for anonymity purposes), but many studies will discuss details which appear consistent with the stress model, such as recruits living at the institution and undergoing significant amounts of physical training (Cohen 2021; Prokos and Padavic 2002). That is not to say that the academies studied are solely stress based, as not only do academies mix these two models, but these studies do also discuss situations and environments which could be consistent with non-stress models, such as discussions concerning classroom setting environments (Cohen 2021; Prokos and Padavic 2002; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2021). It appears that the majority of research on police socialization (particularly in relation to police solidarity and the code of silence) occurs in an academy which includes the stress model to some extent, but this is unconfirmed.

The socialization process is effective and relatively fast. Reaves (2016) finds that the average length of police academy training is 21 weeks, and Buehler (2021) finds the average length of basic training to be 833 hours, and the average length of field training is 508 hours. Over the course of those weeks (a little less than 5 months total), Schuck and Rabe-Hemp (2021) find that recruits' personal views about police integrity change over the course of police academy training, where recruits value integrity significantly less after completing their training, this implies that recruits are more likely to adhere to the code of silence after their time in police academies. Schuck and Rabe-Hemp (2022) also find that recruits who express stronger negative attitudes towards non-police were more likely to adhere to the code of silence, consistent with Caplan's (2003) findings.

The majority of research on the academy socialization process finds that the daily lifestyle filled with physical and mental stress serves as the foundation for recruits to bond in their suffering (Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010; Sierra-Arévalo 2021). Recruits wear uniforms and commonly face collective punishments for misconduct, the formal structure and social environment erasing the concept of the individual and encouraging the concept of the whole, the Brotherhood of police. Recruits, as they bond with one another, are also socially isolated from non-police, and instructors explicitly tell recruits to break ties with non-police, including family (Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010; Conti and Nolan 2005). Non-police are degraded by instructors, presented to not understand what police officers go through in their work, and instructors tell recruits that police officers only have each other. A strong 'us vs. them' mentality is built — 'them' being civilians.

The most commonly criticized aspect of resocialization in police academies (and in police departments) is the "danger imperative" (Sierra-Arévalo 2021). Instructors often regale 'war stories' to recruits and show body-cam videos of officers dying on the job, and teach recruits that anything and everything can go wrong — one must always be ready for the worst (Sierra-Arévalo; Chappell and Lanza-Kaduce 2010). Officers "are taught that they live in an intensely hostile world... and learn to be afraid" (Stoughton 2015:227). Excessive use of force in police work is then often reasoned to be an officer fearing for his own safety, and that fear is seen as a legitimate reason to shoot a civilian (Sierra-Arévalo 2021). Anyone who is not police could be potentially violent and dangerous, and with this intense loyalty to fellow officers, the code of silence, the expectation to always support one another, manifests.

Research directly measuring police misconduct and police integrity is difficult, so the majority of research on the code of silence measures self-reported behavior (through surveys or interviews) or self-reported hypothetical responses to presented scenarios (Klockars et al. 2006;

Kutnjak Ivković 2018; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2021; Westmarland 2020). From the research which has been done, several variables have been found to be associated with increased adherence to the code of silence: perceived severity of the misconduct; perceptions of whether other officers would adhere to the code; fear of retaliation; perceptions of deviant climate levels in the department; promotion of ethical standards; being a line officer (versus being a supervisor); and gender.

Perhaps the most robust correlate of adherence to the code is the perceived severity of the misconduct (Lim and Sloan 2016; Klockars et al. 2006; Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2018; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022; Westmarland and Conway 2020). The less severe the misconduct is perceived to be, the less likely the officer is willing to report the misconduct, therefore the more likely the officer is to adhere to the code. This generally means that more severe instances of misconduct are more likely to be reported (e.g., unjustifiable use of force), while less serious examples of police misconduct are less likely to be reported (e.g., accepting a free meal from a merchant), but there is some variation based on what the officer perceives to be serious (Klockars et al. 2006; Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2018; Westmarland and Conway 2020).

Other than misconduct severity, if an officer believes that other officers will adhere to the code of silence, then it is likely that the officer will be less willing to report misconduct (Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2018). In a similar manner, supervisors who believe there is not much of a 'deviant climate' in the agency are more likely to break the code of silence (Lim and Sloan 2016), and if an officer fears retaliation from other officers for reporting misconduct, then the officer will also be less willing to report misconduct (Wieslander 2019). On the other hand, promotion of ethical standards is associated with less adherence to the code of silence (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2021 2022). Recruits who take ethics courses during their time in police academies report valuing police

integrity more (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2021), and adherence to the code seems associated with failure to promote high ethical standards in police organizations (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022). Additionally, Kutnjak Ivković and colleagues (2018) find that line officers are more likely to adhere to the code of silence than supervisors, where supervisors are more likely to report officer misconduct, and Campeau (2015) explores this relationship a little more deeply, reporting that because of the nature of police work, there is this expectation for officers to have each other's backs and look out for each other, and administrative staff are not seen to have officers' backs.

As highlighted by the associations and patterns above, the code of silence is a social phenomenon, and officers choose to what extent they draw from the code of silence for each situation they are presented with. Campeau (2015) speaks at length of how the code of silence is not a strict set of rules, and as Swidler (1986) describes it, is a 'tool kit' officers can use when needed. While a number of social factors have been found to impact (or not impact) adherence to the code of silence, there has been little to no exploration of how gender impacts adherence. While there are no studies on the code of silence explicitly measuring gender's influence on reporting likelihood, Schuck and Rabe-Hemp (2021) find that female police recruits value integrity more and find police misconduct more serious than male recruits, and suggest that women officers are then more likely to break the code of silence — although one must note how in this study, the authors find that recruits overall value integrity *less* after undergoing police academy training. Schuck and Rabe-Hemp (2022) continue and argue that this difference in values stems from women's outsider status in the male-dominated field of policing.

GENDERED ORGANIZATIONS

Most sociological and criminological research frames gender as separate from (though related to) physical sex, and instead defines gender as a set of behaviors, a performance all people

partake in and are held accountable for (West and Zimmerman 1987). This thesis also operates under Jon Acker's (1990) theory of gendered organizations, which posits that gender is inescapable and that organizations are *inherently* gendered, no matter if an organization explicitly states itself to be gender neutral. It is then important to conduct research through a gendered lens, especially in criminology, where the dominating research and theories only address men's behavior, or simply do not address gender at all.

Britton and colleagues (2018) proposes that the engendering of organizations occurs through three means: cultural images, organizational structures, and the agency of workers. Many organizations have cultural images, or images associated with that organization, which are gendered. Examples of this include childcare and nursing being seen as feminine professions, and firefighting and the military being seen as masculine professions. The way in which an organization was designed, the organizational structures, may be explicitly gender-neutral in formal language, but Acker (1990) explains that many organizations are still inherently gendered through expectations for the ideal worker of the organization. For example, all policies concerning childcare workers may be written to concern he/she or not include gendered pronouns at all, but the ideal worker in childcare would be nurturing and 'motherly', drawing from feminine archetypes. Finally, the agency of the workers concerns how the workers of an organization reinforce gender roles on a smaller scale.

POLICING IS MASCULINE

The image of policing is still inherently masculine in many ways. Women's presence in police departments is small, but slowly growing (Britton et al. 2018; Brooks 2022). Other than their presence, women's roles in the police force are still limited, both in the roles they fulfill and the extent to which they climb the ranks. Sneed (2007) describes "glass walls" women often face

in government employment, and this very much applies to women in policing. The roles in which women fulfill in policing are often places where their femininity is valued more, typically positions involving women and children in the community, such as working with female victims of violence, and women are rarely part of teams which require more physical strength, such as SWAT teams (Chan et al. 2010; Lonsway et al. 2003; Morabito and Shelley 2018; Sneed 2007). Chan and colleagues (2021) describes how women have their own niche in policing which is separate from the men's space. Many women also describe their struggles with trying to climb the ranks (Brown et al. 2020; Morabito and Shelley 2018; Sanders et al. 2022).

The ideal police officer is masculine, and policing is not a career designed with women in mind (Chan et al. 2010; Silvestri 2017), even if both men and women are fully capable of fulfilling the roles of an ideal officer (Lonsway et al. 2003). Silvestri (2017) argues that the ideal officer has two key aspects: physicality and time. An ideal police officer must be physically strong, able to operate within the quasi-military definitions of police work, and must be willing and able to dedicate one's whole life to the work of policing. It is more difficult for a woman to achieve the same physicality as the ideal male officer, though not impossible, but working overtime is idealized, and this comes much easier for men who often do not have the same responsibilities as women outside of police work — such as child rearing and household maintenance, which are still vastly seen as a woman's responsibility (Hochschild 1989; Horne, Johnson, Galambos, and Krahn 2017). If a female officer has children and/or is married, then she is unable to dedicate her time the same as her male counterparts may be able to. Brown and colleagues (2020) find that the ideal officer embodies traditionally masculine traits such as strength, aggression, and independence, and the image of the crime fighter is also promoted throughout policing, an image associated with

physical strength, dominance, and aggression (Rabe-Hemp 2009; Shelley et al. 2011; Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016; Prokos and Padavic 2002).

The social environment within police departments, the agency of police department workers, also reinforces the expectations for masculinity, particularly through language. As mentioned earlier, the solidarity of police officers is sometimes referred to as the Brotherhood (Sanders et al. 2022), and the term itself is inherently masculine. Sanders and colleagues (2022) interviews numerous women police officers and finds a range of interpretations of how gender exclusive the Brotherhood is and of how accepting the Brotherhood is of women. Some officers view the Brotherhood as gender neutral in the sense that anyone can join, man or woman, and find a deep comfort in the solidarity the Brotherhood brings, however, other officers note that in order to be part of the Brotherhood, one must not "challenge" the men (Sanders et al. 2022:649) and support of other women is viewed to be negative. Sanders (2022) notes a "process of gender neutralization" which occurs (Sanders et al., 2022:646) in order to earn one's place in the Brotherhood, where women cannot be *women*, and instead must be a person in uniform.

Additionally, one of the ways in which the Brotherhood presents masculinity is the use of camaraderie and sexual jokes which demean women (Brown et al. 2020; Prokos and Padavic 2022; Rabe-Hemp 2009; Shelley et al. 2021; Taylor et al. 2022). Sexual jokes are seen as the norm, and to be part of the Brotherhood, one must have "thick skin" (Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016:269) and be able to tolerate the jokes, if not participate in the "quid pro quo sexual harassment" (Brown et al. 2020:145).

The language used in police academies also assumes masculinity from recruits (Prokos and Padavic 2002). Instructors commonly only use male pronouns when describing hypothetical situations when teaching, and if any female pronouns were used, it was seen as something special.

Women are constantly demeaned in academies for their femininity and challenged more so than men.

WOMEN IN POLICING

In 2018, 19% of police recruits were female (Buehler 2021), and as of 2020, about 15% of police personnel and 13% of supervisory law enforcement personnel are women (Brooks 2022). Women officers appear to be more concentrated in police departments which serve larger populations (Goodison 2022), however, despite the slow growth of women's presence in policing, the research finds that women are generally unable to fully integrate into policing.

Research on the experience of female officers in policing (and police subculture in general) finds that those experiences are not homogenous (Brown et al. 2020; Shelley at al. 2011), but these unique experiences all seem to happen on the individual levels — there is no evidence to suggest that women officers create a 'Sisterhood' parallel to the Brotherhood (Rabe-Hemp 2009; Morabito and Shelley 2018; Shelley et al. 2011; Brown et al. 2020). However, despite the heterogeneity, there are some general patterns identified. It is women's performance of gender which appears to vary systematically, where women choose the extent to which they perform femininity, masculinity, or disengage from gender altogether.

Engaging with Femininity

Some women engage more with their femininity, which Rabe-Hemp (2009) refers to as holding a "policeWOMAN persona." These women believe that their feminine qualities make them more effective officers (Rabe-Hemp 2009) and therefore attempt to succeed by "capitalizing on stereotypical femininity" (Prokos and Padavic 2022:441), and may believe that policing is not a woman's job, and so stay in the more traditionally feminine roles of the organization (Chan et

al. 2010). Some female officers point out how their femininity aids them when they interact with victims, as they are seen as less dangerous and physically smaller (Rabe-Hemp 2009), but Rabe-Hemp (2009) does point out how this may backfire on some women, as they may be seen as less competent.

Engaging with Masculinity

Other women may choose to engage more with masculinity (Brown et al. 2020; Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016; Prokos and Padavic 2022; Sanders et al. 2022). Some describe regulating their feminine behavior to socialize with men more easily (Sanders et al. 2022), or taking on more masculine traits and roles (Brown et al. 2020). Brown and colleagues (2020) finds that lesbians are more accepted by the heterosexual male officers in their agencies because of 'shared characteristics' with men, which allows for more comradery to build, and Rabe-Hemp (2009) describes how some women worry about performing masculinity to achieve success in policing, as they may be labeled as lesbians. Some women may believe the lesbian label to be negative, and Galvin and O'Neal (2016) find that lesbian women in policing are heterogenous in the extent to which they display their sexuality, but Brown and colleagues' (2020) sample of policewomen, lesbian officers generally ranked higher than straight female officers, which suggests that there is some merit to performing masculine traits which may be associated with being a lesbian. Women who engage with the masculine subculture positively and participate in the verbal banter with male officers also report being more well integrated into the social environment (Brown et al. 2020; Galvin and O'Neal 2016).

Sanders and colleagues (2022) interviewed 86 female Canadian police officers of varied ranks and different departments (municipal, provincial, and federal) as well as 5 female civilians working in police services, and explored how these women navigate the Brotherhood and

understand their own fit in police culture. The majority of these women were white, with an average of 20 years of experience in policing (ranging from 1 to 30 years of experience). Through this study, Sanders and colleagues (2022) find that many female officers report only being able to be a part of the Brotherhood if they conform to the masculine norms. They report being 'tested' by male officers to prove their position in the Brotherhood, tests which are sometimes physical in nature. One participant describes an incident where her male patrol partner (and other male police officer witnesses at the scene) did not back her up in a physical confrontation with a suspect, later claiming that he wanted to see if she could physically handle the task.

Brown and colleagues (2020) conducted in-depth semi-structured interviews with 9 female police officers who were recruited through a snowball sample (2 separate chains), all of which had patrol experience and an average of 9 years of experience (ranging from 2 to 23 years of experience). They looked to explore how female officers experience the police subculture, and determine if there is a hypermasculine subculture present, although they note that police subculture is *not* homogenous. Interestingly, Brown and colleagues (2020) find the opposite phenomenon as Sanders and colleagues (2022), where male officers are more likely to 'assist' female officers in numerous situations because the female officers are seen as less capable, but this all still demonstrates the cultural assumption that women are less capable. Many of the women Sanders and colleagues (2022) interview say that the need to prove their capabilities feels like an experience only women officers face, whereas their male counterparts are assumed to already be capable, and Brown and colleagues (2020) find similar stories with other women interviewed, where women are automatically assumed to be lesser, and male officers are less willing to trust and rely on female officers. One must note the small sample size of only 9 officers in Brown and colleagues (2020) study, which limits variability, especially since participants were acquired through a snowball

sampling method, and this may potentially explain the variability between Brown and colleagues' (2009) and Sanders and colleagues (2022) studies. Additionally, while Rief and Clinkinbeard (2020) finds that women generally feel confident in their own fit with their job in policing and that their values are aligned with the organization, within the workgroup culture and more social aspects, women report feeling unable to fully integrate.

Other than the social aspect, Todak (2023) surveys a sample of 924 U.S. female police officers and finds that many women experience barriers to promotion in policing, particularly through inherent biases within the promotion process (with the mechanisms proposed by Britton and colleagues (2018), this would involve the agency of the workers) and the ways in which policing has a masculine organizational culture (Britton and colleagues' (2018) design of the organization). The promotional process is described as being a very social process which relies on who is chosen to be prepared for promotions — men are often 'groomed' for promotion far more than women, and this is exacerbated by the fact that most evaluators are men who hold gender biases against women. Additionally, participants who had children noted the difficulty of balancing work, studying for evaluation exams, and childcare, echoing Silvestri's (2017) argument of policing being inherently masculine because it assumes the ideal officers to be able to dedicate excessive time to the career, which is generally more difficult for women to do when they are also responsible for domestic responsibilities outside of their career. There is this perception among female officers that there is limited space for women in the higher ranks of policing, and that those who are promoted are only promoted for their identity as a woman (Brown et al. 2020; Todak 2023). Female career advancement is stigmatized, where promotions are seen to be not because of merit, but because of preferential treatment and female promiscuity (Brown et al. 2020).

The idea that women are outsiders policing in policing is also enforced by female officers (Prokos and Padavic 2002). Sanders and colleagues (2022) finds that in order to integrate into the masculine subculture, women have to be hostile towards other women, one participant stating (Sanders et al. 2022:652):

> "We eat our own around here. Every female's jealous of every other female, it's insane here. We do not support each other at all... you won't see too many females here that are friends with other female cops."

Another participant states: "If you're seen supporting other women, you're looked at in a negative light by the guys." (Sanders et al., 2022:652). There is this perception among Sanders and colleagues' (2022) participants that there is limited space for women in policing, and so if a female officer is to succeed, she must fight other female officers for higher ranking positions.

Disengaging from Gender

Some female officers disengage from gender, performing the POLICEwoman persona, as Rabe-Hemp (2009) describes it. Many women believe that gender does not inherently matter in policing, as long as one's job is done well, then you will be treated well — and some men also hold this gender neutral belief (Chan et al. 2010; Galvin and O'Neal 2016; Prokos and Padavic 2002). However, while these women may use explicitly gender neutral language and emphasize their police identity over any sort of gender identity, the policing identity is still inherently masculine — so disengaging from gender as a police officer may still be a way to emphasize one's masculine traits.

THE CURRENT STUDY

Schuck and Rabe-Hemp (2021) suggest that women may treat integrity more seriously, which implies that they would be more likely to report misconduct. However, literature suggests that the code of silence is maintained because of a sense of loyalty to the Brotherhood, and women have also shown to also have a deep sense of loyalty to the Brotherhood, which implies that some women would have the same likelihood to report misconduct as their male counterparts. As such, our first research question asks: Is there a significant difference between women and men's likelihood to report misconduct?

Because many women make an effort to become part of the Brotherhood (succeeding at policing masculinity by demonstrating physical competence and a willingness to engage positively with the sexist environment, 'having a thick skin') (Brown et al. 2020; Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016; Sanders et al. 2022), and as adhering to the code of silence is a part of police culture (Campeau 2015), I hypothesize that there will be no significant difference between women's reporting and men's reporting.

One must also note that gender is not a phenomenon which occurs within one person, gender is fundamentally a performance in which we are held accountable in social situations, and as a 'toolkit' and resource individuals can chose to draw on based on the situation they find themselves in, the gender of the individual committing the misconduct to be reported also matters. Research has suggested that there is 'limited space' for women in policing, and women appear to generally not support other women in policing (Chan et al. 2021; Sanders et al. 2022; Sneed 2007). Considering then that women could be considered 'outsiders' in policing, it could be argued that other officers would feel less inclined to stay 'loyal' to women and therefore be more likely to report misconduct. We then want to also explore if the gender identity of the hypothetical actor

has any impact on the reporting likelihood, and ask: Do all officers show differential reporting likelihood by gender of the officer engaged in the misconduct? And, does this vary by the gender of the reporting officer?

Because of women's outsider status in policing (Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022) and the tendency for women to fight other women for limited positions in policing (Brown et al. 2020; Todak 2023), I hypothesize that both men and women are more likely to report on the misconduct of a female actor than that of a male actor.

However, as gender identity is a performance and social resource, perhaps it matters not the identity of an officer (whether they are male or female), perhaps what matters more is the extent to which an officer performs masculinity in policing contexts. Brown and colleagues (2020) show that lesbians (who may perform masculinity more so than their heterosexual counterparts) are more integrated into police culture, and studies have found that women report needing to edit their behavior in order to succeed in the policing workplace (Brown et al. 2020; Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016; Rabe-Hemp 2008). We then ask: Are officers who display more masculinity more likely to adhere to the code of silence and not report misconduct?

We hypothesize that the more a participant performs masculinity in policing contexts (adhering to the masculine social norms), the more likely they are to adhere to the code of silence (another policing social norm).

Chapter 3: Data and Methods

SAMPLE

This research proposes to engage in primary data collection, surveying female and male sworn officers from three police agencies in Maryland which serve populations of at least 250,000 residents, such as the Baltimore Police Department which serves a population of 614,000 people (National Policing Institute 2017). To distribute the survey to our population of interest, we will request permission from police agency supervisors to share the survey link with only sworn officers in the agency, and officers will independently decide if they wish to respond to the survey. Considering that police officers are a difficult population to get access to (especially as an undergraduate student with no personal ties to police officers), voluntary response sampling may be a more feasible method to acquire survey responses (as compared to a true random sampling method).

We plan to sample sworn officers from agencies which serve larger populations to aid in the recruitment of more female participants, as in the US, agencies which serve larger populations (specifically 250,000 residents and above) generally have a higher percentage of female sworn officers (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2017; Goodison 2022). However, with this rule in place, the sampling method will exclude rural spaces and smaller jurisdictions which may have fewer female officers and therefore have a different gender dynamic in the agency. We further explore the limitations of this sampling decision in the discussion section.

To compensate for the low number of women in police agencies, even in the more concentrated agencies serving larger populations, at the end of each survey, participants will be asked to share the survey with any female officers they may know, and this will serve to

oversample female officers through snowball sampling. This study may also use a method similar to Morabito and Shelley (2018) to oversample the female officer population, contacting existing law enforcement associations dedicated to women and requesting them to identify women who may be interested in participating in this study. However, different from Morabito and Shelley's (2018) approach, we will be sampling from various jurisdictions and will have more contextual variation to address. The ideal number of total participants is 400 individuals, with 200 men and 200 women. These participants will be randomly assigned to two different versions of the survey, Conditions 1 and 2, and ideally there will be 100 male officers and 100 female officers who take Condition 1, and 100 male officers and 100 female officers who take Condition 2.

The proposed study will use primary data collected from a survey we create through Qualtrics. The survey will be distributed digitally and completed on a smartphone, computer, laptop, or other device which can access the internet. We will get full informed consent of all participants. Immediately after clicking the survey link, participants will see a statement describing the purpose and details of the survey, and in order to continue with the survey, they must acknowledge the statement. The survey can be terminated at any point, and they will not be required to answer every question in the survey. There will be no personal identifiable information collected (no names, no information about which agency they are from, etc.).

SURVEY DESIGN

The survey will contain five sections: 1) responses to hypothetical misconduct scenarios, 2) how the participant performs police-specific masculinity, 3) how the participant performs general masculinity, and 4) demographics. See Appendix A for the full survey.

When participants open the survey, prior to any questions, they will be shown a short explanation of the survey, including details such as approximately how long the survey will take

them, the purposes of the survey, and ensuring them that all responses will be completely anonymous and that no identifiable information will be collected.

Section 1

Section 1 will include five hypothetical scenarios of an officer committing some kind of misconduct, presented in the form of a vignette 1-3 sentences long (see Appendix A for full set of vignettes). Scenarios are drawn from the 11 scenarios originally created by Klockars (1997), and are edited to always include some gendered pronoun in each scenario (See Appendix A for full vignette). There will be two versions of the survey distributed, and participants will be randomly assigned to one version, where some participants will receive the scenarios with female pronouns used for the hypothetical officer, and the rest will receive the scenarios with male pronouns used for the hypothetical officer. An example of a female-pronouns condition scenario includes:

> "A police officer finds a wallet in a parking lot. It contains the amount of money equivalent to a full-day's pay for that officer. She reports the wallet as lost property, but keeps the money for herself."

After reading each scenario, participants will be asked a series of closed-response questions, also pulled from Klockars (1997) and slightly edited:

1. How serious do you perceive this behavior to be?
2. How serious would most officers in your agency perceive this behavior to be?
3. Would you report this behavior?
4. Would most officers in your agency report this behavior?

Questions 1 and 2 have a response category of 0-100%, 0% being "not serious at all" and 100% being "extremely serious." Questions 3 and 4 have a response category of 0-100%, 0% being "definitely would NOT report" and 100% being "definitely WOULD report."

Section 2

Section 2 will include five closed-response questions aiming to measure the extent to which participants perform policing-specific masculinity. The first question asks plainly how masculine (specifically, "macho") the participant presents themselves to be when at the police agency they are currently employed at, and responds on a scale of 0% to 100%, 0% being "NOT macho at all," and 100% being "EXTREMELY macho." The second question of Section 3 will ask, of the coworkers the participant socializes with outside of work, what percentage of them are male.

The next three questions of Section 2 will be in response to a small vignette, describing a scenario where the participant is described to witness another officer being berated by a female officer of a higher rank (see Appendix A for full vignette). After the vignette, the participant will be asked how strongly they endorse the female officer's behavior (on a scale of 0 to 100%), how strongly they endorse the berated officer's comments (on a scale of 0 to 100%), and how serious they believe it is that an officer has made a sexually demeaning joke (on a scale of 0 to 100%).

Section 3

Section 3 will present all questions from the shortened version of the CMNI (Levant et al. 2020), which includes 22 variables associated with masculinity, where participants will be asked to what extent they agree or disagree with the statements made. Statements include phrases such as: "I like to talk about my feelings" and "My work is the most important part of my life."

Section 4

Section 4 will ask closed-ended demographic questions, including gender, ethnicity, rank, and supervisor status.

Upon completing the survey, there will be a brief debriefing statement explaining the purpose of the survey to the participants, and a request for the participant to share the survey with any female police officers they may know.

MEASURES

Dependent Variables

The dependent variable of interest is the likelihood of the participant to report fellow officers' misconduct, and will be measured by responses in Section 1, when participants are asked "would you report this behavior?" and respond on a scale of 0-100%, 0% being 'would NOT report' and 100% being 'WOULD report.' To combine scores across the five scenarios in the survey, we plan to either add up scores or average them – this will depend on the distribution of responses to each scenario. If we add scores across questions, the minimum possible score is 0, and the maximum possible score is 500. If we average scores across questions, the minimum possible score is 0, and the maximum possible score is 100. This variable will be treated as continuous.

Independent Variables

There are three independent variables of interest: participants' gender, the gender of the officer described in the vignettes, and the extent to which the participant performs masculinity. The gender of the participant will be measured alongside other demographics, and will be measured as male, female, or nonbinary. The gender of the officer described in the vignettes is a dichotomous variable, measured as either male or female for the vignettes. While gender is not a binary, gender-neutral pronouns will not be included in the hypothetical scenarios for several reasons. Firstly, when Klockars (1997) first conducted his study on the code of silence with his 11

described scenarios, if pronouns were used, they were male, despite Klockars not exploring any relationship between gender and adherence to the code of silence. In the masculine space of a police agency, where the prototypical (and ideal) officer is male, it is likely that if presented with a scenario where there are no pronouns or gender-neutral pronouns used, the actor will be assumed to be male. Additionally, many participants may assume the actor to be either male or female and would not interpret the actor to be non-binary/genderqueer, so technically the manipulation of the actor's gender may still only result in two genders. Other than successfully manipulating gender, there will be limited access to many female participants, and since the independent variable is being manipulated across (and not within) participants, it is important to maximize the number of responses for the male versus female actor categories, as the question of interest is to compare these two groups.

Our third independent variable of interest is the extent to which the participant performs masculinity. Masculinity performance will be measured as a combination of policing-specific masculinity (measured in Section 2) and general masculinity (measured in Section 3). Policing-specific masculinity will be turned into a single score by adding up scores from all questions, and two questions are reverse coded (marked by an asterisk). General masculinity will be measured using the shortened version of the CMNI, where the scores from the 22 items will be added (and note that there are nine items to be reverse coded, and they are marked with an asterisk). Policing-specific and general masculinity scores will be added together, and the higher a participant's score, the more 'masculine' they present themselves to be. This variable will be continuous.

Controls

We will also have several controls of interest, variables which have been shown to be correlated with likelihood to report officer misconduct.

Kutnjak Ivković and colleagues (2018) finds that perceived likelihood of other officers to report misconduct is positively correlated with participant's reported likelihood of reporting misconduct. Here, we measure perceived likelihood of other officers to report misconduct as the sum of scores from Section 1, where participants are asked "Would most officers in your agency report this behavior?" Kutnjak Ivković and colleagues (2018) argues that peer influence is one of the stronger predictors of adherence to the code. Staying consistent with the questions Klockars (1997) asked in his survey, we also measure the belief of how other officers would view the misconduct's severity as summed scores from the question in Section 1, which asks: "How serious would most officers in your agency perceive this behavior to be?" Participants respond on a scale of 0-100%, 0% being 'not serious at all' and 100% being 'extremely serious.' Scores will be combined in the same manner reporting likelihood is measured, either averaged or summed based on the distribution of responses, and the variable will be treated as continuous.

Perceived severity of the misconduct is also positively correlated with participant's reported likelihood of reporting misconduct (Lim and Sloan 2016; Klockars et al. 2006; Kutnjak Ivković et al. 2018; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022; Westmarland and Conway 2020). Here, we measure this variable as summed scores from the question in Section 1 which asks: "How serious do you perceive this behavior to be?" This variable will be measured the same way as the belief of how other officers would view the misconduct's severity.

The final control measured in this study is whether or not the participant holds a supervisor position. Kutnjak Ivković and colleagues (2018) has shown that officers who are supervisors are significantly more likely than non-supervisors to report misconduct, and so this is measured in the demographics section of the survey (Section 4), where participants report if they are either supervisory or non-supervisory personnel.

ANALYTICAL METHOD

Likelihood to Report Misconduct (by gender identity)

To determine if there is a difference between male and female officers' likelihood to report misconduct, we would conduct a two sample t-test between male officers and female officers' likelihood to report. We use a two sample t-test as the samples of male and female officers are assumed to be independent, and the likelihood to report is a continuous variable. We assume a normal distribution and homogeneity of variance between male and female officers.

Likelihood to be Reported On (by gender identity)

To determine if officers are more likely to report on female or male officers from the hypothetical scenarios described in the survey, we would run two paired sample t-tests. The first t-test would compare female officers who received the male offender version of the survey with female officers who received the female offender version of the survey. The second t-test would compare male officers who received the male offender version of the survey with male officers who received the female offender version of the survey. We use a paired sample t-test, rather than a two sample t-test, as the participants are arguably not fully independent of one another as they are grouped by gender. Likelihood to report is a continuous variable, and we assume a normal distribution and homogeneity of variance between male and female officers.

Likelihood to Report Misconduct (by masculinity performance)

To determine if there is a relationship between masculinity performance and likelihood to report misconduct, we would run a linear regression between masculinity performance and likelihood to report misconduct. Both variables are continuous and here we assume a linear

relationship. We will control for the previously listed control variables by including them as a covariate in the linear regression.

Chapter 4: Results

LIKELIHOOD TO REPORT MISCONDUCT (BY GENDER IDENTITY)

We hypothesize that there will be no significant difference between male and female officers' likelihood to report misconduct. If we find this result, it would imply that female officers behave similarly to male officers and conform to police social norms. This would also imply that gender identity has no impact on the code of silence. From a policy standpoint, this may suggest that simply including more women in policing will not change police culture and will not significantly impact the rates of reporting misconduct. It is important to note that this would be reflective of departments which are similar to those sampled in this study, departments with higher concentrations of female officers. This result would be particularly interesting, because despite arguably having enough female officers to create some sort of subculture in policing where the behavior and attitudes differed from male officers, female officers would be shown to still conform to masculine police norms.

However, we may also find that there is a significant difference between male and female officers' likelihood to report misconduct. Perhaps men may report more than women, which would imply that women do not conform to police culture social norms, and behave distinctly from male officers. This result would only be generalizable to other departments which have similarly high concentrations of female officers, as departments with fewer female officers would possibly see a different result.

LIKELIHOOD TO BE REPORTED ON (BY GENDER IDENTITY)

We hypothesize that both male and female officers would be more likely to report on female actors of misconduct, and this would provide evidence for the viewpoint that women are

considered 'outsiders' in policing, and that outsider status is something considered by officers when making the decision whether or not to conform to the code of silence.

However, we may also find that male and female officers are not more likely to report on female actors of misconduct, and there is no difference to be found in reporting likelihood between scenarios with male actors or female actors of misconduct. Here, this would imply that gender identity is irrelevant when officers are deciding whether or not to conform to the code of silence. We may also find that male officers are more likely to be reported on, which would be a very surprising response, and may indicate that perhaps there is another variable we have not considered.

LIKELIHOOD TO REPORT MISCONDUCT (BY MASCULINITY PERFORMANCE)

We hypothesize that masculinity performance will be negatively correlated with likelihood to report misconduct — that the more an officer performs masculinity, the less likely they will be to report misconduct. If we find this result, that would show that individuals who adhere to the code of silence perform masculinity to a greater extent. What we would not know is if individuals who already perform masculinity more are those who also value adhering to the code of silence, or if the code of silence and masculinity performance are two separate aspects of police culture officers strive to uphold. We may also find that masculinity performance is not correlated with the likelihood to report misconduct, which would imply that gender performance has no impact with the code of silence.

Chapter 5: Limitations and Future Directions

There are many limitations of the proposed study, the first of which involves the sampling method proposed. In order to over sample the female officer population, it is proposed to sample from larger police departments which will have a higher concentration of female officers, however, this limits the sample and excludes smaller departments which serve smaller communities, and these departments may be distinctly different. These smaller departments may have fewer women, and because of that lower concentration of women, those female officers may behave differently than the female officers who serve in larger agencies which have more women. A wider sampling method may be implemented in future studies, sampling from different kinds of departments of different sizes, which may allow us to explore differences in behavior between women in larger departments and women in smaller departments.

Concerning the sampling method, we do not collect identifiable information of the agencies participants are sampled from. In this study, although we plan to sample from a limited number of agencies, through the snowball sampling method, we may also collect information from participants who serve in agencies other than those sampled. The decision to keep agency descriptors anonymous was made in the hopes of bolstering the response rate and accuracy of the responses, however this also limits the conclusions we are able to draw. It is likely that participants from different agencies are systematically different, especially if those agencies differ in terms of proportion of women, culture, size, etc. Future studies could look to include this information on the survey, however for the purposes of this study, this information is not included.

As with much of the research on the blue code of silence, there is no actual behavior being measured in this study, only self-reported hypothetical behavior to hypothetical scenarios, which may not reflect what participants would actually do or what the participants may have done before.

However, as measuring actual reporting behavior is difficult (particularly because of the stigma surrounding officers who report), using hypothetical self-report is the main method of studying this phenomenon. The behavior measured through this hypothetical self-report is also rather tame; there is no discussion of more severe acts of misconduct which are arguably more important to study, such as excessive use of force and sexual assault. Future research could attempt to measure something closer to actual behavior, perhaps through self-report, exploring what an officer *has* done, and this could take the form of an interview, which would allow for more in-depth exploration of rationalizations for decisions made.

Another limitation of the hypothetical scenarios used is they do not include other identity variables which may play a role in determining reporting likelihood. These variables include sexuality and how that is displayed in one's physical appearance (as there are some studies (Brown et al. 2020; Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016) which show that lesbians are more accepted in police departments, but not all lesbians are 'out'); personal closeness with the individual committing the misconduct; race and ethnicity; and more. As discussed before, these scenarios also do not include any non-binary individuals, and thus these results cannot be confidently generalized to gender-non-conforming individuals.

These hypothetical scenarios, and this thesis overall, also do not discuss the *intersectionality* of race, sexuality, and gender. These variables may interact with each other and those of different intersecting identities may experience the police culture differently, and therefore respond differently. The gendered performances officers partake in may be perceived differently, for example, female black officers may be perceived differently than white women when they perform masculinity. Though this proposed project does aim to collect demographic data, there are

no analytical plans to explore the relationship between gender, race, and sexuality. Future studies should look to explore the impact of these intersecting identities.

Concerning our measure for likelihood to report, participants are asked to respond to five hypothetical scenarios, and their responses to these five scenarios are then combined into a single score to indicate their overall willingness to report misconduct. However, these single scores may not be able to adequately reflect variation across individual scenarios. Participants may respond very unwilling to report misconduct for some scenarios and very willing to report for the other scenarios, but in the single score, this would be reflected to be a 'medium' willingness to report. Future studies should explore different ways to measure overall willingness to report which allows consideration of the variation across potential situations to be reported.

The pathways to reporting misconduct may also play a role in the likelihood to report misconduct. In the process of conducting this thesis' literature review, we were unable to find any discussion on how officers are able to report acts of misconduct, and if this varies based on jurisdictions and type of misconduct. This process may require interpersonal direct communications, or perhaps instead involves more administrative routes of filing various forms, and we anticipate that these pathways may interact with any relationship between gender and reporting likelihood. If a more interpersonal communication route is common, then perhaps officers would react differently if the supervisor they were reporting to was male or female. If the reporting process is more administrative, then perhaps gender plays less of a role, but the difficulty of filing a report may impact the likelihood to report misconduct as well.

Results from this study will not determine any causal relationship between gender and likelihood to report misconduct, as the study is non-experimental and does not explore any changes in behavior over time. This study simply further explores what variables are associated with

reporting behavior. There is no evidence to say if masculinity performance may cause adherence to the code, or if adherence to the code causes more masculine performances.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

As this is only a proposal, there are no specific results to discuss, however we argue that any results from this study would have implications for police policy. A proposed method of addressing numerous police issues, including low police legitimacy, is to increase gender diversity in police agencies. An example of this is the 30x30 Initiative signed by 150 police American and Canadian police departments, including the Metropolitan Police Department in Washington DC (Metropolitan Police Department n.d.; The Policing Project 2021), which is an initiative aiming to increase the number of women in policing. The 30x30 Initiative frames women as better officers in terms of their efficiency, integrity, and relationship with communities served, however the literature also shows that female officers may not necessarily behave any differently from male officers, especially in the context of adhering to the social norms of police culture (Brown et al. 2020; Galvin-White and O'Neal 2016; Prokos and Padavic 2022; Sanders et al. 2022). Despite policing being inherently gendered and the code of silence being a central part of police culture (Chan et al. 2010; Silvestri 2017; Kutnjak-Ivković 2022; Schuck and Rabe-Hemp 2022), there is limited research exploring the relationship between gender and the code of silence. This thesis hopes to rectify this by beginning the exploration of how gender identity and gender performance may play a role in influencing police behavior. Perhaps it is not about gender identity, being a man, woman or otherwise, but about gender performance, which anyone can engage in. Simply including more women in policing may not actually effectively address policing issues.

Appendices

Appendix A

Section 1

A police officer has a private arrangement with a local auto body shop to refer the owners of the cars damaged in the accidents to the shop. In exchange for each referral, she receives a payment of 5% of the repair bill from the shop owner.

How serious do *you* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all | Extremely serious

0————25————50————75————100

How serious would *most officers in your agency* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all | Extremely serious

0————25————50————75————100

Would *you* report this behavior?

Would NOT report | WOULD report

0————25————50————75————100

Would *most officers in your agency* report this behavior?

Would NOT report | WOULD report

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

<u>A police officer discovers a burglary of a jewelry shop. The display cases are smashed and it is obvious that many items have been taken. While searching the shop, she takes a watch, worth about two days pay for that officer. She reports that the watch had been stolen during the burglary.</u>

How serious do *you* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all Extremely serious

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

How serious would *most officers in your agency* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all Extremely serious

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

Would *you* report this behavior?

Would NOT report WOULD report

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

Would *most officers in your agency* report this behavior?

Would NOT report WOULD report

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

At 2 A.M. a police officer, who is on duty, is driving her patrol car on a deserted road. She sees a vehicle that has been driven off the road and is stuck in a ditch. She approaches the vehicle and observes that the driver is not hurt but is obviously intoxicated. She also finds that the driver is a police officer. Instead of reporting this accident and offense she transports the driver to her home.

How serious do *you* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all — Extremely serious

0————25————50————75————100

How serious would *most officers in your agency* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all — Extremely serious

0————25————50————75————100

Would *you* report this behavior?

Would NOT report — WOULD report

0————25————50————75————100

Would *most officers in your agency* report this behavior?

Would NOT report — WOULD report

0————25————50————75————100

A police officer finds a bar on her beat which is still serving drinks a half hour past its legal closing time. Instead of reporting this violation, the police officer agrees to accept a couple of free drinks from the owner.

How serious do *you* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all Extremely serious

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

How serious would *most officers in your agency* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all Extremely serious

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

Would *you* report this behavior?

Would NOT report WOULD report

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

Would *most officers in your agency* report this behavior?

Would NOT report WOULD report

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

A police officer finds a wallet in a parking lot. It contains the amount of money equivalent to a full-day's pay for that officer. She reports the wallet as lost property, but keeps the money for herself.

How serious do *you* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all | Extremely serious

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

How serious would *most officers in your agency* perceive this behavior to be?

Not serious at all | Extremely serious

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

Would *you* report this behavior?

Would NOT report | WOULD report

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

Would *most officers in your agency* report this behavior?

Would NOT report | WOULD report

0————————25————————50————————75————————100

Section 2

In the police agency which you are currently employed at, how "macho" do you present yourself to be?

NOT macho VERY macho

0————25————50————75————100

Of the coworkers you socialized with *outside* of work, what percentage of them are male?

None are male All are male

0————25————50————75————100

In a briefing, a fellow officer of the same rank as you makes a sexual comment about a woman relevant to a current case, and in response, a female officer of a higher rank than you says, "Nice joke, but would you say that to your mother? Would you say that to your wife?" Later the same day, the officer who made the sexual comment notes that the higher ranking female officer is a "bitch."

To what extent do you endorse the higher ranking female officer's reprimand?*

Do not endorse Strongly endorse

0————25————50————75————100

To what extent do you endorse the officer's later comment?

Do not endorse Strongly endorse

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

How serious is it that an officer made a sexual comment about a woman relevant to a current case?*

Not serious at all Very serious

0——————25——————50——————75——————100

Section 3

For each statement, please circle if you strongly disagree (SD), disagree (D), agree (A), or strongly agree (SA) with the statement on the left.

My work is the most important part of my life	SD	D	A	SA
I make sure people do as I say	SD	D	A	SA
In general, I do not like risky situations*	SD	D	A	SA
It would be awful if someone thought I was gay	SD	D	A	SA
I love it when men are in charge of women	SD	D	A	SA
I like to talk about my feelings*	SD	D	A	SA
I would feel good if I had many sexual partners	SD	D	A	SA
It is important to me that people think I am heterosexual	SD	D	A	SA
I believe that violence is never justified*	SD	D	A	SA
I tend to share my feelings*	SD	D	A	SA
I should be in charge	SD	D	A	SA
I would hate to be important*	SD	D	A	SA
Sometimes violent action is necessary	SD	D	A	SA

I don’t like giving all my attention to work*	SD	D	A	SA
More often than not, losing does not bother me*	SD	D	A	SA
If I could, I would frequently change sexual partners	SD	D	A	SA
I never do things to be an important person*	SD	D	A	SA
I never ask for help	SD	D	A	SA
I enjoy taking risks	SD	D	A	SA
Men and women should respect each other as equals*	SD	D	A	SA
Winning isn’t everything, it’s the only thing	SD	D	A	SA
It bothers me when I have to ask for help	SD	D	A	SA

* variable is to be reverse coded

Section 4

What is your gender?

- o Male
- o Female
- o Non-Binary

What is your ethnicity?

- o Black / African American
- o White / Caucasian
- o East Asian
- o South Asian
- o Hispanic
- o Native American
- o Other (please specify): ___________________

What is your sexuality?

- o Heterosexual
- o Homosexual
- o Bisexual
- o Pansexual
- o Other (please specify): ___________________

What is your rank?

- o Recruit
- o Corporal

- Lieutenant
- Colonel
- Officer
- Detective
- Captain
- Chief/Sheriff
- Deputy
- Sergeant
- Major
- Other:___________________

What is your assignment?

- Patrol
- On-call
- Detective
- Traffic
- Administrative
- Other:___________________

Are you a supervisor or non-supervisor?

- Supervisor (unit supervisor, group supervisor, chief / sheriff, etc.)
- Non-supervisor

Tables

Table 1

Recruits in basic training programs in state and local law enforcement training academies, by type of training environment, 2011-13 and 2018

TABLE 6
Stress training that academies offered and recruits received during basic training, by type of training environment, 2011–13 and 2018

Type of training environment	Percent of academies, 2018	Percent of recruits, 2018*	Percent of recruits, 2011–13
Total	100%	100%	100%
All/mostly stress	6.1	11.0	23.3 †
Slightly more stress than nonstress	16.4	15.9	25.0 †
Balanced stress and nonstress	52.3	48.9	33.2 †
Slightly more nonstress than stress	20.7	17.2	10.7 †
All/mostly nonstress	4.5	7.0	7.8

Note: Academies were asked about the degree to which their curriculum followed a stress model (i.e., military or paramilitary style), a nonstress model (i.e., academic or adult learning), or a combination of both models. Percentage of recruits is based on recruits who started basic training. Details may not sum to totals due to rounding. See appendix table 7 for standard errors.

*Comparison group.

†Difference with comparison group is significant at the 95% confidence level.

Source: Bureau of Justice Statistics, Census of Law Enforcement Training Academies, 2013 and 2018.

Note: Graph taken from Buehler (2021).

References

Acker, Joan. 1990. "HIERARCHIES, JOBS, BODIES:: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender & Society* 4(2):139–58. doi: 10.1177/089124390004002002.

Boehme, Hunter M., Christi Metcalfe, and Robert J. Kaminski. 2022. "Female Officers in Use-of-Force Encounters: An Examination of Potential Correlates." *Police Quarterly* 25(4):497–534. doi: 10.1177/10986111211053842.

Britton, Dana M., Shannon K. Jacobsen, and Grace E. Howard. 2018. *The Gender of Crime*. 2nd ed. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Brooks, Connor. 2022. "Federal Law Enforcement Officers, 2020 – Statistical Tables." *Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and United States of America.* https://bjs.ojp.gov/document/fleo20st.pdf

Brown, Jennifer, and Marisa Silvestri. 2019. "A Police Service in Transformation: Implications for Women Police Officers." *Police Practice & Research: An International Journal* 21(5):459–75. doi: 10.1080/15614263.2019.1611206.

Brown, Katharine L., and Michael D. Reisig. 2019. "Procedural Injustice, Police Legitimacy, and Officer Gender: A Vignette-Based Test of the Invariance Thesis." *Behavioral Sciences & the Law* 37(6):696–710. doi: 10.1002/bsl.2439.

Brown, Timothy C., Julie M. Baldwin, Rick Dierenfeldt, and Steven McCain. 2020. "Playing the Game: A Qualitative Exploration of the Female Experience in a Hypermasculine Policing Environment." *Police Quarterly* 23(2):143–73. doi: 10.1177/1098611119883423.

Buehler, Emily. 2021. "State and Local Law Enforcement Training Academies, 2018 – Statistical Tables." *Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice*

Programs, and United States of America. https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/slleta18st.pdf

Campeau, Holly. 2015. "'Police Culture' at Work: Making Sense of Police Oversight." *The British Journal of Criminology* 55(4):669–87. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azu093.

Caplan, Joel. 2003. "Police Cynicism: Police Survival Tool?" *The Police Journal* 76(4):304–13. doi: 10.1350/pojo.76.4.304.25821.

Civil Rights Division. 2023. "Law Enforcement Misconduct." U.S. Department of Justice. https://www.justice.gov/crt/law-enforcement-misconduct

Chan, Janet, Sally Doran, and Christina Marel. 2010. "Doing and Undoing Gender in Policing." *Theoretical Criminology* 14(4):425–46. doi: 10.1177/1362480610376408.

Chappell, Allison T., and Lonn Lanza-Kaduce. 2010. "Police Academy Socialization: Understanding the Lessons Learned in a Paramilitary-Bureaucratic Organization." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 39(2):187–214. doi: 10.1177/0891241609342230.

Cohen, Galia. 2021. "Public Administration Training in Basic Police Academies: A 50-State Comparative Analysis." *The American Review of Public Administration* 51(5):345–59. doi: 10.1177/0275074021999872.

Conti, Norman, and James J. Nolan III. 2005. "Policing the Platonic Cave: Ethics and Efficacy in Police Training." *Policing and Society* 15(2):166–86. doi: 10.1080/10439460500071705.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2017. "Table 74: Full-time Law Enforcement Employees by Population Group, Percent Male and Female." *Crime in the United States*. Retrieved December 10, 2023 (https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2017/crime-in-the-u.s.-2017/tables/table-74)

Galvin-White, Christine M., and Eryn Nicole O'Neal. 2016. "Lesbian Police Officers' Interpersonal Working Relationships and Sexuality Disclosure: A Qualitative Study." *Feminist Criminology* 11(3):253–84. doi: 10.1177/1557085115588359.

Garner, Joel H., Matthew J. Hickman, Ronald W. Malega, and Christopher D. Maxwell. 2018. "Progress toward National Estimates of Police Use of Force." *PLOS ONE* 13(2):e0192932. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0192932.

Goodison, Sean E. 2022. "Local Police Departments Personnel, 2020." *Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, and United States of America.* https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/lpdp20.pdf

Hochschild, Arlie Russell, and Anne Machung. 1989. *The Second Shift: Working Families and the Revolution at Home*. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books.

Horne, Rebecca M., Matthew D. Johnson, Nancy L. Galambos, and Harvey J. Krahn. 2018. "Time, Money, or Gender? Predictors of the Division of Household Labour Across Life Stages." *Sex Roles* 78(11):731–43. doi: 10.1007/s11199-017-0832-1.

Jones, Daniel J. 2020. "The Potential Impacts of Pandemic Policing on Police Legitimacy: Planning Past the COVID-19 Crisis." *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 14(3):579–86. doi: 10.1093/police/paaa026.

Klockars, Carl B., Sanja Kutnjak Ivkovic, and Maria R. Haberfeld. 2006. *Enhancing Police Integrity*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Klockars, Carl B. 1997. "Police Corruption in Thirty Agencies in the United States, 1997." ICPSR. https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02629.v1

Kutnjak Ivković, Sanja, Jon Maskály, Ahmet Kule, and Maria Maki Haberfeld. 2022. *Police Code of Silence in Times of Change*. Springer Nature.

Kutnjak Ivković, Sanja, M. R. Haberfeld, and Robert Peacock. 2019. "Overlapping Shades of Blue: Exploring Police Officer, Supervisor, and Administrator Cultures of Police Integrity." Pp. 35–60 in *Exploring Police Integrity: Novel Approaches to Police Integrity Theory and Methodology*, edited by S. Kutnjak Ivković and M. R. Haberfeld. Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Kutnjak Ivković, Sanja, Maki Haberfeld, and Robert Peacock. 2018. "Decoding the Code of Silence." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 29(2):172–89. doi: 10.1177/0887403416680853.

Levant, Ronald F., Ryon McDermott, Mike C. Parent, Nuha Alshabani, James R. Mahalik, and Joseph H. Hammer. 2020. "Development and Evaluation of a New Short Form of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory (CMNI-30)." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 67(5):622–36. doi: 10.1037/cou0000414.

Lim, Hyeyoung, and John Sloan III. 2016. "Police Officer Integrity: A Partial Replication and Extension." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 39:284–301. doi: 10.1108/PIJPSM-10-2015-0127.

Lonsway, Kim, Margaret Moore, Penny Harrington, Eleanor Smeal, and Katherine Spillar. 2003. "Hiring and Retaining More Women: The Advantages to Law Enforcement Agencies." *National Center for Women & Policing*.

Metropolitan Police Department Washington, D.C. (n.d.). "Women in Policing." Retrieved 5 May, 2024 (https://joinmpd.dc.gov/metropolitan-police/women-law-enforcement)

Morabito, Melissa, and Tara Shelley. 2018. "Constrained Agency Theory and Leadership: A New Perspective to Understand How Female Police Officers Overcome the Structural and Social Impediments to Promotion." *Feminist Criminology* 13:155708511876310. doi: 10.1177/1557085118763104.

National Policing Institute. 2017. "Participating Agencies." Police Data Initiative. https://www.policedatainitiative.org/participating-agencies/

Noppe, Jannie, Antoinette Verhage, and Anjuli Van Damme. 2017. "Police Legitimacy: An Introduction." *Policing: An International Journal* 40(3):474–79. doi: 10.1108/PIJPSM-05-2017-0058.

Prokos, Anastasia, and Irene Padavic. 2002. "'There Oughtta Be a Law Against Bitches': Masculinity Lessons in Police Academy Training." *Gender, Work & Organization* 9(4):439–59. doi: 10.1111/1468-0432.00168.

Rabe-Hemp, Cara E. 2009. "POLICEwomen or PoliceWOMEN?: Doing Gender and Police Work." *Feminist Criminology* 4(2):114–29. doi: 10.1177/1557085108327659.

Rief, Rachael M., and Samantha S. Clinkinbeard. 2020. "Exploring Gendered Environments in Policing: Workplace Incivilities and Fit Perceptions in Men and Women Officers." *Police Quarterly* 23(4):427–50. doi: 10.1177/1098611120917942.

Rucker, Julian M., and Jennifer A. Richeson. 2021. "Toward an Understanding of Structural Racism: Implications for Criminal Justice." *Science* 374(6565):286–90. doi: 10.1126/science.abj7779.

Sanders, Carrie B., Julie Gouweloos, and Debra Langan. 2022. "Gender, Police Culture, and Structured Ambivalence: Navigating 'Fit' with the Brotherhood, Boys' Club, and Sisterhood." *Feminist Criminology* 17(5):641–60. doi: 10.1177/15570851221098040.

Schuck, Amie M., and Cara E. Rabe-Hemp. 2021. "A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Academy Socialization on Police Integrity." *Police Quarterly* 24(4):578–606. doi: 10.1177/10986111211029958.

Schuck, Amie M., and Cara E. Rabe-Hemp. 2022. "Breaking the Code of Silence: The Importance of Control Systems and Empathy Toward Outgroups." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 49(11):1637–55. doi: 10.1177/00938548221105219.

Schuck, Amie M., and Cara Rabe-Hemp. 2005. "Women Police: The Use of Force by and Against Female Officers." *Women & Criminal Justice* 16(4):91–117. doi: 10.1300/J012v16n04_05.

Schuck, Amie M., Paola Baldo, and Christopher Powell. 2021. "Women in Policing and Legitimacy: A Vignette-Based Study of Symbolic Representation." *Women & Criminal Justice* 31(5):342–59. doi: 10.1080/08974454.2020.1871159.

Schuck, Amie M. 2021. "Motivations for a Career in Policing: Social Group Differences and Occupational Satisfaction." *Police Practice and Research* 22(5):1507–23. doi: 10.1080/15614263.2020.1830772.

Shelley, Tara, Melissa Morabito, and Jennifer Tobin. 2011. "Gendered Institutions and Gender Roles: Understanding the Experiences of Women in Policing." *Criminal Justice Studies* 24:351–67. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2011.625698.

Sierra-Arévalo, Michael. 2021. "American Policing and the Danger Imperative." *Law & Society Review* 55(1):70–103. doi: 10.1111/lasr.12526.

Silvestri, Marisa. 2017. "Police Culture and Gender: Revisiting the 'Cult of Masculinity.'" *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 11(3):289–300. doi: 10.1093/police/paw052.

Sneed, Bethany G. 2007. "Glass Walls in State Bureaucracies: Examining the Difference Departmental Function Can Make." *Public Administration Review* 67(5):880–91. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6210.2007.00775.x.

Stoughton, Seth W. 2015. "Law Enforcement's "Warrior" Problem." *Harvard Law Review Forum* 128:225-234

Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies." *American Sociological Review* 51(2):273–86. doi: 10.2307/2095521.

Taylor, Bruce G., Poulami Maitra, Elizabeth Mumford, and Weiwei Liu. 2022. "Sexual Harassment of Law Enforcement Officers: Findings From a Nationally Representative Survey." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 37(11–12):NP8454–78. doi: 10.1177/0886260520978180.

The Policing Project. 2021. "30x30 Initiative." https://30x30initiative.org/

Todak, Natalie. 2023. ""'A Panel of Good Ol' Boys": Women Navigating the Police Promotions Process." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 48:967–83. doi: 10.1007/s12103-023-09732-w.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2):125–51.

Westmarland, Louise, and Steve Conway. 2020. "Police Ethics and Integrity: Keeping the 'Blue Code' of Silence." *International Journal of Police Science & Management* 22(4):378–92. doi: 10.1177/1461355720947762.

Wieslander, Malin. 2019. "Learning the (Hidden) Silence Policy within the Police." *Studies in Continuing Education* 41(3):308–25. doi: 10.1080/0158037X.2018.1497592.