3-2018

FEMALE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER'S EXPERIENCES OF WORKPLACE HARASSMENT

Vanessa Brodeur

FEMALE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER'S EXPERIENCES OF WORKPLACE HARASSMENT

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Criminal Justice

by

Vanessa Michelle Brodeur

March 2018

FEMALE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER'S EXPERIENCE OF WORKPLACE HARASSMENT

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Vanessa Michelle Brodeur

March 2018

Approved by:

Christine Famega, Committee Chair, Criminal Justice

Deborah Parsons, Committee Member

John Reitzel, Committee Member

ABSTRACT

Prior research shows that female police officers experience more incidents of harassment than male police officers, and these experiences of harassment have been shown to have negative effects on their mental and physical health, retention, and job satisfaction. The current study examined the experiences of harassment of 20 female police officers from agencies around Southern California. A survey interview was used, and it was found that none of the women had experienced quid pro quo harassment, but every woman recalled experiencing environmental harassment at some point throughout their career. Hostility towards women was more commonly experienced than harassment which was sexual in nature. Several themes arose from responses to open-ended questions. Female police officers reported that: gender related comments/jokes are not “unwanted”; that they participate in the jokes; gender related jokes are part of the policing culture; and that female officers are negatively targeted because of their sex. Some women stated they did not want to report the harassment and risk ruining their career.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Famega, my committee chair, for all of her support and guidance throughout my career at California State University, San Bernardino. She has pushed me to be better academically from the time I started in my undergraduate career, to my first quarter as a graduate student, to guiding me through writing my thesis. I would like to acknowledge my committee members, Dr. Reitzel and Dr. Parsons, for their support throughout this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Schoepfer for her assistance and guidance throughout my graduate career.

DEDICATION

To my mom and dad (Michelle and Edgar), my sister (Veronica), and Grandma and Grandfather:

You have all supported me throughout my college career, and especially in the last 6 years while achieving my Master's Degree. Throughout my life you have all told me I can do whatever I set my mind to, and you have loved and supported me unconditionally. Whenever I felt overwhelmed or lost, you reminded me to stay focused, trust God, and that everything will work out as it was supposed to. I want to make a special dedication to my mom; over the last year you truly taught me what it means to be strong mentally and physically. Although you have been going through a scary time in life, you have never stopped cheering me on and supporting me. I would not be where I am today if it were not for your constant love, support, and encouragement. I love you all so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Prevalence of the Problem

Law enforcement is a predominantly male profession, and it has been this way since police departments and sheriff departments were first created. As of 2007, even in large departments (100 sworn officers or greater), females accounted for 15% or less of the total sworn officers (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010).

Studies which have examined harassment among police officers/military personnel have found that female officers experienced more incidents of harassment than male officers (Burke and Mikkelsen, 2004; DeHaas, Timmerman, and Hoing, 2009; Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, and Waldo, 1999; Hassell and Brandl, 2009; Lonsway, Paynich, and Hall, 2013; Morash, Kwak, and Haarr, 2006; Rabe-Hemp, 2007; Seklecki and Paynich, 2007; Somvadee and Morash, 2008; Thompson, Kirk, and Brown, 2006). These incidents ranged from being touched in a way that made them uncomfortable, to hearing dirty stories and jokes, to being mistreated due to being a female. Fitzgerald et al. (1999) learned that many problems that women faced were due to hostility towards women in the workplace, and not of sexual nature.

Rabe-Hemp (2007) found that 100% of the female law enforcement officer's she interviewed had experienced some form of harassment at some point throughout their career. Many times this harassment was experienced towards the beginning of their career and tapered off. An interesting finding by Rabe-Hemp (2007) was that women who changed departments experienced harassment again at their new department. Not all studies specifically ask whether an officer has been harassed, rather they ask if officers have experienced certain behaviors, and how often they have experienced them. Every study measuring harassment in law enforcement found that female law enforcement officers had experienced some type of harassment at some point throughout her career.

Sexual harassment has been used as a predictor of stress in law enforcement officers (Morash et al., 2006). It was found that female law enforcement officers reported more experiences of sexual harassment and experienced significantly more stress than male law enforcement officers (Morash et al., 2006). Thompson et al. (2006) measured stress in female law enforcement officers, and found that interpersonal stress was the most stressful for females. Two of the items included in interpersonal stress were gender discrimination and sexual harassment. These two items had the highest scores within interpersonal stress. Mental health, physical health, and burnout are also negatively affected by experiences of sexual harassment (DeHaas et al., 2009).

Burke and Mikkelsen (2004) found that female law enforcement officers reported more instances of sexual harassment. Those females who reported higher sexual harassment, also reported lower job satisfaction. Therefore, sexual harassment is significantly negatively correlated to job satisfaction. One survey done by Cordner and Cordner (2011) revealed that female officers believe that experiencing sexual harassment affects retention of female officers. Not only are female law enforcement officers experiencing harassment at a higher rate than male law enforcement officers, but it is negatively affecting job satisfaction, retention, mental health, and physical health. When law enforcement officers are experiencing higher levels of stress due to harassment, or their mental/physical health begins to decline this will decrease how efficiently they are able to do their job. If an officer is not fully focused on their job, rather what just occurred in briefing or something that was said to them or about them, it will also affect officer safety. When the problem becomes bad enough, it is possible that females will begin to leave the field of law enforcement which creates a problem in needing more officers in the field, cities/counties having to pay to hire and train new officers, all with the risk of this occurring again. It is necessary to determine what type of harassment is occurring and how often it is occurring in hopes to help department's better tailor sexual harassment training for their employees.

Purpose of the Study

The present study used a survey interview to gather data regarding female law enforcement officers' experiences of harassment. In examining harassment among female law enforcement officers, a definition of harassment is needed. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) defines harassment as follows:

> Harassment is unwelcome conduct that is based on race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy), national origin, age (40 or older), disability, or genetic information.

The EEOC defines sex discrimination harassment as:

> Harassment can include "sexual harassment" or unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature. Harassment does not have to be of sexual nature, however, and can include offensive remarks about a person's sex.

Since the current study is only examining female law enforcement officers, an adaptation of the EEOC definition of harassment and sex discrimination harassment will be used. The definition of harassment that was used for the current study is:

> Unwelcome conduct based on gender, sex, or being pregnant, by a supervisor, supervisor of another unit, or a co-worker.

Most of the questions on the current survey have been either directly taken from prior studies or they are adaptations of questions from prior studies. It is hoped that this compilation of survey questions from prior research will provide data to address topics with limited research in the existing literature. Most of the prior studies lacked the examination of what type of harassment occurs more often, environmental harassment (jokes, stories, being mistreated, etc.) or quid pro quo harassment (offering job related perks for sexual favors). Behaviors were measured which fall under environmental harassment and quid pro quo harassment, but it was not clearly examined as to which one was occurring more often.

Although some prior studies have looked at job satisfaction, female officers have not been asked whether they believe their job satisfaction is related to their experiences of harassment. Prior studies have also not examined whether there is a relationship between marital/relationship status and experiences of harassment. The current study will address these questions/issues, as well as: how frequently experiences of harassment occur and whether harassment subsides as the female gains more years of experience.

Since it has been found in one prior study that switching departments caused female officers to experience harassment again, this will be measured in the current study as well. The effect of several demographic characteristics, such as race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current

assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, and marital status, on experiences of harassment will also be measured. These demographic variables have been collected in prior studies, but few have examined their relationship to experiences of sexual harassment

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Harassment Defined

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) defines harassment as “unwelcome conduct that is based on race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy), national origin, age (40 or older), disability or genetic information”. Sex discrimination harassment “can include ‘sexual harassment’ or unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature. Harassment does not have to be of a sexual nature, however, and can include offensive remarks about a person’s sex” (EEOC). For the current study, an adaptation of the EEOC definition will be used. Harassment will be defined as: unwelcome conduct based on gender, sex, or being pregnant, by a supervisor, supervisor of another unit, or a co-worker.

The participants in this study are female law enforcement officers from Southern California law enforcement agencies. There are several studies that examine workplace harassment in law enforcement or the military. Since law enforcement agencies and military branches are similar in structure, rank, and personnel (more males than females), findings of studies examining sexual harassment in the military will also be reviewed.

Previous Studies

Sexual Experiences

Hay and Elig (1999) explain the data collection, and the design of a survey used by Fitzgerald et al. (1999) as part of a 1995 study to measure gender issues in the military. Over 49,000 males and females in the military were mailed a letter soliciting participation in the study, approximately 6 weeks later the questionnaire was mailed out (Hay and Elig, 1999). One reminder, a second questionnaire and third questionnaire with reminders encouraging participants to complete the questionnaire were each sent out at four week intervals (Hay and Elig, 1999). A total of 28,296 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 53%; 22,372 of these were female, and 5,924 were male (women were purposely oversampled [Hay and Elig, 1999]), making the total percent of women 79% (Hay and Elig, 1999).

The questionnaire used was a military version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). The SEQ-DoD was comprised of 28 items measuring sexual coercion, unwanted sexual attention, and gender harassment with a three point response scale (0= never; 1= once; 2=more than once) (Fitzgerald et al., 1999).

Sexual coercion is defined as “extortion of sexual cooperation in return for job related considerations” (Fitzgeral et al., 1999, pg. 246). Unwanted sexual attention is defined as “verbal and nonverbal behavior that is offensive, unwanted, and unreciprocated” (Fitzgerald et al., 1999, pg. 246). Gender

harassment is defined as “verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed as sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about women” (Fitzgerald et al., 1999, pg. 246). Gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention fall into the category of hostile environment, while sexual coercion is often referred to as quid pro quo harassment (Fitzgeral et al., 1999). After analyzing the data, Fitzgerald et al. (1999) broke gender harassment into two categories: sexist hostility, which is discrimination based on one’s sex, and sexual hostility, which is sexual in nature. It was found that females reported higher levels of all types of harassment. Approximately 42% of females reported experiencing unwanted sexual attention, 13% experienced sexual coercion, 69% experienced sexist hostility, and 63% experienced sexual hostility (Fitzgerald et al., 1999). Approximately 8% of males experienced unwanted sexual attention, 2% reported experiencing sexual coercion, 35% experienced sexist hostility, and 15% experienced sexual hostility (Fitzgerald et al., 1999). Fitzgerald et al. (1999) found that many problems faced by women in the military were not sexual in nature; it had more to do with hostility towards women.

De Guzman and Frank (2003) aimed to identify and measure gender related workplace problems among the Filipino police force. The capital city of Iloilo Province in the Visayas region of the Philippines, Iloilo City, is where this study took place. The department had 359 total sworn personnel, 33 of which were female; this ratio of male to female police officers is similar to that of the rest of the Filipino police forces (DeGuzman & Frank, 2003).

A three part questionnaire was distributed to the 33 women. The first part of the questionnaire collected demographic data and data regarding the females' assignment at work. The second part of the questionnaire collected data regarding the female officer's performance. The third part of the questionnaire consisted of 20 items focusing on the identification and measurements of gender related work problems, including, but not limited to, recruitment, promotion, unit assignment, work assignment, and work place environment (DeGuzman & Frank, 2003). One of the items measuring workplace environment was sexual harassment. Approximately 30% of the females chose the answers "agree" or "strongly agree" that sexual harassment is common in the workplace (DeGuzman & Frank, 2003).

Rabe-Hemp (2007) conducted in-depth interviews with female law enforcement officers to learn about their experiences in the workplace, including resistance and obstacles faced, coping mechanisms used, and underlying themes in success stories. Twenty-four female officers from twelve departments were interviewed for this study. All officers had between ten to thirty years of experience. Participants for the study were obtained using snowball sampling (Rabe-Hemp, 2007). The interviewer took notes and, with the participants' permission, recorded the interviews. Rabe-Hemp (2007) found that all 24 women she interviewed reported instances of sexual harassment, discrimination, or disrespect. It was found that most of these instances occurred early in the female's career, and slowed down as she gained tenure (Rabe-Hemp, 2007).

However, if a female officer changed departments, the sexual harassment, discrimination, or disrespect would occur again at her new department (Rabe-Hemp, 2007). This study does not report statistics due to the qualitative nature, so it is unknown which of these occurred more frequently and how often these instances occurred.

In 2007, Seklecki and Paynich examined experiences of harassing behaviors using a random sample of all female police officers listed in National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators, Correctional Institutions, and Related Agencies. The goal was to sample 2,000 female law enforcement officers. Seklecki and Paynich (2007) began by using every 30th agency, speaking with the agency, finding out how many female officers were employed at the agency, and if the female officers would be allowed to participate in the study. The researchers realized they were not going to obtain 2,000 females so they began using every 29th agency on the list. Surveys were sent to a trusted contact within the given departments to be distributed to the female officers (Seklecki and Paynich, 2007). Approximately 2,000 surveys were mailed out, and 531 were returned for an approximate 26% return rate (Seklecki and Paynich, 2007).

The most common harassing behaviors experienced by female officers are "putting women down, being insulted and called homosexual by citizens, someone trying to have a sexual relationship with the respondent despite their objections, someone making sexually suggestive remarks at or about the

respondent, and hearing dirty jokes and/or stories being told" (Seklecki and Paynich, 2007, pg. 26). However, despite these incidents being considered harassment, 72.8% of female officers reported that they did not feel they had ever been sexually harassed (Seklecki and Paynich, 2007). Seklecki and Paynich (2007) suggested that future research into harassment of officers should include qualitative responses to determine what these incidents are that are occurring and obtain more knowledge of what female officers consider harassment. Data was also collected regarding sexual preference, rank, race, tenure, education, and current assignment, but analyses were not conducted regarding these characteristics and experience of harassment. Seklecki and Paynich (2007) suggested for future research to compare experiences of harassment of homosexual officers versus heterosexual officers.

Somvadee and Morash (2008) examined sexual harassment experiences of female law enforcement officers in the United States. Five agencies in the Midwest portion of the United States allowed their females to participate in the study while on-duty. A total of 121 females were asked to participate in the study, and 117 females agreed and completed the survey (resulting in a 96.7% response rate) (Somvadee & Morash, 2008). One of the authors met with women in small groups to explain the study and allow them to complete the survey. The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) was used to measure females' experiences at work. Approximately 90% had experienced one or more

of the behaviors on the SEQ, but only 58.2% felt they had been a victim of sexual harassment (Somvadee & Morash, 2008).

In the category of gender harassment, 86.6% of women reported hearing suggestive jokes or offensive stories, 53.8% reported males had been condescending to them due to their sex, and 69.2% reported being treated differently due to their sex (Somvadee & Morash, 2008). In the category of unwanted sexual attention, 36.7% of the females reported experiencing unwelcome touching, and 20.5% reported coworkers had attempted to establish a sexual relationship (Somvadee & Morash, 2008). Only 5% of the females that completed the survey reported an implication of better treatment for their sexual cooperation (Somvadee & Morash, 2008). Qualitative descriptions of these behaviors were also gathered, and it was found that most women were more concerned about the males they work with questioning whether they could "do the job" or not (Somvadee & Morash, 2008).

Somvadee and Morash (2009) used the same sample as their study published in 2008, however they evaluated female's responses to sexual harassment in the study published in 2009. The results regarding what percentage of females experienced each of the types of harassment are listed above (Somvadee and Morash, 2008). The most common way female officer's reacted to sexual harassment was by hinting about their dissatisfaction (61.3%), and the least common reaction was to file a formal complaint (19.8%). Also,

women who tend to work with mostly males viewed sexual harassment as less severe.

Lonsway et al. (2013) conducted two studies regarding the incidence, impact, and perception of sexual harassment among law enforcement officers. Study 1 gathered data regarding experiences that had occurred in the last year. Study 1 started with 797 sworn personnel, but they wanted to over sample those with the rank of Captain or greater, therefore the sample grew to 807 sworn personnel (Lonsway et al., 2013). An initial letter was sent out to participants explaining the study, that it will be used to shape future policies, and where the survey administration would occur. Those with the rank of Captain or greater had the questionnaire mailed to them; those with the rank of lieutenant or lower were requested to respond in groups of 50 to complete the questionnaire (Lonsway et al., 2013). The overall response rate was 84%; 69 of the 82 females responded, 293 of the 369 minority males responded, and 301 of the 346 white males responded (Lonsway et al., 2013).

The questionnaire asked questions regarding work attitudes/behaviors, health, and sexual harassment; for purposes of the given study, data regarding sexual harassment is focused on. Sixteen behaviors adapted from the SEQ were used on the questionnaire to measure gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and quid pro quo harassment. Females experienced each of the behaviors more, and felt that the behaviors experienced constituted sexual harassment (92.5% of females and 82.6% of males had experienced at least one

behavior in the last year) (Lonsway et al., 2013). A total of 48.5% of females reported receiving unwanted sexual attention, and only 18.2% of males; 91.2% of females experienced gender harassment, as compared to 82.4% of males; 4.3% of females experienced quid pro quo harassment, in comparison to 2.3% of males. Nearly 6% of females felt that these behaviors constituted sexual harassment, versus only 0.2% for males.

The participants were also asked who the most common perpetrator is: coworkers, supervisors, command staff, or other (Lonsway et al., 2013). It was found that coworkers were the most common perpetrator.

In Study 2, Lonsway et al. (2013) examined experiences and perceptions of harassment that had occurred over the course of female law enforcement officers' careers. The researchers began with a list of law enforcement agencies that had been published by the Public Safety Information Bureau in 2002, and every 30th agency was chosen (Lonsway et al., 2013). These agencies were contacted and permission was requested to use their female officers; if permission was granted, the total number of female officers was requested from the agency. The goal was to obtain 2,000 female law enforcement officers. Researchers realized they would not obtain their goal; therefore they began using every 29th agency in order to obtain their goal (Lonsway et al., 2013). A total of 2,000 surveys were mailed out with prepaid and addressed return envelopes; however, only 531 surveys were returned for a response rate of 26% (Lonsway et al., 2013). The survey in Study 2 also

measured unwanted sexual attention, gender harassment, and quid pro quo harassment using several items adapted from the SEQ. There were three responses available: never, once or twice, and three or more (Lonway et al., 2013). Approximately 93% of the females had experienced at least one behavior throughout their career; 74% of females had experienced unwanted sexual attention; 15% of females experienced quid pro quo harassment; 91% of females experienced gender harassment (generally experienced during briefing); and 27% of females reported feeling sexually harassed (Lonsway et al., 2013). When females responded that they had experienced a behavior, they were asked to elaborate on the incident. The amount of females reported sexually harassing behaviors was higher in Study 2, however that is likely due to the time frame being ones entire career rather than only the last year.

Stress, Mental, and Physical Health

Morash et al. (2006) studied differences in predictors of stress in male versus female law enforcement officers using a survey instrument. The 11 departments that agreed to participate stemmed from an original study conducted in 1993 consisting of 24 departments, some of the departments that declined to participate did so due to staffing and workload levels (Morash et al., 2006). Researchers attempted to recruit 30 individuals from the following 8 categories from each department: black females, black males, Asian females, Asian males, Hispanic females, Hispanic males, white females, and white males; however, this was not possible for some of the smaller departments included in

the study. A total of 2,051 officers were given the survey to complete either during briefings or delivered through intradepartmental mail (Morash et al., 2006). Of the surveys distributed, 947 were returned for a 46% response rate.

This was done using a survey instrument measured: workplace problems (overestimation of physical ability, underestimation of physical ability, perceived lack of advancement opportunity, ridicule/set ups, lack of influence, feeling invisible, language harassment, bias, sexual harassment, racial harassment, and stigmatization due to physical appearance), social support, token status, community and department characteristics, and stress (Morash et al., 2006). For purposes of the current study, only the results regarding harassment will be covered here. Females (n= 241) reported experiencing greater language, sexual, and racial harassment than males (n= 670), female mean scores were 1.51, 1.12, and 1.14, respectively, and male mean scores were 1.27, 1.09, and 1.09, respectively (Morash et al., 2006). Sexual harassment is one of the items used by Morash et al. (2006) to measure stress, and it was found that females experience statistically significantly more stress than their male counterparts.

In 2006, Thompson et al. examined stress levels among female law enforcement officers in Australia. The survey was mailed to all of the female officers (1,081), including police recruits; only 421 usable surveys were returned (Thompson et al., 2006). The majority of the participants were constables (approximately 56%), and the least were commissioned officers (approximately 1%).

Rather than asking if certain stress predictors were present in their work environment, Thompson et al. (2006) asked how much they agreed that the stress predictor was present in order to determine which predictors cause the most stress. The survey consisted of sixteen (16) measures and had a 5-point Likert type scale to answer to what degree the respondent agreed or disagreed with the measure. Thompson et al. (2006) calculated the mean for the entire sample together, but also split the sample into two groups (sample 1, n=206, and sample 2, n=213) to run exploratory factor analysis (sample 1) and confirmatory sample analysis (sample 2). In calculating the mean for the full sample, the five highest means were workload and time pressures, physical threats or danger, administrative demands, problems with management, and exposure to trauma (M= 3.83; 3.79; 3.65; 3.64; and 3.64, respectively) (Thompson et al., 2006). Sexual harassment (M= 2.38) did not make the top five highest rated measures, it was actually the lowest mean of all 16 measures. After doing the confirmatory factor analysis with sample 1, the 16 measures were split into three groups: interpersonal stress (lack of colleague support, gender discrimination, sexual harassment, interpersonal conflict, and lack of confidentiality), organizational stress (physical working conditions, lack of positive feedback, problems with management, lack of resources, and administrative demands), and operational stress (interactions with the public, physical threats or dangers, exposure to trauma, work schedule, legal requirements, and workload and time pressures) (Thompson et al., 2006). Interpersonal stress was found to be the most stressful

for female law enforcement officers when, included in this is gender discrimination and sexual harassment which were the two highest items.

Dowler and Arai (2008) examined whether gender discrimination affected stress in officers. They used data that had been collected for a previous study; the dataset included officers from 9 police precincts in Baltimore, Maryland. Within those 9 precincts, one or two briefings were randomly chosen, and officers were asked to complete a questionnaire. This generated a 68% response rate, and totaled 1,104 officers (Dowler and Arai, 2008).

Gender discrimination was measured by asking how strongly officers agree with three statements: “within the department, gender-related jokes are often made in my presence” (p. 126), “the department tends to be more lenient in enforcing rules and regulations for female officers” (p. 126), and “female officers are held to a higher standard than male officers) (p. 126) (Dowler and Arai, 2008). Demographic characteristics were also collected including, but not limited to, race, age, marital status, education level, rank, and tenure. Females reported a higher perception of gender related jokes being told in front of them (7.1%) in comparison to their male counterparts (4.7%); females also agreed more strongly that females are held to a higher standard (11.5%) than their male counterparts (1.9%); and females had a lower agreement for females being treated more leniently (0.6%) as compared to their male counterparts (16.8%) (Dowler and Arai, 2008). Female officers had a higher mean score for stress (46.68), than male officers (44.74); however, the perception of gender related jokes being told

in front of the officer and the level of stress was only significantly related for females.

DeHaas, Timmerman, and Hoing (2009) examined the effect of sexual harassment on an officer's mental and physical health using the Dutch police department. All 25 Dutch regional police divisions were included. The researchers mailed out requests to the participants to complete an Internet questionnaire, after four weeks a reminder was sent to the participants to complete the questionnaire; the response rate was 15%, and included 3,001 male officers and 1,295 female officers. The Dutch adaptation of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire was used to measure sexual harassment, three questions were eliminated, thus the SEQ only measured unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion (DeHaas et al., 2009). Data on social support, workload, burnout, and physical health problems were also collected. Approximately 32% of female officers had experienced sexual harassment, but were not bothered by it; another 32% of female officers had experienced sexual harassment, and were bothered by it (DeHaas et al., 2009). Approximately 34% of males had experienced sexual harassment, but were not bothered by it, and approximately 13% of males had experienced sexual harassment and were bothered by it (DeHaas et al., 2009). Female officers experienced one or more sexual behaviors per week significantly more than male officers (64% and 48%, respectively) (DeHaas et al., 2009). DeHaas et al. (2009) found that, regardless

of gender, if an officer reports experiencing sexual harassment and being bothered by it, there will be negative effects on their health and burnout.

Hassell and Brandl (2009) examined the affect of sex, sexual orientation, and race on workplace experiences and how those experiences affect stress within the Milwaukee Police Department. At the time the data was collected, approximately 16% of the department was female, and there was White female chief. Questionnaires were given out during a mandatory in-service training session to all patrol personnel (Hassell & Brandl, 2009). Prior to completing the questionnaire, a video explaining the purpose of the study, how to complete the questionnaire, and how the data will be confidential and anonymous was shown. A total of 1,388 questionnaires were administered, and 1,191 were completed for a response rate of 86.8%, approximately 20% of the sample was female (Hassell & Brandl, 2009).

One of the workplace experiences included in the study was "sexually offensive behaviors", and one of the items measuring sexually offensive behaviors included "unwanted advances for romantic, physical, and sexual relationships with or without threats" (Hassell & Brandl, 2009, p. 415). While the mean for sexually offensive behavior was the lowest (M= 1.34) of all the workplace experiences, all of the females in the study reported more negative experiences of sexually offensive behaviors in the workplace. Hassell and Brandl (2009) found that participants' race and sex affected their workplace experiences and workplace experiences affect stress. Sexually offensive

behaviors were statistically related to stress; however, when participants reported more instances of sexually offensive behaviors, they also reported lower stress.

Sexual Harassment and Job Satisfaction and Retention

Burke and Mikkelson (2004) aimed to uncover whether male and female law enforcement officers in Norway held similar beliefs regarding gender issues within their departments, and whether female officers' experiences of these issues affected their job satisfaction. The Norwegian police union mailed questionnaires to 766 officers within 22 jurisdictions. The questionnaires were returned to an independent research institution (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004). A total of 640 males and 125 females returned the questionnaires, for a 62% response rate. They examined three (3) gender issues and seven (7) work and psychological well being items.

The three gender issues Burke and Mikkelson (2004) examined were: perception of equal opportunity, reasons for differences in career, and sexual harassment. Perception of equal opportunity was measured by four items: "respondents indicated whether males and females had equal opportunities for professional development, promotions to leadership positions, income and staying until retirement" (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004, pg. 137). Burke and Mikkelson examined to what degree four specific items were related to the difference in career paths of males and females; these items are "work assignments, work time, gender differences between men and women and discrimination against women" (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004, pg. 137). To

measure the issue of sexual harassment, Burke and Mikkelson used two items: “officers indicated the frequency they received unwanted sexual attention from work colleagues and the public” (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004, pg. 137).

Of the seven work and psychological well being items, only one pertains to the current study: job satisfaction. Burke and Mikkelson (2004) used seven items to measure job satisfaction, but they only specifically list one in their article, “regarding your work in general, how satisfied are you with your job as a whole, everything taken into consideration” (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004, pg. 137). Sexual harassment was significantly negatively correlated with job satisfaction. Female law enforcement officers reported more sexual harassment than their male counterparts (the mean was 3.0 for females and 2.2 for males), and the females who reported more sexual harassment reported lower job satisfaction, and greater cynicism (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004).

Cordner and Cordner (2011) surveyed female law enforcement officers from three counties (N=54) in Pennsylvania, and all of the chiefs of police of the departments within those three counties (N=68), all of whom were male. The surveys were mailed to participants; female officers received two reminders, and chiefs received one reminder to complete the survey. This generated a 78% response rate among female officers, and a 47% response rate among chiefs of police. Cordner and Cordner (2011) were investigating why there are so few female police officers in the region. Over 80% of chiefs of police and over 65% of female law enforcement officers believe there are so few females because a

low number of females apply for the position (Cordner and Cordner, 2011). There were six items listed in regards to retention of female officers, and participants were asked to rate these on a scale of 1 to 4 with 1 being strongly agree and 4 being strongly disagree. Females had a higher mean on all of the items (academy is male dominated and not woman friendly; departments are male dominated and not woman friendly; lack of family friendly policies; women leave after they have kids; lack of career advancement opportunity; and sexual harassment) (Cordner and Cordner, 2011). Women's response for sexual harassment being a hindrance to retention of female officers was twice as high as the chiefs of police, 27% and 13% respectively (Cordner and Cordner, 2011). The survey also asked open-ended questions to gather more depth regarding the closed-ended questions, and these answers were recorded in the article.

Summary

While the majority of the above listed studies were done in the United States (Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Morash et al., 2006; Rabe-Hemp, 2007; Seklecki and Paynich, 2007; Dowler and Arai, 2008; Hassell and Brandl, 2009; Cordner and Cordner, 2011; Somvadee and Morash, 2008; Somvadee and Morash, 2009; and Lonsway et al., 2013), there were several conducted in other countries around the world, such as, the Phillipines (DeGuzman et al., 2003), Norway (Burke and Mikkelson, 2004), Australia (Thompson et al., 2006), and the

Netherlands (DeHaas et al., 2009). However, no matter what country the study was conducted in, there was some percentage of women in the sample that had experienced sexual harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1999; DeGuzman et al., 2003; Burke and Mikkelson, 2004; Morash et al., 2006; Thompson et al., 2006; Rabe-Hemp, 2007; Seklecki and Paynich, 2007; Dowler and Arai, 2008; Somvadee and Morash, 2008; DeHaas et al., 2009; Hassell and Brandl, 2009; Somvadee and Morash, 2009; Cordner and Cordner, 2011; Lonsway et al., 2013).

The highest percentage of women reporting that they experienced sexual harassment was 100% (Rabe-Hemp, 2007); and the lowest percentage was 30% of females agreeing that sexual harassment was common in the workplace (DeGuzman et al., 2003). Gender harassment, including hearing sexual jokes/stories, being treated differently due to sex, and being condescending to females, accounted for a low of 7.1% (Dowler and Arai, 2008) to a high of 91.2% (Lonsway et al., 2013 [study 1]) of the type of harassment experienced by female officers. Quid pro quo harassment was typically the least commonly experienced type of harassment; the lowest percentage of females reporting this type of harassment was 4.3% (Lonsway et al., 2013 [study 1]), and the most was 15% (Lonsway et al., 2013 [study 2]); Fitzgerald et al. (1999) found that 13% of their female sample had experienced this type of harassment, and Somvadee and Morash (2008) found that only 5% of their sample had experienced this. Unwanted sexual attention, although not having the highest scores, had high scores across each of the studies examining it. The lowest percentage of

women experiencing unwanted sexual attention was 42% (Fitzgerald et al., 1999), and the highest was 57.2% (this combined unwanted touching [36.7%] and attempts at unwanted relationships [20.5%]) (Somvadee and Morash, 2008). Seklecki and Paynich (2007) also found that their most common forms of harassment included being put down, being insulted and called homosexual by citizens, and pursuing sexual relationships despite objections, all of which fall under the category of unwanted sexual attention.

The experience of sexual harassment tends to increase stress and cynicism while lowering job satisfaction (Thompson et al., 2006; Burke and Mikkelson, 2004). The only study which had results that were not in what would be a predicted direction, was Hassell and Brandl (2009). Hassell and Brandl (2009) found that an officer's race and sex affected their experiences at work, and experiences at work affected an officer's level of reported stress; however, officers who reported higher levels of sexual harassment, reported lower levels of stress.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Participants and Sampling Method

The purpose of this study was to obtain interviews with female law enforcement officers to determine how often harassment occurs, what type of harassment occurs, whether harassment varies as females gain more time in the law enforcement field, which, if any, demographic characteristics affect experiences of harassment, and if job satisfaction is related to experience of harassment. The participants in this study are female law enforcement officers from Southern California law enforcement agencies. The women were selected through snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is a nonparametric sampling method, meaning it is non-random. It is considered a purposive way to collect data because the researcher is looking for a certain group of people. The researcher identifies subjects who meet the criteria and asks the subjects to identify others similar to them; this type of snowball sampling is considered exponential non-discriminative snowball sampling. This method assists in locating participants of an interconnected population that may otherwise be difficult to contact and gain trust with (Bachman & Schutt, 2008). It is simple to conduct, cost-efficient and time efficient. For this study, the researcher has identified several female officers willing to participate. The first interviews were

conducted with these officers. At the conclusion of each interview, the researcher asked the interviewee if she was willing to refer other female officers to participate in the interview. If so, the researcher then contacted the referred officer(s) using the telephone or email information provided, and informed the officer of the purpose, description, and approximate duration of the interview. If the officer indicated that she was interested in participating, she was asked to identify a time and location where she would feel comfortable conducting the interview (a quiet, private area for recording purposes and to eliminate the possibility of others overhearing the interview to protect her privacy). The researcher continued to interview referred subjects until a sample size of at least thirty was obtained.

Prior to completing a demographic survey and the interview, the participants were given an informed consent form to read and sign acknowledging they understand the procedures, measures being taken to maintain confidentiality, and risks/benefits of participation.

Procedures

The researcher conducted face-to-face interview surveys with each participant (Babbie, 2008). Face-to-face interview surveys were used because they generate a higher response rate, and the researcher can make clarifications if the participant does not understand a question (Babbie, 2008).

Participants were asked for permission to tape record the interview. Either using a recording device, taking notes, or a combination of both is very

important during interviews to gather as much information as possible. Recording interviews allows for the researcher to go back, listen to the interview, and possibly discover themes within the interviews that were missed during the initial interview and note taking. Participants were asked if they have any concerns about being recorded during the interview. If the participant did not consent to being recorded, the researcher took detailed notes during the interview. The recording device was set up between the interviewer and the participant if the interview setting allows, otherwise the interviewer held the recorder during the interview. Participants were informed that questions may be skipped if desired, and that the interview may be terminated at anytime the participant requests (see Appendix C).

Confidentiality

The demographic survey, interview instruments and audio recordings do not identify the participants by name, and participant names are not be used in any reports produced from the data collected. Each law enforcement agency used is coded with a letter (A, B, C … etc.); each participant is given a letter and number (A1, A2, A3 … etc.) in order to maintain confidentiality. The paper demographic surveys, and interview instruments, as well as the voice recordings of the interviews were stored in a locked safe. All computer data files were stored on external flash drives. The code lists and database were stored on separate external flash drives, and stored in a locked safe as well. The tapes

and notes taken during the interviews will be shredded and discarded in separate trash bins one year after completion of the research.

After securing informed consent, the participants were first given the demographic survey to complete (see Appendix B). After completion of the demographic survey, the interviewer began interviewing the participant. The interviewer read the introduction and questions to the participants and the answers were recorded, written down, or both.

All recordings were stored on an external flash drive that will be maintained by the interviewer until all interviews and analyses have been completed and the researcher has completed writing the research paper. The interview instrument and voice recordings of the interviews will be stored in a locked safe. The code lists and data files will be stored on separate external flash drives, and stored in a locked safe as well. The tapes and notes taken during the interviews will be shredded and discarded in separate trash bins one year after completion of the research. Each law enforcement agency used will be coded with a letter (A, B, C … etc.); each participant will be given a letter and number (A1, A2, A3 … etc.) in order to maintain anonymity.

Measures

A survey interview method was used (Babbie, 2008). The same set of questions was asked to each participant regarding their experiences of

harassment; however, depending upon the participant's answer, further open-ended questions were asked to clarify or expand certain issues (Babbie, 2008). Quantitative research typically provides more data; however, qualitative research typically provides more in-depth data. This survey interview was created to gather both quantitative data as well as qualitative data (see Appendix E). A scale similar to that used by Lonsway et al. (2013) (never, once or twice, three or more times) was used to gather information regarding how many times, if ever, the participant has experienced harassment at the police department she currently works for. See Appendix A for a list of the questions used, articles supporting the question and the rationale behind using those questions.

Data Analyses

Presented below is a description of the proposed statistical analyses that will be used accompanied by an explanation of why each analysis will be used. All analyses will be performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24.

First, to describe the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents frequency tables will be presented for the following variables: race, age, sexual orientation, marital/relationship status, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience. The data obtained from the

demographic survey and interviews with female police officers will be used to answer several research questions.

Research Question 1: What percent of female officers have experienced different forms of harassment during their career at their current police department?

On the interview schedule, 30 questions are asked regarding the frequency (never, once or twice, three or more times) of experiences of 8 different forms of harassment during different periods of their policing career. For each question, responses will be recoded into a binary response of: “have not experienced” (never = 0) and “have experienced” (once or twice, three or more times = 1). Responses of “have experienced” during any of the time periods will be used to calculate the number and percent of respondents that have experienced each type of harassment during their career at their current police department.

Research Question 2: Does the frequency of experiencing different types of harassment differ significantly during different periods of female police officers’ careers?

Cross tables will be used to present and summarize the participants’ responses to the questions measuring their experiences of different forms of harassment (unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes; colleagues touching you that made you uncomfortable; colleagues pursuing a date or sexual relationship despite objection; being asked to participate in sexual relations to receive something relevant to your job; or colleagues saying you completed

FTO/probation because you are female) during different periods of their policing career (field training; probation; first year after probation; during the last year).

The Friedman test will be used to test for differences in the mean frequency of experiencing different types of harassment between the different time periods. The Friedman test is the non-parametric alternative to the one-way ANOVA with repeated measures. It is used to test for differences between groups when the dependent variable being measured is ordinal (e.g. never, once or twice, three or more times).

The test statistic (χ^2) value ("Chi-square"), degrees of freedom, and the significance level will indicate whether there was an overall statistically significant difference between the mean frequency of experiencing different types of harassment by time period.

If there is a significant difference, Wilcoxon signed-rank test (posthoc tests) will be run to examine where the differences occur. A Bonferroni adjustment will be used on the results of the Wilcoxon tests because multiple comparisons are being made, which makes it more likely that a Type I error will occur (results are declared significant when they are not).

Research Question 3: Are experiences of harassment <u>during the last year</u> related to officer demographic characteristics such as race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, and marital/relationship status?

On the interview schedule, 4 questions are asked regarding the frequency (never, once or twice, three or more times) of experiences of 4 different forms of harassment during the last year. For each question, responses will be recoded into a binary response of: “have not experienced” (never = 0) and “have experienced” (once or twice, three or more times = 1). A response of “have experienced” for any question will indicate an experience of harassment during the last year.

Pearson’s chi-square tests will be used to test for a relationship between the officer demographic characteristics of race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, marital status and experiences of harassment during the last year. The chi-square test is used to determine if there is a relationship between two categorical variables.

Research Question 4: Are experiences of harassment <u>during field training</u> related to officer demographic characteristics such as race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, and marital/relationship status?

On the interview schedule, 4 questions are asked regarding the frequency (never, once or twice, three or more times) of experiences of 4 different forms of harassment during the officer’s time on field training. For each question, responses will be recoded into a binary response of: “have not experienced”

(never = 0) and “have experienced” (once or twice, three or more times = 1). A response of “have experienced” for any question will indicate an experience of harassment during the officer’s time on field training.

Pearson’s chi-square tests will be used to test for a relationship between the officer demographic characteristics of race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, marital/relationship status and experiences of harassment during the officer’s time on field training. The chi-square test is used to determine if there is a relationship between two categorical variables.

Research Question 5: Are experiences of harassment during probation related to officer demographic characteristics such as race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, and marital/relationship status?

On the interview schedule, 5 questions are asked regarding the frequency (never, once or twice, three or more times) of experiences of 5 different forms of harassment during the officer’s probationary period. For each question, responses will be recoded into a binary response of: “have not experienced” (never = 0) and “have experienced” (once or twice, three or more times = 1). A response of “have experienced” for any question will indicate an experience of harassment during the officer’s probationary period.

Pearson's chi-square tests will be used to test for a relationship between the officer demographic characteristics of race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, marital status and experiences of harassment during the officer's probationary period. The chi-square test is used to determine if there is a relationship between two categorical variables.

Research Question 6: Are experiences of harassment during the officer's first year off probation related to officer demographics such as race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, and marital/relationship status?

On the interview schedule, 5 questions are asked regarding the frequency (never, once or twice, three or more times) of experiences of 5 different forms of harassment during the officer's first year off probation. For each question, responses will be recoded into a binary response of: "have not experienced" (never = 0) and "have experienced" (once or twice, three or more times = 1). A response of "have experienced" for any question will indicate an experience of harassment during the officer's first year off probation.

Pearson's chi-square tests will be used to test for a relationship between the officer demographic characteristics of race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, agency type, current assignment, current rank, months of employment

at current agency, total years of law enforcement experience, marital status and experiences of harassment during the officer's first year off probation. The chi-square test is used to determine if there is a relationship between two categorical variables.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction to Participants

Interviews were conducted with 20 female law enforcement officers from Los Angeles County, San Bernardino County, Riverside County, and Orange County law enforcement agencies. No names have been used in this study in order to ensure confidentiality. Women will be referred to by their rank and total time of law enforcement experience. The women's law enforcement ranks range from the officer to sergeant, with years of experience ranging from 3 years to over 20 years. Their current assignments vary from patrol officers to investigations or supervising at the academy. Table 1, below, shows that majority of the respondents hold the rank of officer, and 60 percent have between 6-15 years of experience in law enforcement. About a third of the women have worked for two agencies. The majority of the participants currently work for a municipal agency and have only worked for one department. Most of the women (60%) are single/never married, divorced, or widowed.

Table 1. Participant Demographics

Age	N	%	Sexual Orientation	N	%
26-30 Years Old	5	25%	Heterosexual	18	90%
31-40 Years Old	9	45%	Homosexual	1	5%
41+ Years old	6	30%	Bisexual	1	5%
Range: 26-52					
Race			Education		
White, not Hispanic origin	9	45%	Less than 4 Years of College	8	40%
Hispanic or Latino	9	45%	4 Year College Degree	10	50%
Asian or Black	2	10%	Master's Degree	2	10%
Agency Type			Assignment		
Municipal	15	75%	Patrol	6	30%
County	5	25%	Investigations	4	20%
			Traffic	3	15%
			Other	7	35%
Rank			Total Years of Experience		
Officer	15	75%	1-5 Years	5	25%
Master Officer I	1	5%	6-10 Years	6	30%
Corporal	1	5%	11-15 Years	6	30%
Sergeant	2	10%	16-20 Years	1	5%
Deputy I	1	5%	21+ Years	2	10%
			Range: 3-26		
Years at Current Department			Current Marital Status		
1-5 Years	7	35%	Single/Never Married	9	45%
6-10 Years	3	15%	Married	6	30%
11-15 Years	7	35%	Divorced	2	10%
16-20 Years	0	0%	Widowed	1	5%
21+ Years	3	15%	In a Committed Relationship	2	10%
Range: 1-26					
Dept. Worked For					
One Department	13	65%			
Two Departments	7	35%			

Research Question One

The first research question examines the percent of female officers who have experienced harassment throughout their career at their current police department[1]. The table below shows whether the women did or did not experience each of the types of harassment examined. The most commonly experienced types of harassment were environmental harassment (hostile environment). Nineteen women recalled hearing unwanted gender related or sexual jokes. The second two most common types of harassment experienced were hearing sexist remarks and coworkers or supervisors being condescending due to gender; 15 women in each category recalled it occurring, and 5 never recalled it occurring. Three women recalled coworkers or supervisors saying they only completed either field training or probation due to their gender, but one of these women believed it was in a joking manner. The least commonly experienced type of harassment was being asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or maintain something relevant to their job (sexual coercion or quid pro quo harassment). No one recalled experiencing this type of harassment at any point throughout their career (see Table 2, below).

Table 2. Harassment Experienced Throughout Career at Current Department

[1] "Throughout their career at their current department" includes the women's recall of experiences during four time periods: during field training, during probation, during the first year off probation, and during the last twelve months; or during the applicable time period for which they have been at their current department.

Forms of Harassment	Experience of harassment			
	No	Yes	N/A	Total:
	N(%)	N(%)	N(%)	
Unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes	1(5%)	19(95%)	0	20(100%)
Treated you differently because of your sex	6(30%)	14(70%)	0	20(100%)
Offensive sexist remarks	5(25%)	15(75%)	0	20(100%)
Condescending to you because of your sex	5(25%)	15(75%)	0	20(100%)
Colleagues touching you that made you uncomfortable	16(80%)	2(10%)	2(10%)	20(100%)
Colleagues pursuing a date or sexual relationship despite objection	8(40%)	12(60%)	0	20(100%)
Colleagues saying you completed FTO/probation because you are female	16(80%)	3(15%)	1(5%)[a]	20(100%)
Being asked to participate in sexual relations to receive something relevant to your job	20 (100%)	0	0	20(100%)

[a] Not applicable because the female has not completed probation.

Research Question Two

The second research question examines the frequency with which female officers experienced different kinds of harassment at different time periods throughout their career (field training, probation, the first year off of probation, and during the last twelve months). The tables below show the different types of harassment questioned and how often women recalled experiencing it during each time period.

As shown in Table 3 women were least likely to recall jokes being made during field training, and most likely to recall a joke being made during the last year. With the exception of field training, gender related jokes were at least as likely, if not more likely to be recalled than not.

Table 3. Were Unwelcome Gender Related Jokes Made in Your Presence?

Were Unwelcome Gender Related Jokes Made in Your Presence?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field training	10	0	9	1	0	0	20
Probation	7	2	9	2	0	0	20
Year after probation	9	2	7	1	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	2	4	13	0	1[b]	0	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview
[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as “during probation”

When asked if a coworker or superior had treated them differently because of their sex, for each time period the majority of women responded this never occurred. (see Table 4). Women recalled being treated differently most often during their probationary period than the other time periods. For the other three time periods, the majority of women recalled never being treated differently.

Table 4. Did a Coworker/Superior Treat You Differently Because of Your Sex?

	Did a Coworker/Superior Treat You Differently Because of Your Sex?						
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field Training	14	2	3	1	0	0	20
Probation	10	4	6	0	0	0	20
Year after probation	12	1	5	1	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	11	1	6	0	1[b]	1	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview
[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as "during probation"

> *Officer with 4 years experience:* I remember rolling up to sergeant, he was doing a ped check and he asked for a Code 1 [follow officer]. Obviously being a new officer and wanting to impress, you chime up on the radio first, "I'll be en route," I wasn't far anyway, so I go and before I even get there he says, "Go ahead and send me another one." So when I get there he goes, "I'm going to pat him down, but I'm going to wait for someone else to get here just in case." That really made me feel like I was a centimeter tall, because I worked my ass off to get where I am. To be treated that way, it sucks, it is definitely belittling. [During probation] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Table 5 indicates that women recalled hearing an offensive sexist remark most often during the first year off of probation. During field training and during

the last year, the majority of women did not recall hearing offensive sexist remarks.

Table 5. Did a Coworker/Superior Make Offensive Sexist Remarks?

Did a Coworker/Superior Make Offensive Sexist Remarks?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field Training	12	5	2	1	0	0	20
Probation	10	4	4	2	0	0	20
Year after probation	9	3	6	1	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	12	3	4	0	1[b]	0	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview
[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as "during probation"

> *Sergeant with 26 years experience:* One field training officer said out loud, not directed at me, but I was the only female in the room, "If there are any female trainees that come in here on training, we try to get rid of them. We don't let female deputies off training here." [During field training] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

> *Officer with 20 years experience:* In regards to becoming a K9 handler: That lieutenant [said], "I'm not sure that she's strong enough to be able to handle a dog, because women tend to be weaker and you have to be able

to dominate the K-9, and I'm not sure a woman can dominate it." [During the last 12 months] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Women recall that a coworker or superior was condescending to them during field training and during the last year more so than during probation and the first year off of probation (see Table 6).

Table 6. Was a Coworker/Superior Condescending to You Because of Your Sex?

Was a Coworker/Superior Condescending to You Because of Your Sex?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field Training	12	4	4	0	0	0	20
Probation	11	4	3	2	0	0	20
Year after probation	11	3	4	1	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	11	5	3	0	1[b]	0	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview
[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as "during probation"

Sergeant with 26 years experience: I worked the early morning shift so my windows weren't all the way down, they were like halfway up … there was one senior deputy who had been there for a long time that had already made little comments to me here and there … So I'm driving around and he came the other way on a major street and he sent me a message on our computers and it said, "This isn't Hollywood, Barbie, roll down your windows." I think that is condescending calling me

Barbie. [During patrol probation] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Table 7 shows the frequency of women who reported being touched in a way that made them uncomfortable. Though it is a small sample size, the majority of women reported never being touched in a way that made them feel uncomfortable. However, the women who did experience this type of harassment experienced it earlier in their career, either during field training, during their probationary period, or within the first year after their probationary period.

Table 7. Did a Coworker/Superior Touch You in a Way That Made You Feel Uncomfortable?

Did a Coworker/Superior Touch You in a Way That Made You Feel Uncomfortable?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field Training	19	1	0	0	0	0	20
Probation	19	1	0	0	0	0	20
Year after probation	18	0	1	0	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	19	0	0	0	1[b]	0	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview
[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as “during probation”

Master Officer with 11 Years Experience: There was an incident with another officer where we were at the range, and he grabbed my ass. And I

was like what the fuck are you doing, and another officer just laughed. [During probation] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 4 Years Experience: Standing there and them coming up and giving me a massage, while I was sitting and typing a report and he [her field training officer] came up and started massaging my shoulders. [During field training] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Within each of the examined time frames, most women did not experience a coworker or superior pursuing a date or sexual relationship with them. The majority of those that did recall experiencing this type of harassment, experienced it during the first year after probation (see Table 8). Out of those who did experience this type of harassment, the majority only experienced it once or twice.

Table 8. Did a Coworker/Superior Pursue a Date or Sexual Relationship With You Despite Your Objections?

Did a Coworker/Superior Pursue a Date or Sexual Relationship With You Despite Your Objections?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field Training	14	4	2	0	0	0	20
Probation	14	4	2	0	0	0	20
Year after probation	11	8	0	0	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	18	1	0	0	1[b]	0	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview

[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as “during probation”

> *Officer with 10 years experience*: One of my former FTO’s asked me out, and he had the decency to wait until I was off training and off probation, and I said, “No.” Someone I liked and respected, and he kind of kept pursuing it. [During first year after probation] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

> *Corporal with 13 years experience:* There was one that was quite persistent all the way up until he retired, which was 8 years into my career. He’s been retired 4 or 5 years … he still talks to a lot of these guys, and they are like, “Oh, so and so asked for your number.” [Throughout career] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

None of the respondents reported being asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or maintain something relevant to their job (see Table 9). All 20 women who were able to answer for their time in field training and on probation reported never experiencing this type of harassment.

Table 9. Were You Ever Asked to Participate in Sexual Relations to Receive or Maintain Something Relevant to Your Job?

Were You Ever Asked to Participate in Sexual Relations to Receive or Maintain Something Relevant to Your Job?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Field Training	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Probation	20	0	0	0	0	0	20
Year after probation	19	0	0	0	1[a]	0	20
During the last year	18	0	0	0	1[b]	1	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview
[b] Not applicable due to female still being on probation, answers would be the same as "during probation"

The majority of the women did not experience hearing comments from coworkers or superiors regarding completing field training or probation due to being a female (see Table 10). However, for the three that did report hearing such comments, it was after they completed field training – during their probationary period. Only one of these women felt that it was said in a joking manner.

Table 10. Did a Coworker/Superior Say You Only Completed Field Training or Probation Because You Are a Female?

Did a Coworker/Superior Say You Only Completed Field Training or Probation Because You Are a Female?							
Time period	Frequency						
	Never	Once or twice	Three or more times	Do not Recall	Not Applicable	Missing	Total:
Probation	17	3	0	0	0	0	20
Year after probation	18	0	0	1	1[a]	0	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at time of interview

Officer with 4 years experience: It was brought up that I only got it because I was a female and I know how to sweet talk. [During probation, after completing filed training] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Corporal with 13 years experience: They said it, but I don't think they were serious. I think it was just us shit talking going back and forth. [During probation, after completing field training] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Sergeant with 26 years experience: That same guy who said they don't let females off training, he told me that I made it off training because I had two really easy TOs [training officers] and the reason I had the easy TOs is because I'm a female and that they wouldn't give me to him because he's too hard. [During probation, after completing field training] (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

One of the purposes of this study was to examine whether females' experiences of harassment differed by period in their career. For each type of harassment (Tables 3-10), the Friedman test was used to test for differences in the mean frequency of experiencing harassment between time periods; no significant differences were found. The findings in Tables 3-10 suggest that experiences of harassment do not vary much as female officers gain more time in the law enforcement field. Though more women reported never experiencing

the majority of the behaviors evaluated, a similar number of women in each time period reported experiencing the evaluated behaviors throughout each time period. In the last year, more women reported hearing unwelcome gender related jokes than any other time period.

Research questions three, four, five and six, examine experiences of harassment during different career periods by respondents' demographic characteristics. The responses to questions regarding harassment in the last year were recoded from "never", "once or twice", and "three or more times" into "did not experience harassment" and "did experience harassment". If a woman reported that something had occurred once or twice or three or more times, these were recoded into "did experience harassment", and if she reported that it never occurred, it was recoded into "did not experience harassment".

Research Question Three

The third research question is whether experiences of harassment during the last year (last 12 months) are related to participant's demographic characteristics (race, age, sexual orientation, level of education, marital/relationship status, agency type, current assignment, current rank, years of employment at current agency, and total years of law enforcement experience) or job satisfaction.

Although the sample size is small, it is apparent that nearly all women had experienced some form of harassment irrespective of their demographic characteristics (17/19 or approximately 90 percent). The two women who reported that they did not experience harassment throughout the last year are heterosexual, have a four year college degree, are younger, have less time on the job, and work at a county agency.

The women were asked to rate their job satisfaction during the last year, and also if their rating of job satisfaction was affected by the extent to which they experienced harassment. Table 11 indicates that 17 women recalled experiencing harassment throughout the last year, and 16 of them reported that they were satisfied in their job. Women explained that although they experienced harassment, they liked their job and it did not affect them enough to affect their job satisfaction. Fisher's exact test revealed no significant differences between job satisfaction and experiencing harassment.

Table 11. Experienced Harassment During the Last Year

Experienced Harassment During the Last Year									
	No	Yes	N/A[a]	Total		No	Yes	N/A[a]	Total
Race					Education				
White, not Hispanic origin	1	8	0	9	Less than 4 years of College	0	8	0	8
Hispanic or Latino	0	8	1	9	4 Year College Degree	2	7	1	10
Asian or Black	1	1	0	2	Masters Degree	0	2	0	2
Total:	2	17	1	20	Total:	2	17	1	20

Sexual orientation					Current Age				
Heterosexual	2	16	0	18	26-30 years	2	2	1	5
Homosexual	0	0	1	1	31-40 years	0	9	0	9
Bisexual	0	1	0	1	41+ years	0	6	0	6
Total:	2	17	1	20	Total:	2	17	1	20
Current Marital/Relationship Status					Total Years of Law Enforcement Experience				
Single/never married	0	9	0	9	1-5 Years	2	2	1	5
Married	1	5	0	6	6-10 Years	0	6	0	6
Divorced	1	1	0	2	11-15 Years	0	6	0	6
Widowed	0	1	0	1	16-20 Years	0	1	0	1
In a committed relationship	0	1	1	2	21+ Years	0	2	0	2
Total:	2	17	1	20	Total:	2	17	1	20
Agency Type					Years of employment at current agency				
Municipal	0	14	1	15	1-5 years	2	4	1	7
County	2	3	0	5	6-10 years	0	3	0	3
Total:	2	17	1	20	11-15 years	0	7	0	7
					16-20 years	0	0	0	0
					21+ years	0	3	0	3
					Total:	2	17	1	20
Current Assignment					Current Rank				
Patrol	0	5	1	6	Officer	1	13	1	15
Investigations	1	3	0	4	Master Officer I	0	1	0	1
Traffic	0	3	0	3	Corporal	0	1	0	1
Other	1	6	0	7	Sergeant	0	2	0	2
Total:	2	17	1	20	Deputy I	1	0	0	1
					Total:	2	17	1	20
Job Satisfaction									
Unsatisfied	0	1	0	1					
Satisfied	2	16	0	18					
Not Applicable	0	0	1	1					
Total:	2	17	1	20					

[a]Not applicable due to one female being on probation still, so her answers for "during the last year" would duplicate her answers for "during probation".

The demographic variables in table 12 were recoded into the following binary variables: Race (White Non-Hispanic/Other); Sexual Orientation (Heterosexual/Other); Marital/Relationship Status (Married or Committed Relationship/Other); Age (26-35 years/36+ years); Education (Less than 4 Years College/Bachelor's or Master's Degree); Total years law enforcement experience (1-10 Years/11+ Years); Months of employment at current agency (1-10 Years/11+ Years); Current assignment (Patrol and Traffic/Investigations and Other). Fisher's exact test was conducted to examine whether there are significant associations between these binary demographic variables and whether women did or did not experience harassment. Only the relationship between agency type and experiences of harassment came close to significance (p=.053; FET). Women working in municipal agencies were more likely to have experienced harassment in the last year than women working in county agencies.

Research Question Four

The fourth research question is whether experiencing harassment during field training is related to officer demographic characteristics and job satisfaction. Table 12 shows the number of officers who did or did not experience harassment during field training for each demographic characteristic. It is noticeable that more than twice as many women (14/20 or 70 percent) did experience

harassment throughout field training as did not experience harassment. Fisher's exact test revealed no significant differences between experiences of harassment during field training and demographic characteristics (the binary variables) or job satisfaction. Seventy percent of women recalled experiencing harassment during field training, yet 60 percent reported still being satisfied with their job. Only 10 percent recalled experiencing harassment and reported being unsatisfied with their job.

Table 12. Experienced Harassment During Field Training

Experienced Harassment During Field Training							
	No	Yes	Total		No	Yes	Total
Race				Age During Field Training			
White, not Hispanic origin	3	6	9	21-25 Years old	3	5	8
Hispanic or Latino	2	7	9	26+ Years old	3	9	12
Asian or Black	1	1	2	Total:	6	14	20
Total:	6	14	20				
Sexual orientation				Years of employment at current agency			
Heterosexual	6	12	18	1-5 years	3	4	7
Homosexual	0	1	1	6-10 years	0	3	3
Bisexual	0	1	1	11-15 years	3	4	7
Total:	6	14	20	16-20 years	0	0	0
				21+ years	0	3	3
				Total:	6	14	20
Marital/Relationship Status during field training				Current Rank			
Single/never married/Widowed/ Divorced	4	7	11	Officer	4	11	15
Married/In a Committed Relationship	2	7	9	Master Officer I	1	0	1
Total:	6	14	20	Corporal	0	1	1

				Sergeant	0	2	2
				Deputy I	1	0	1
				Total:	6	14	20
Agency Type				Job Satisfaction			
Municipal	3	12	15	Unsatisfied	0	2	2
County	3	2	5	Satisfied	6	12	18
Total:	6	14	20	Total:	6	14	20

Research Question Five

The fifth research question is whether officer demographic characteristics are related to experiencing harassment during probation. The majority of women (18/20 or 90 percent) experienced harassment during probation. All 5 of the females higher ranking than officer; all 9 of the females identifying as “White, not Hispanic origin”; all 8 of the females with less than 4 years of college; all 13 females with more than 6 years at their current department; and all 6 of the females over 41 years old, reported experiencing harassment during probation. It is possible that the older female officers experienced harassment during probation more often than younger female officers due to the time they started their career in law enforcement. Ninety percent of the women recalled experiencing harassment, yet 80 percent still reported being satisfied in their job. Many of these women reported that they were so excited to be a police officer, that they did not allow their experiences of harassment to affect their job satisfaction.

Table 13. Experienced Harassment During Probation

Experienced Harassment During Probation							
	No	Yes	Total		No	Yes	Total
Race				Age During Probation			
White, not Hispanic origin	0	9	9	21-25 Years old	1	7	8
Hispanic or Latino	1	8	9	26+ Years old	1	11	12
Asian or Black	1	1	2	Total:	2	18	20
Total:	2	18	20				
Sexual orientation				Years of Employment at Current Agency			
Heterosexual	2	16	18	1-5 years	2	5	7
Homosexual	0	1	1	6-10 years	0	3	3
Bisexual	0	1	1	11-15 years	0	7	7
Total:	2	18	20	16-20 years	0	0	0
				21+ years	0	3	3
				Total:	2	18	20
Marital/Relationship Status during probation				Current Rank			
Single/never married/Widowed/ Divorced	0	10	10	Officer	2	13	15
Married/In a Committed Relationship	2	8	10	Master Officer I	0	1	1
Total:	2	18	20	Corporal	0	1	1
				Sergeant	0	2	2
				Deputy I	0	1	1
				Total:	2	18	20
Agency Type				Job Satisfaction			
Municipal	1	14	15	Unsatisfied	0	2	2
County	1	4	5	Satisfied	2	16	18
Total:	2	18	20	Total:	2	18	20

Research Question Six

The sixth research question is whether experiences of harassment during the officer's first year off probation was related to officer demographic characteristics and job satisfaction. Again, ninety percent of women did experience harassment during their first year off probation. The two women who reported that they did not experience harassment are both Hispanic, heterosexual, and work at a municipal agency. Despite experiencing harassment, 80 percent of women (16/20) still reported being satisfied with their job during their first year off probation. Some of these women told me they were able to separate their experiences of harassment from their job satisfaction.

Table 14. Experienced Harassment During First Year Off Probation

Experienced Harassment During First Year Off Probation									
	No	Yes	N/A[a]	Total		No	Yes	N/A[a]	Total
Race					Age during first year off probation				
White, not Hispanic origin	0	9	0	9	21-25 years	1	5	0	6
Hispanic or Latino	2	6	1	9	26+ years	1	12	1	14
Asian or Black	0	2	0	2	Total:	2	17	1	20
Total:	2	17	1	20					
Sexual orientation[2]					Years of employment at current agency				
Heterosexual	2	16	0	18	1-5 years	1	5	1	7
Homosexu	0	0	1	1	6-10 years	0	3	0	3

al									
Bisexual	0	1	0	1	11-15 years	1	6	0	7
Total:	2	17	1	20	16-20 years	0	0	0	0
					21+ years	0	3	0	3
					Total:	2	17	1	20
Marital/Relationship Status during first year off probation					Current Rank				
Single/never married/Widowed/ Divorced	2	7	0	9	Officer	2	12	1	15
Married/In a Committed Relationship	0	10	1	11	Master Officer I	0	1	0	1
Total:	2	17	1	20	Corporal	0	1	0	1
					Sergeant	0	2	0	2
					Deputy I	0	1	0	1
					Total:	2	17	1	20
Agency Type					Job Satisfaction				
Municipal	2	12	1	15	Unsatisfied	0	1	0	1
County	0	5	0	5	Satisfied	2	16	0	18
Total:	2	17	1	20	Not Applicable	0	0	1	1
					Total:	2	17	1	20

[a] Not applicable due to one female not being off probation at the time of survey interview

Summary

Throughout the specific career periods examined, the women in this sample have experienced various forms of environmental harassment, but none of the women indicate having experienced quid pro quo harassment (Table 10).

Friedman tests for differences in the mean frequency of experiencing harassment between time periods revealed no significant differences. Overall, the findings in tables 4-11 suggest that experiences of different types of harassment do not vary much by time period, and suggest that harassment does not subside as women gain tenure in the field.

Research questions three, four, five and six, examine whether experiences of harassment during different career periods are related to respondents' demographic characteristics or job satisfaction. Table 13 indicates that during field training 70 percent of women (14/20) recall experiencing some type of harassment. During the probationary period, first year off probation, and during the last year, 90 percent of women (18/20) recall experiencing some type of harassment. During each period, the majority of women reported being satisfied with their job. When questioned on whether experiencing harassment affected their job satisfaction, women often expressed that they enjoyed their job so much that they did not allow these experiences to bother them. Tests of significance yielded no significant relationships between respondents' demographic characteristics or job satisfaction and whether women did or did not experience harassment during each time period.

Qualitative Findings

Several themes within the open-ended responses to interview questions were identified. These themes were 1) comments and jokes not being

"unwelcome"; 2) some women participate in the jokes and/or comments; 3) it is the culture of policing and they are used to hearing these things; 4) you are the exception for your gender; 5) being negatively targeted specifically because you are a female; and 6) the women do not want to ruin their career. Each of these themes will be further explored below.

Comments and Jokes Not Being "Unwelcome"

One finding revealed through the qualitative responses was that some women replied unwelcome gender related jokes were "never" made in their presence during specific time periods due to the word "unwelcome" being in the question. While other women answered that they had experienced this type of harassment, but would clarify in their response that they heard the jokes or comments, but they were not unwelcome.

> *Deputy I with 4 years experience:* So I am just going unwanted (sic), it doesn't bother me, but I'm not saying it never happens, because it does happen. (Personal Communication, interview conducted 2016)

> *Sergeant with 9 ½ years experience:* Sexual related jokes were made, but I wouldn't classify it as unwelcome. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 11 years experience: Unwelcome, no. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 6 years experience: People make a lot of jokes, I don't necessarily care. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Deputy with 24 years experience: It's nothing that offends me. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 4 years experience: Well now that I'm thinking about it, when you say unwelcome, I guess my answer would be no because they don't really affect me. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Active Participation in Jokes and/or Comments

Ninety –five percent of women report hearing gender or sexual related jokes at some point in their career (recall Table X -2?), but they also admit to being an active participant in the joking. Some women say they use the jokes as retaliation to having jokes made about them, while others say it is part of the job, and one woman said she takes offense when her male coworkers change the way they talk around her.

Officer with 11 years experience: I joke around, it is kind of a banter back and forth. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 13 years experience: A guy walks into the office and goes, "Oh its cold in here," what do I get, heads turn, "Hey, you got your high beams on?" Bull shit like that … I turn it around and I'm blatant with them, "I don't know. Is your dick shriveled up? Are your balls small?" (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 13 years experience: Now I've been a motor officer for seven years, and I've established relationships with these men. So they do their jokes now, and I just learned to joke back and kind of throw jabs back. So it's become like a friendly banter, it's not like demeaning anymore. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Corporal with 13 years experience: There's a couple guys, they crack me up, because they wouldn't want to curse around me … if they happened to slip the word "boobs" into a conversation they would be like, "I'm sorry, I'm sorry." When they change their behavior because they're afraid of offending me [I don't like that]. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Deputy with 24 years experience: I guess it just goes with the job, because I'm participating in it also. Nothing has ever been personal. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

It is the Culture of Policing and They are Used to it

Throughout the interviews, every woman at some point said that sexual harassment is "part of the culture of policing" or "part of the job". Several said that they expected it and knew that it would happen prior to getting hired, while others said they just learned to deal with it once on the job. Although these women are hearing gender or sexual related jokes, or they are hearing sexist comments, many state they are used to it. Even an officer with only three years experience feels she has been around it "so long" now that she is used to how her male counterparts talk. Many of these women now do not take offense to it, but that does not mean the harassing behaviors are not occurring.

Sergeant with 9 ½ years experience: I've heard a lot of sexual related comments, but I didn't tell anyone, "Hey I'm offended". I just kind of rolled with it because it's a male dominated field and I don't want to speak up. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 4 years experience: Obviously dealing with it and having worked in law enforcement you just learn to cope with it, you just kind of blow things off. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 20 years experience: Nothing that made me feel uncomfortable, it's just I think the culture. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Deputy with 24 years experience: Conversation just starts at grey and goes to black, it's just common in this field. I work in a male dominated field … (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Corporal with 13 years experience: It was just in general because that's how people talk in police work. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 3 years experience: I think because I've been around it so long, I just think I'm used to how guys are and how their humor is, so I didn't take offense to it personally. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

> *Officer with 13 years experience:* To use the word unwanted is kind of one of those things that you know just comes with the territory. I get where I work, I get the environment that I work in, it's going to happen. If something is said, I can either respond to it or I just get up and leave … I'm sure it did because that's the nature of the beast … You pick and choose your battles. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

.

You are the Exception for Your Gender if You Are Good at Your Job, but When One Female Makes a Mistake, Every Female is to Blame

Several women pointed out that when a female police officer is good at her job, the male officers and supervisors act as if she is the exception to her gender. Their male partners make it seem as if the majority of female officers are not good at their job, and when you are good at your job, you are one of the few. While this may be a good thing for those particular women , it shows that females as a whole are not widely accepted in police work and/or are not thought to be good police officers. The opposite also applies, when one female does something wrong, many women noted that it is not just that one female who messed up, it is the gender as a whole. If one woman makes a mistake in a special unit, it makes it much more difficult for another woman, even years later, to get into that special unit. If one woman is not a good fighter or gets injured in a fight, a blanket statement is typically made that male officers do not want a female officer as their partner in a fight.

Sergeant with 9 ½ years experience: Stupid things like, “Oh you can shoot for a girl.” (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 4 years experience: They directed it more towards me like, “You’re one of the few who can do this job, not a lot of women can.” … Another person kind of rated the females at the agency and said, “You and so and so are at the top because we know you guys can handle yourselves, then this other officer well she’s kind of in the middle I don’t know if she can fight, then this other officer we aren’t really sure about her I wouldn’t trust her with my life.” (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 20 years experience: Just the older group of gentlemen that were there and it was in regards to most women aren’t good at the job. I never got them directed at me. They think that if you are a squared away female, they act like you’re the exception. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Deputy with 24 years experience: For girls, the whole gender is bad, or the whole gender fucked up, but for a guy, it’s just that specific guy screwed up, but for girls it’s the whole gender. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016

Being Targeted Because You Are a Female

This theme was titled as such because there were several instances when female officers were treated differently or had comments made that are specific to their gender, but they did not fall into the prior categories. Instances include being asked why they wear so much makeup, being punished for doing something the same as a male counterpart who was not punished, being spoken to regarding the way they dress off duty, and being criticized for the work that you do even if you do not mess anything up. One woman was spoken to on two separate occasions about her clothing she wears off duty, and another one was questioned as to why she wears the makeup she wears.

> *Officer with 13 years experience:* The sergeant making a comment about my makeup, asking why I am wearing so much makeup. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

> *Officer with 4 years experience:* [during probation] I got closed doored by one of our female sergeants, and she wasn't even there when it occurred, but she talked to me because I would wear workout capris and like a sweatshirt or a t-shirt in from my car to my locker room to change out. Well another sergeant saw what I had worn, specifically the Capri pants, and I got talked to about saying I should really pay attention to what I wear into work because I'm going to give the wrong impression to guys … [after

an end of shift BBQ/pool party] It was described as a pool party/BBQ, I showed up in shorts, like Bermuda shorts, and a v-neck, brought my bathing suit but didn't go in the pool, yet a couple of the guys went swimming, and I got talked to about wearing shorts. I even asked two of the guys if they ever got talked to about going swimming and they said no. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Others were criticized for the way they conduct surveillance, how they handle calls for service, or just told that their male partner was going to wait for another male to show up. These particular comments may not fall into a category which has been previously discussed, but they are still harassing comments based on ones gender. These types of comments create a hostile work environment for some females.

Officer with 13 years experience: Being a woman, we have certain abilities to talk to men, or other people, the way men don't. Everything got resolved, peacefully, fine, no big deal, didn't have to go hands on, didn't have to do anything, calmed him down, it was all good, took care of business, he went to jail. That male partner came up to me and basically had this conversation with me about, "I don't know if you were just afraid to take out your gun," I looked at him and I got pissed. No I wasn't afraid to do any of that, I didn't have to. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Master Officer with 11 years experience: A supervisor said to another officer that I don't have experience with surveillances … why did you point me out? I didn't burn the surveillance, I didn't do anything, I was just on the surveillance, and I'm the only female that was involved in the surveillances and it was said that I don't have enough experience on surveillances … One time I was told I shouldn't go help out with a transport of a suspect because I was a female and he was a big guy … People request a follow, then request another follow. Like you're en route then [they say] "Start me one more unit", and it is kind of like, "Do you not want me as your follow?" (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 13 years experience: It was a sergeant, he basically singled me out. We [her and a male partner] went to lunch, we have thirty minutes, we both stayed five minutes after, we ate together, we went 10-8 over the radio together, he wrote me up, but he didn't write the other [male] officer up. … in regards to becoming a motor officer] They just gave it to her because she's a girl. They just did it because they wanted a female motor. I had one guy who had put in formotors three or four times, and he didn't pass motor school and he goes, "Oh I'm sure they opened the cones for her, or they made it easier for her." (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Sergeant with 26 years experience: I hear the deputies and I hear some of the male sergeants say, “She’s way too small for that,” or, “She’s way too pretty for this job,” or, “She’s going to get torn up when she gets off training,” or, “There’s too many females in this class so our PT [physical training] isn’t as high as it should be because of the females.” … [on requesting backup officers] You know how you have the computers and you can send a message to somebody, so if you are on a traffic stop and you need backup, instead of getting on the radio … the guys would send messages to each other so the females wouldn’t come. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Two of the women also recalled that they had problems when they were pregnant. One woman, during her first pregnancy, was given negative evaluations for taking sick time due to her pregnancy, and during her second pregnancy had to consult an attorney because her supervisor wanted to remove her from her position and permanently refill it. The other woman was afraid to tell her supervisor about her pregnancy because she heard how terribly everyone talked about the other women who got pregnant.

Officer with 11 years experience: When I got pregnant, I was definitely treated differently. I was in a special assignment as an SRO [school resource officer], so I was able to keep it to myself for a while. I had just gotten the special assignment, and I had been in it five months when I

finally told them I was pregnant, and they were just mad. It was to the point where I consulted an attorney, because they were going to take me out of my special assignment and fill it with someone else, but they wanted to fill it permanently … My first pregnancy, I ended up miscarrying, I was in patrol at that time. It was almost like a nuisance that I was out sick. It's been noted in my eval that I take a lot of sick time, but it was for being pregnant and being sick … It was not fun to go to work and tell people you were pregnant, because they were like, "Well what the fuck are we going to do?" (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Sergeant with 26 years experience: When I first got there [the booking center for men's central jail], I remember a lot of the deputies talking about we can't get too many females that work here because they all start getting pregnant as soon as they graduate and they can't work back here and they can't do real work … I would talk to him [her husband] about how I can't get pregnant because they won't treat me well and I'll be that "typical female" … I end up getting pregnant and I'm working with the most disgusting people coming into the jail system for like four months before I told them … I put my own child at risk because I was so worried about what the guys were going to say. So I told him [the supervisor], and he threw his hands up and took a deep breath and was like, "Okay I don't

know what we're going to do or where we are going to put you because you can't do much work." I felt like such less of a woman, such less of a person, and so guilty about being pregnant. I just couldn't believe how I was treated by him. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Women Do Not Want to Ruin Their Career

Though this particular theme did not come up often, it is still important to note. The fact that women hear harassing comments or they are touched inappropriately, yet do not report it due to not wanting to "ruin" their own career is alarming. Some of the women stated they were so motivated to do the job that they were willing to push these harassing behaviors aside because they did not want to lose their job or be labeled as a "rat". A few of these instances occurred while the women were either in training or on probation at which time they could more easily lose their job.

Sergeant with 9 ½ Years Experience: Other supervisors, like watch commanders, I've heard lots of sexual comments, not directed at me, but I was obviously in the room, and everyone thinks I'm cool with it. Which I guess I am to an extent, I'm not going to stop anybody, I'm not going to derail my career, but they wouldn't be doing it to a male counterpart. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 13 Years Experience: I've learned that females that did do something, or did sue, or did do something to like "hey this is sexual harassment" were banned, they were shunned, you can kiss your fucking career goodbye, I didn't want to do that ... I didn't want to be "that girl", I just wanted to be a cop … Was I a victim of sexual harassment? 100% yes. Could I have sued the city? Yes, 100%. But I didn't want to, it wasn't worth it to me at that time. I was 21 years old, I just wanted to be a police officer. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 9 Years Experience: He ended up getting fired, I didn't report it, somebody else who heard me cussing him out reported it. He said something like, "Oh I would love it if you could come over and cook and do some laundry…" (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

Officer with 13 Years Experience: I remember distinctly how I felt. I didn't know if I wanted to be a police officer, I was doubting myself if I wanted to do this. I was like I can't do this, if this is what my career is going to be like, I can't do this. There was a point during probation where I would come home after every shift and just cry myself to sleep. It got so bad that it went to internal affairs, I don't know who went to internal affairs … but I didn't want anything done, I just wanted to be a police officer. He was

harassing me, he was belittling me in front of other people. (Personal communication, interview conducted 2016)

These women quoted above made it very clear that they still hear or have heard harassing comments or been subject to sexual harassment themselves, yet consciously chose not to report it because they did not want to lose their job or receive a negative label that would follow them throughout their career.

Summary of Qualitative Responses

Though the sample size for this study is small (N=20), it is important to note that 6 specific themes arose in the qualitative answers given. One of these being that sexual and/or gender related jokes are not necessarily "unwanted", which caused some of the women to answer "never" in regards to hearing these types of jokes, despite the women reporting that they hear them often. All 20 women reported, in their own words, that sexual/gender related jokes, sexist comments, and being treated differently is a part of the policing culture. Many of these women stated they have learned to cope with it. Some women cope with it by joking back, while others just remove themselves from the situation.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to supplement the prior research on female law enforcement officer's experiences of harassment. Prior studies were weak in the areas of the frequency of different forms of harassment occurring, whether experiences of harassment vary as female law enforcement officers gain more experience, and whether experiences of harassment are affected by certain demographic characteristics. The present study aimed to address these questions. As suggested by Seklecki and Paynich (2007) interviews with open ended questions were used to further learn about incidents of harassment experienced by officers. The women were asked about how frequently they experienced several different types of harassment. These questions measured both environmental harassment, such as hearing gender related jokes or condescending comments about females; and quid pro quo harassment, being asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or maintain something relevant to their job. When an officer answered "once or twice" or "three or more times," follow up questions were asked for them to elaborate on their experiences. These qualitative responses were transcribed and six prominent themes arose from them: 1) comments and jokes not being "unwelcome"; 2) some women participate in the comments and/or jokes; 3) it is the culture of policing and they

are used to hearing these things; 4) you are the exception for your gender; 5) being negatively targeted specifically because you are a female; and 6) the women do not want to ruin their career. Without the qualitative answers, these themes would not have been discovered.

Summary and Discussion of Findings

Sexual Experiences

In the current study, the women interviewed had a range of experience from 3 years to 26 years, and a range of rank from officer to sergeant. As in the study done by Rabe-Hemp (2007) with interviews of female law enforcement officers, every woman interviewed had experienced harassment at some point throughout their career.

While all of the women in this study reported experiencing environmental harassment at some point, none of the women reported experiencing quid pro quo harassment/sexual coercion. In Fitzgerald et al.'s (1999) military survey of gender issues, females were also more likely to report forms of environmental harassment (i.e. unwanted sexual attention: verbal & non verbal behavior that is offensive, unwanted and unreciprocated (42 percent); sexist hostility: discrimination based on sex (69 percent); than sexual coercion (13 percent). Lonsway et al., (2013b) also found that only 15 percent of female law enforcement officers had experienced quid pro quo harassment. Similarly,

Somvadee and Morash's (2008) examination of sexual harassment experiences of female law enforcement officers found that only five percent reported an implication of better treatment for their sexual cooperation.

Seklecki and Paynich (2007) found that the most common harassing behaviors that female police officers experienced included: hearing dirty jokes/stories, and someone trying to have a sexual relationship with the respondent despite their objections. Somvadee and Morash (2008) found that 87 percent of female officers reported hearing suggestive jokes or offensive stories, and 21 percent reported coworkers had attempted to establish a sexual relationship. In this study the most commonly experienced type of harassment throughout a female officer's career was hearing unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes. Ninety-five percent of women recalled experiencing this type of harassment at some point throughout their career. Only one woman answered "never occurred" throughout all four time periods in regards to hearing unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes. Sixty percent of women responded that a colleague had pursued a date or sexual relationship despite their objection.

Both Seklecki and Paynich (2007) and Somvadee and Morash (2008) reported that despite these incidents being considered harassment, the majority of female officers reported that they did not feel that they had ever been sexually harassed (73 percent and 58 percent respectively). In this study, some women reported hearing gender related or sexual jokes, but answered "never" when asked if they had heard unwanted gender related or sexual jokes because they

did not feel that they were unwelcome, while others recalled actively participating in the jokes and/or comments.

Fitzgerald et al. (1999) noted that experiences of sexual harassment were often not sexual in nature, but frequently hostility towards women. Similarly, in this study, after experiences of unwelcome gender/sexual jokes, the next most commonly experienced types of harassment were hearing offensive sexist remarks; and experiencing condescending behavior from coworkers or superiors (75 percent for both behaviors), followed by being treated differently due to being female (70 percent). Somvadee and Morash (2008) also found that more than 50 percent of female officers reported males had been condescending to them due to their sex, and almost 70 percent reported being treated differently due to their sex. They report that female officers were very concerned with their male counterparts questioning whether they can do the job or not. In the current study, women voiced that their male partners would request a third officer, cancel the follow, criticize the way they handled calls, or tell the women not to get into physical altercations because they could not handle them. The women who had these comments made to them said they felt belittled and they felt that their partners did not feel safe with them or consider them a good officer.

In contrast, one of the themes that emerged from the qualitative responses in this research is that women reported hearing that they were the exception to their gender since they were good at the job. One woman was actually told that the males at her department had ranked the females based on

their ability to do the job. A few women recalled having males request a third officer respond when they were sent as the follow officer, and even having male partners type to other males to respond and assist them rather than request a second officer over the radio and risk a female being dispatched as their follow officer.

Rabe-Hemp (2007) found that most instances of sexual harassment, discrimination, or disrespect occurred earlier in womens' careers, and slowed as they gained tenure. In the current study, the only form of harassment that was solely recalled during the early career periods, and not within the last year, was being touched in an uncomfortable way. There were only three reported occurrences, one each during field training, probation, and the year after probation. Contrary to Rabe-Hemp's findings, 70 percent of women recalled experiencing some form of sexual harassment during their field training period; but 80-90 percent of women recalled experiencing harassment during the later career periods. However, when the Friedman test was used to test for differences in the mean frequency of experiencing each form of harassment between time periods (field training, probation, first year off probation, during the last year) no statistically significant differences were found.

Lonsway et al. (2013a), found that 92.5 percent of the women in their study experienced at least one harassing behavior in the last year. Similarly, 89.5 percent of women in this study experienced at least one harassing behavior in the last year. Nearly 90 percent of the women recalled hearing unwanted

gender related or sexual jokes in the last year which was the highest occurrence out of all four time periods examined. Approximately 42 percent experienced a coworker or superior being condescending to them because of their sex, and approximately 37 percent recalled hearing an offensive sexist remark in the last year.

Seklecki and Paynich (2007) suggested future research compare experiences of heterosexual officers and homosexual officers. For this study, information regarding participants' sexual orientation was collected. All 20 participants answered this question, 18 identify as heterosexual, 1 identifies as homosexual, and 1 identifies as bisexual. The two women who identified as homosexual/bisexual both experienced harassment during all four time periods evaluated. Since only two identified as such, it is difficult to say whether their sexual orientation played a role in experiencing harassment or if it was just their gender. Tests of significance yielded no significant relationships between any of the respondents' demographic characteristics and whether women did or did not experience harassment.

Stress, Mental, and Physical Health

The current study did not include direct measures of stress, mental or physical health, but some of the open-ended responses were related to these issues. One woman recalled being afraid to tell her supervisor about her pregnancy due to the negative comments made about other women when they became pregnant. Dowler and Arai (2008) found that gender related jokes being

told in front of female officers was found to be significantly related to their level of stress. In the current study, all but one of the women said that they experienced hearing unwelcome gender and/or sexual related jokes throughout their career. However, many women commented that the jokes were not truly unwelcome, or that the jokes did not bother them.

Thompson et al. (2006) found that interpersonal stress is the most stressful for female officers, and the two most stressful items within that category are gender discrimination and sexual harassment. Dehaas et al. (2009) reported that when an officer experiences harassment and is bothered by it, there are negative effects on their health and burnout. A few women in the current study reported that during field training and/or probation they would cry either before work or after work, and stated they questioned whether they wanted to be a police officer anymore. Those who recalled doing this said these thoughts stemmed from the mistreatment they were experiencing from coworkers, field training officers, and supervisors. These experiences of harassment could potentially affect the retention of female officers as well as their mental health throughout their career.

Sexual Harassment and Job Satisfaction and Retention

Job satisfaction of female officers was measured in a prior study done by Burke and Mikkelson (2004) in which it was found that the females who reported higher instances of sexual harassment also reported lower job satisfaction. In this study women were asked to rate their job satisfaction for each time period,

and if their job satisfaction rating was affected by the extent to which they experienced harassment. Across all time periods 90 percent of women reported that they were satisfied with their job, and there were no significant differences between whether women did or did not experience harassment and their job satisfaction. Women generally reported a high level of job satisfaction despite reporting experiences of harassment. Some women elaborated on this, explaining that they enjoy their job and do not allow the negative sexist remarks or their coworkers condescending comments bring them down.

In 2009, Somvadee and Morash reported that it was very uncommon for women to file formal complaints of harassment. This was something also found in the current study. One of the themes that arose from the qualitative answers was that women do not want to ruin their career by reporting the instances of harassment. Two women in the current study recalled that their experiences of harassment became so bad that someone else reported it to internal affairs, but when they were interviewed they told internal affairs they wanted nothing done in order to maintain their career and not have a negative stigma follow them. Some of the women who acknowledged that they had been victims of harassment stated they did not want to file complaints for risk of being labeled a “rat” or jeopardizing their future with the department. Many women said they would either confront the person, or they would just hold it in and get past it.

Limitations of the Research

Reliability and Validity of Responses

Reliability concerns are minimized by the use of a structured survey instrument; however, recall may have affected the validity of responses. Some of the officers had trouble recalling whether they experienced certain types of harassment. This could have affected the results, indicating less harassment than what may really be occurring. A few of the participants stated that field training was so long ago, they are not sure if the questioned behaviors happened or not. Sometimes when they would say this, they would follow-up and state that it never occurred. Recall seems to have been a factor in 5 of the 10 of the women's responses who had 10 or more years experience.

It is also possible that the women were not as open or honest with their answers due to the sensitive nature of the research. Some women asked the interviewer prior to the interview starting, and after the interview started, if the interview was confidential. One woman actually laid out ground rules prior to the interview starting in order to ensure confidentiality, and wanted to be clear that this interview was being done on her terms.

Responses may also have been influenced by the interviewer. Officers may have wanted to present themselves in a certain light depending on their perceptions of the interviewer. It is possible that they responded in a manner that exaggerated or minimized their past experiences. Being law enforcement officers, it is possible that these women would not want to be viewed as weak or

as victims themselves. While others may have exaggerated their experiences to provide the researcher with the answers they believe she was looking for.

Generalizability

The female law enforcement officers interviewed for this study were selected through snowball sampling, which is a non-random sampling method. Interviews were conducted with 20 female officers from 14 different southern California law enforcement agencies but the findings may not be representative of all female officers in these departments, or of female officers in departments outside southern California.

Although the officers were assured of both confidentiality and anonymity, it is very difficult to gain the trust of law enforcement officers in order to obtain information about such a sensitive topic. The goal was to obtain 30 female law enforcement officers to participate in this survey interview. Ten of the women who initially agreed to an interview, ultimately declined due to one of two reasons, either they could not fit the time into their schedule, or they learned the questions were regarding experiences of sexual harassment. The women learned this by asking the researcher the title of the study, or just for further information about the study in general. Thus, there is also the possibility of a "non-response" bias, the officers who were interested in participating in the interview until they were informed of the subject matter may be different from the officers who agreed to complete the interview. The small sample size presents problems generalizing these results because the experiences and opinions of 20

female law enforcement officers do not necessarily represent those of the larger population.

If the surveys had been mailed out with return envelopes it is possible that a larger sample could have been obtained, but it is also more likely that more questions would have been skipped because the researcher would not be there to clarify questions. Babbie (2008) is a proponent of using face-to-face interviews because it is less likely to have missing data due to the researcher being able to answer questions and also probe for more qualitative answers. So although a greater sample size may have been reached, the number of qualitative responses would likely have been much lower and the number of missing answers may have been higher.

The sample size is also a limitation when conducting tests for significant differences. Both the Fisher's exact tests (conducted to examine whether there are significant associations between binary demographic variables and whether women did or did not experience harassment, and between harassment and job satisfaction) and the Friedman test (used to test for differences in the mean frequency of experiencing each form of harassment between time periods) revealed no significant differences. A larger sample may have yielded different results.

Future Research

There are at least two ways future research could build on this study. In order to obtain a larger sample size, the surveys could be mailed out with return envelopes. This could be done similarly to Seklecki and Paynich (2007) where they used every 30th law enforcement agency in the National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators, Correctional Institutions, and Related Agencies. Eventually they began using every 29th agency to attempt to reach their goal of 2,000 female law enforcement officers. Although their response rate was only 26 percent, they obtained 531 completed surveys. Another way to obtain participants for a mailed survey could be done somewhat like a snowball sample, where one female could be contacted at each agency, and trusted to provide all other females in her department with the survey and the return envelopes. Even if the researcher only personally knew a few women, this could potentially reach hundreds of women, and a larger sample could potentially be obtained. However, although the quantitative side of the research would improve, the qualitative side would likely be entirely lost because it is unlikely that women would fill in their responses regarding experiences of harassment. Another improvement for future research could include taking out the word “unwanted” from the questions asking about gender related or sexual jokes, or accounting for whether the joke was unwanted or not within the survey itself.

Policy Implications

This study can provide insight into what police agencies should be training on in regards to harassment. The responses suggest that women may be nervous to report instances of harassment due to the negative light it places on them. Often times, the person in charge of internal affairs, which is the department a victim of harassment would go to in order to file a complaint, is another sworn officer, and occasionally they are a sergeant. It may be useful to have a non-sworn employee, or even someone not employed by the department directly, in charge of receiving complaints of harassment. This may assist in making victims of harassment more comfortable in reporting it because they are not going to someone who potentially is friends with the person they are filing a complaint against, or someone who may have been a harasser at one time as well.

Conclusion

The present study sought to fill the gap in prior literature regarding whether environmental harassment or quid pro quo harassment occurred more often. Though the results of this study may not be generalizable due to the smaller sample size, it was found that none of the women experienced quid pro quo harassment, and all experienced environmental harassment at some point throughout their career. Job satisfaction was found not to be related to

experiences of harassment, as many women reported high levels of job satisfaction despite experiencing harassment. This study is just a stepping stone to future research which could potentially use the same schedule of questions, but use more interviewers in order to reach more women, or even send out the survey to a handful of trusted women at departments in order to reach the rest of the women at the given departments. If more interviewers were used, such as one or two in each county, it would be possible to reach more participants, and still receive the answers to the open-ended questions so as not to lose the qualitative side of the research. However, if the open-ended questions were removed from the survey, it would be useful to send out the surveys as described above in an attempt to reach an even larger number of female law enforcement officers in order to strengthen the quantitative side of the research.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS AND RATIONALE

Questionnaire Item	Supporting Study	Rationale for Question
1: How many police departments have you worked for as a law enforcement officer?	N/A	To inform respondents that have worked at multiple departments to answer questions with reference to their current department in order to examine whether experiences of harassment differ by department (if there are a sufficient number of respondents from different departments).
2: How long is the field training period for your department? 2a. Have you completed field training?	N/A	To examine whether experiences of harassment differ by different time periods in respondents' careers. If respondents have not completed field training

2b. How many days or months of your filed training have you completed?		only questions 11-18 & 37 are applicable.
3: How long is the probationary period for your department? 3a: Have you completed probation? 3b: How many days or months of your probationary period have you completed?	N/A	To examine whether experiences of harassment differ by different time periods in respondents' careers. If respondents have not completed probation, only questions 11-27 & 37 are applicable.
3c: How long have you been off probation?	N/A	To examine whether experiences of harassment differ by different time periods in respondents' careers. If respondents have been off

		probation less than one year, only questions 11-37 are applicable.
4, 15, 26, 38: Were you married/in a relationship during each time frame? 4a, 15a, 26a, 38a: Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer? 4b, 15b, 26b, 38b: Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer at your agency?	N/A	To examine whether experiences of harassment differ by marital/relationship status, and whether respondents are married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer.

5, 16, 28, 40: Were unwelcome gender related/sexual jokes made in your presence?	Dowler & Arai, 2008; Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999; Lonsway, Paynich, & Hall, 2013; Seklecki & Paynich, 2007; Somvadee & Morash, 2008 .	A measure of environmental harassment. Prior studies used similar measures in their examinations of: perceptions of gender discrimination and stress between male and female police officers[3], sexual harassment of females in the military[4], frequency of sexual harassment[5], the specific types of harassment experienced[6], and behaviors that make

[3] In Dowler and Arai (2008) respondents were asked how strongly they agree with the statement "within the department, gender-related jokes are often made in my presence" and found that females reported a higher frequency of hearing gender related jokes.
[4] Fitzgerald et al. (1999) used the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) adapted for the Department of Defense (DOD) and used "repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you" as a measure of sexual harassment. It was found that 63% of women compared to 15% of men experienced sexual harassment.
[5] Lonsway et al. (2013) evaluated how often sexual harassment occurred during the respondent's last year and during the respondent's law enforcement career using the measures "tell dirty stories or jokes" and "tell inappropriate dirty stories or jokes".
[6] Seklecki & Paynich (2007) found in their qualitative responses that one of the highest reported forms of harassment was "hearing dirty jokes and/or stories being told". Seklecki & Paynich suggested future research do more in-depth research regarding these qualitative answers.

		female law enforcement officers uncomfortable[7].
6, 17, 29, 41: Did a coworker/superior treat you differently because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)?	Fitzgerald et al, 1999; Hassell & Brandl, 2009; Somvadee & Morash, 2008.	A measure of environmental harassment. A prior study used this measure in their examination of harassment experienced by females in the military[8]. Another study used similar measures to examine harassment and consequences of that harassment[9], while another study used a similar measure to learn

[7] Somvadee and Morash (2008) used the measure "suggestive stories or offensive jokes, and found that 86.6% of females reported hearing suggestive stories of offensive jokes.
[8] Fitzgerald et al. (1999) used the SEQ measure "treated you 'differently' because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)" to measure gender harassment among female officers in the military. It was found that approximately 63% of women reported experiencing gender harassment, compared to only approximately 15% of men.
[9] Hassell & Brandl (2009) used several items to "measure the sense that people at work . . . do not recognize respondent's presence". Female respondents reported this occurred more often to them compared to their male counterparts.

		what behaviors made female's uncomfortable[10].
7, 18, 30, 42: Did a coworker/superior make offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)?	DeGuzman and Frank, 2003; Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Hassell & Brandl, 2009; Lonsway et al., 2013	Measure of environmental harassment. Prior studies used similar measures in their examination of: harassment of females in the military[11], workplace experiences of harassment and the consequences of those experiences[12], how often harassment occurs among law enforcement officers[13], and how strongly female officers

[10] Somvadee and Morash (2008) used the measure "treated differently due to sex" and found that approximately 69% reported being treated differently due to their sex.
[11] Fitzgerald et al. (1999) used the measure "made offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)" to measure gender harassment. Approximately 63% of women, and only 15% of men reported experiencing gender harassment.
[12] Hassell & Brandl (2009) uses "measures of the sense that there is bias at work against people of respondent's sex, age, race, ethnic group, and sexual orientation", however they do not give the exact measures used. Bias was found to be positively related to workplace stress.
[13] Lonsway et al. (2013) used the measure "say things to put women down (e.g., women don't make good supervisors)" in their studies and found that 40% of women in one study, and 58% of women in their other study had experienced this, and it was most commonly from a coworker.

		agree that this type of harassment occurs[14].
8, 19, 31, 43: Was a coworker/superior condescending to you because of your sex?	Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Somvadee & Morash, 2008.	A measure of environmental harassment. A similar measure was used in prior studies to evaluate: sexual harassment of females in the military[15], and what behaviors from male counterparts make female officer's uncomfortable[16].

[14] DeGuzman and Frank (2003) asked Filipino female law enforcement officers how strongly they agree that their physical capabilities are under estimated, and approximately 54% either agreed or strongly agreed.
[15] Fitzgerald et al. (1999) used the measure "put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex" and found that more women reported this occurring than did men.
[16] Somvadee and Morash (2008) used the measure "put down/condescending due to sex" and found that approximately 54% of females reported male coworkers had been condescending to them due to their sex.

6, 14, 23, 32: Did a coworker/superior touch you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Lonsway et al., 2013; Morash, Kwak, & Haarr, 2006; Somvadee & Morash, 2008.	A measure of environmental harassment. This is a measure similar to that used in each of the listed studies in their examination of: sexual harassment of women in the military[17], how often sexual harassment occurs[18], whether harassment influences police stress[19], and what behaviors make female officers uncomfortable[20].

[17] Fitzgerald et al. (1999) used "touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable" to measure unwanted sexual attention which is a component of environmental harassment. This study found that 42% of women reported unwanted sexual attention, while only 8% of men did.
[18] Lonsway et al. (2013) examined frequency, impact and perception of harassment using some of the scales from the SEQ. The measure "touch you in a way that made you uncomfortable" was used to measure unwanted sexual attention (environmental harassment), and ranked as the second most frequent behavior.
[19] Morash et al. (2006) used the measure "coworkers – physically touch me" to measure sexual harassment. Sexual harassment was more prevalent among female officers than male officers, therefore more likely to predict stress for female officers.
[20] Somvadee and Morash (2008) used the measures "unwelcome touching" and found that 36.7% of female officers had experienced this.

7, 15, 24, 33: Did coworkers/superiors pursue a date or sexual relationship with you despite your objections?	Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Hassell & Brandl, 2009; Lonsway et al., 2013; Morash, et al., 2006; Seklecki & Paynich, 2007; Somvadee & Morash, 2008.	A measure of environmental harassment. Prior studies used variations of this measure to examine: sexual harassment of females in the military[21], workplace experiences of harassment[22], frequency and perception of harassment[23], police stress[24], what type of harassment is

[21] Fitzgerald et al. (1999) uses several measures of unwanted sexual attention to establish environmental harassment experienced by females in the military. Two of these measures are: "made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it" and "continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc. even though you said 'no'".

[22] Hassell & Brandl (2009) "measures whether people at work make unwanted advances for romantic, physical, and sexual relationships with or without threats" to evaluate respondents' experiences of sexually offensive behaviors. They found that females reported more negative sexually offensive behaviors than their male counterparts.

[23] Lonsway et al. (2013) measured the type and frequency of harassment experienced using measures from the SEQ to measure unwanted sexual attention: "Try to have a romantic or sexual relationship with you even though you tried to let the person know you didn't want to" and "Keep on asking you out even after you have said 'no'". They found this is most commonly done by coworkers and occurs more to females than males.

[24] One measure used by Morash et al. (2006) was "superiors – try to have a romantic type of relationship with me". This was used to measure sexual harassment. Sexual harassment is reported more by female officers than male officers and contributes to officer stress.

		experienced by female law enforcement officers[25], and what behaviors from male coworkers make female officer's uncomfortable[26].
8, 16, 25, 34: Were you ever asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or maintain something relevant to your job?	Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Lonsway et al., 2013; Morash et. al., 2006; Somvadee & Morash, 2008.	A measure of quid pro quo harassment. Prior studies have used similar measures to examine: sexual harassment of females in the military[27], incidence of sexual harassment[28], stress

[25] Through evaluation of their qualitative answers, Seklecki & Paynich (2007) found that "someone trying to have a sexual relationship with the respondent despite their objections" was one of the highest occurring situations when respondents were asked about sexual harassment. The authors suggested future research take these qualitative answers and gather more in-depth data about them.

[26] Somvadee and Morash (2008) used the measure "attempts to establish a sexual relation" and found that 20.5% of females reported that their coworkers had attempted to establish a sexual relationship.

[27] Three of the measures used by Fitzgerald et al. (1999) to measure sexual coercion were: "made you feel like you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior", "made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative", and "implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative". Thirteen percent of women in the military reported experiencing this type of harassment, whereas only 2% of men reported it.

[28] Lonsway et al. (2013) used measures from the SEQ to evaluate quid pro quo harassment among law enforcement officers: "hint that you might get some reward for doing something sexual" and "hint at a job benefit of some kind if you were sexual with him or her". This occurred more often among female officers, and the perpetrator was most commonly a coworker.

		related to sexual harassment[29], and learning what behaviors make female officer's uncomfortable[30].

9, 17, 26, 35: How would you rate your job satisfaction?	Dantzer & Kubin, 1998	A measure of overall job satisfaction. Dantzer and Kubin (1998) measured job satisfaction based on several job related factors. Rather than measuring each of these factors individually in this study, overall job satisfaction is being measured by this question.
10, 18, 27 ,36	N/A	A measure to discern

[29] Morash et al. (2006) found that female officers reported more sexual harassment than males. They used "superiors – force me to have sexual intercourse" as one of the measures of sexual harassment. The word forced is not used in this study in order to better capture low levels of quid pro quo harassment. Also, this study is not looking to measure sexual assaults, rather sexual harassment of female law enforcement officers.

[30] Somvadee and Morash (2008) used the measures "implying better treatment for sexual cooperation" and "subtle threats of retaliation for sexual noncooperation". Only 5% of females experienced implications of better treatment for sexual cooperation, and only 2% experienced subtle threats for sexual noncooperation.

Is your rating of your job satisfaction during each time frame affected by the extent to which you experienced harassment?		whether overall job satisfaction is related to experiences of harassment.
11, 19, 28: Age at beginning of each time frame?	N/A	To examine whether experiences of harassment differ by age.

21, 30: Did any of your coworkers say that you completed field training/probation only because you are a female?	Dowler & Arai, 2008; Fitzgerald et al., 1999; Seklecki & Paynich, 2007.	A measure of environmental harassment. This question was created based on results of the listed studies[31].
37: Are there any other experiences you can	N/A	This question is used to gather any experiences of

[31] Dowler and Arai (2008) asked respondents how strongly they agree with the statement "the department tends to be more lenient in enforcing rules and regulations for female officers". They found that male officers agree with this statement more strongly than females. Fitzgerald et al. (1999) used the measure "treated you 'differently' because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)". Seklecki and Paynich (2007) found that women often experience being put down in their career.

think of that have occurred outside of these specific time frames or at another agency you have worked at?		harassment that may have occurred at a different agency or at a time outside of the specified time frames.

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY

Demographic Survey

Circle or fill in your answer where applicable:

1. Race:
   White, not Hispanic origin
   Black/African American, not of Hispanic origin
   Hispanic or Latino
   Asian
   American Indian or Alaska Native
   Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
   Two or more races

2. Age:

3. Education Level:
   GED
   High School Diploma
   Some College
   Two Year College Degree (Associates Degree)
   Four Year College Degree (BA/BS)
   Masters Degree (MA/MS)
   Doctoral Degree (PhD)

4. Marital Status:
   Single/Never Married
   Married
   Divorced
   Widowed
   In a Committed Relationship

5. Sexual Orientation:
   Heterosexual
   Homosexual
   Bisexual
   Prefer Not to Answer

6. Agency Type:
   Municipal
   County
   State
   Federal
   College/University

7. Total Years of Law Enforcement Experience:

8. Years/Months of Employment at Current Agency:

9. Rank:
   Officer
   Master Officer I
   Master Officer II
   Corporal
   Sergeant
   Lieutenant
   Captain
   Chief
   Other:

10. Assignment:
    Patrol
    Investigations
    Hiring
    Traffic
    Special Investigations
    Gang
    Other:

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT

The study in which you are being asked to participate in is designed to investigate female law enforcement officer's experience of harassment in the workplace. This study is being conducted by Vanessa Michelle Brodeur under the supervision of Professor Christine Famega, Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

PURPOSE: The purpose of the research is to examine the types of harassment experienced by female law enforcement officers, how often harassment is experienced, whether harassment varies as female officers gain more experience, which, if any, demographic characteristics affect experiences of harassment, and if job satisfaction is related to experiences of harassment.

DESCRIPTION: A face to face interview will be conducted at a pre-determined location of your choice. During the interview, you will be asked questions about yourself, about your career in law enforcement, and about experiences of harassment at different points in your career. The interviewer will take brief notes on the survey instrument to record your responses. With your consent, the interview will also be tape-recorded. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes, and a break will be given after 20 minutes if you desire.

PARTICIPATION: Your participation is completely voluntary. You may skip any questions you do not want to answer and you may stop the interview at any time if you do not want to continue.

CONFIDENTIALITY: The demographic questionnaire, interview and audio recordings will not identify any participants by name. Each participant will be assigned a number to maintain confidentiality. The agencies that the participants work for will be assigned a letter, and will not be identified by name. The code lists and data files will be stored on separate external flash drives in a secure safe with the paper demographic questionnaires, interview instruments and the voice recordings of the interviews. Only the interviewer (Vanessa Brodeur) will have access to the code list linking subjects' names to numbers. Only the interviewer and Dr. Famega will have access to all other identifiable data. As participants will be snowball sampled from multiple (anonymous) police agencies, it will not be possible to deduce participants' identities from indirect identifiers. Quantitative data will be reported in the aggregate, and any qualitative data (quotations) that are reported will be anonymous. The tapes and notes taken during the interview will be shredded and discarded in separate trash bins one year after the research is completed.

DURATION: The interview will last approximately 45 minutes, and a break will be given after 20 minutes if desired.

RISKS: It is possible you may experience strong emotions and need professional counseling due to recalling times of sexual harassment and possible sexual

assault. A contact list with the addresses and phone numbers of counselors has been provided. If necessary, these professionals are available to help you at this time.

BENEFITS: It is possible that some participants may appreciate the opportunity to share their experiences of harassment in the workplace. The benefits that may reasonably be expected to result from the research include knowledge about the nature and frequency of harassment experienced by female police officers, as well as what types of behavior are perceived as harassment. This information has the potential to influence: the training of police officers, field training officers, and supervisors, as well as departmental policies and procedures to reduce harassment in the workplace.

AUDIO: I understand that this interview will be audio recorded as a note-taking device for the researcher's use only. At no time will my name be used with the audio recording. Initials ____

CONTACT: If you have any questions about this research or your rights as a participant, you can contact Christine Famega, Associate Professor, California State University, San Bernardino, at (909) 537-5285 or cfamega@csusb.edu.

RESULTS: You can obtain the results of the research at CSUSB, Department of Criminal Justice 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, Ca 92407.

I have read and understand the consent document and agree to participate in your study.

SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____

APPENDIX D

EMERGENCY CONTACT LIST

EMERGENCY CONTACT LIST

San Bernardino Sexual Assault
444 N Arrowhead Ave # 101
San Bernardino, Ca 92401-1444
909-885-8884

Community Service Programs – Sexual Assault Resources
1221 E. Dyer Rd. Suite 120
Santa Ana, Ca 92705
24 Hour Crisis Hotline: 714-957-2737 / 949-831-9110
North Orange County Counseling: 714-834-4317
South Orange County Counseling: 949-752-1971

Peace Over Violence
Metro Headquarters
1015 Wilshire Blvd. Suite 200
Los Angeles, Ca 90017
213-955-9090
West San Gabriel Valley Center
892 N. Fair Oaks Ave. Suite D
Pasadena, Ca 91103
626-584-6191
24 Hour Crisis Hotline:
213-626-3393 (Central Los Angeles)
310-392-8381 (South Los Angeles)
626-793-3385 (West San Gabriel Valley)

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Interview

I designed this interview to explore female police officer's experience of harassment at different times in their career: during field training, during their probationary period, and at different times after completing their probationary period.

What I mean by your experiences of harassment is whether you have been subjected to any unwelcome conduct based on your gender, sex, or being pregnant.

The harasser can be your supervisor, the supervisor of another unit, or a co-worker.

1. How many police departments have you worked for as a law enforcement officer?

_____ *(enter number)*

If more than one department, explain this interview will focus on their time and experiences at the current department.

2. How long is the field training period for your department? _____ *(enter number; circle days or months)*

2a. Have you completed field training?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, continue to 2b.
If answer is yes, skip to 3.

2b. How many days or months of your field training have you completed?

_____ *(enter number; circle: days or months)*

Skip to 11

3. How long is the probationary period for your department? _____ *(enter number; circle days or months)*

3a. Have you completed probation?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, continue to 3b.

If answer is yes, skip to 3c.

3b. How many days or months of your probationary period have you completed? _____ *(enter number; circle: days or months)*

Skip to 11.

3c. How long have you been off probation? _____ *(enter number; circle: days or months)*

If less than 1 year, skip to 11.
If more than 1 year, continue to 4.

I would like to ask you some questions about experiences you may have had during the last twelve months.

4. Were you married/in a relationship during the last twelve months?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, circle no for 4a & 4b skip to 5.
If answer is yes, continue to 4a.

4a. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 5.
If answer is yes, continue to 4b.

4b. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer from your agency?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

5. During the last twelve months, have coworkers or supervisors made unwanted gender related or sexual jokes in your presence? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 6.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 5a.

5a. Can you recall a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* Do you remember the joke? Was it a coworker or superior that told it?)

If recording includes a response, circle 5a.

6. During the last twelve months, did a coworker/superior treat you differently because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 7.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 6a.

6a. Can you recall a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 6a.

7. During the last twelve months, did a coworker/superior make offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 8.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 7a.

7a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* What statements were made? Was it a coworker or superior that made the statement?)

If recording includes a response, circle 7a.

8. During the last twelve months, was a coworker/superior condescending to you because of your sex? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 9.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 8a.

8a. Can you recall a specific experience?
If recording includes a response, circle 8a.

9. During the last twelve months, did a coworker/superior touch you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 10.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 9a.

9a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* Where were you touched? Was it a coworker or superior that touched you?)

If recording includes a response, circle 9a.

10. During the last twelve months, did coworkers/superiors pursue a date or sexual relationship with you despite your objections? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 11.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 10a.

10a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 10a.

11. During the last twelve months, were you asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or maintain something relevant to your job? For example, the position or shift you are currently in? A passing evaluation, favorable review or recommendation? A promotion or raise? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 12.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 11a.

11a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 11a.

12. During the last twelve months, how would you rate your job satisfaction? Would you say you were:

0=very unsatisfied; 1=unsatisfied; 2=satisfied; 3=very satisfied? *(circle answer)*

13. Is your rating of your job satisfaction during the last 12 months affected by the extent to which you experienced harassment ?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

I would like to ask you some questions regarding your experiences during your time in field training for your current department.

14. How old were you when you began field training? _____ *(enter years)*

15. Were you married/in a relationship when you began field training?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 16.
If answer is yes, continue to 15a.

15a. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 16.
If answer is yes, continue to 15b.

15b. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer at your agency?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

16. During your time in field training, did coworkers or supervisors make unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes in your presence? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 17.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 16a.

16a. Can you recall a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* Do you remember the joke? Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 16a.

17. During your time in field training, did a coworker/superior treat you differently because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 18.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 17a.

17a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 17a.

18. During your time in field training, did a coworker/superior make offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 19.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 18a.

18a. Can you recall a specific remark that was made to you?
(*Prompts:* What was the remark? Was it a coworker/superior who made the remark?)

If recording includes a response, circle 18a.

19. During your time in field training, was a coworker/superior condescending to you because of your sex? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 20.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 19a.

19a. Can you recall a specific incident?

If recording includes a response, circle 19a.

20. During your time in field training, did coworkers/superiors touch you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 21.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 20a.

20a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* Where were you touched? Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 20a.

21. During your time in field training, did coworkers/superiors pursue a date or sexual relationship with you despite your objections? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never occurred, skip to 22.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 21a.

21a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 21a.

22. During your time in field training, were you asked to participate in sexual relations to receive something relevant to your job ? For example: a desirable shift, a passing evaluation, favorable review or recommendation? Or to complete training? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never occurred, skip to 23.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 22a.

22a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 22a.

23. During your time in field training, how would you rate your job satisfaction? Would you say you were:

0=very unsatisfied; 1=unsatisfied; 2=satisfied; 3=very satisfied? *(circle answer)*

24. Is your rating of your job satisfaction during your time in field training affected by the extent to which you experienced harassment?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

Review answer to question 2a.
If respondent has not completed field training, skip to 49.
If respondent has completed field training, continue to 25.

Now I would like to ask you some questions regarding your experiences during your time on probation for this department.

25. How old were you when you began your probationary period? _____ *(enter years)*

26. Were you married/in a relationship when you began your probationary period?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 27.
If answer is yes, continue to 26a.

26a. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 27.
If answer is yes, continue to 26b.

26b. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer at your agency?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

27. During your probationary period, did any of your coworkers or superiors say that you completed field training only because you are a female? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

*If answer is never occurred, skip to 2*8.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 27a.

27a. Can you recall a specific comment regarding only completing FTO due to being a female?

If recording includes a response, circle 27a.

28. During your probationary period, did coworkers or supervisors make unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes in your presence? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 29.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 28a.

28a. Can you recall a specific experience?
(*Prompts:* What was the joke? Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 28a.

29. During your probationary period, did a coworker/superior treat you differently because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 30.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 29a.

29a. Can you tell me about a specific incident?

If recording includes a response, circle 29a.

30. During your probationary period, did a coworker/superior make offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 31.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 30a.

30a. Can you recall a specific remark?
(*Prompts:* What was the remark? Was the remark made by a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 30a.

31. During your probationary period, was a coworker/superior condescending to you because of your sex? Would you say this:

    0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

    If answer is never, skip to 32.
    If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 31a.

        31a. Can you recall a specific experience?

        If recording includes a response, circle 31a.

32. During your probationary period, did a coworker/superior touch you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? Would you say this:

    0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

    If answer is never, skip to 33.
    If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 32a.

        32a. Can you tell me about a specific experience?
        (*Prompts:* Where were you touched? Was it a coworker or superior?)

        If recording includes a response, circle 32a.

33. During your probationary period, did coworkers/superiors pursue a date or sexual relationship with you despite your objections? Would you say this:

    0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

    If answer is never occurred, skip to 34.
    If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 33a.

        33a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?
        (*Prompts:* Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 33a.

34. During your probationary period, were you asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or obtain something relevant to your job? For example: a desirable shift, a passing evaluation, favorable review or recommendation? Or successful completion of probation? Would you say this:

. 0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 35.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 34a.

34a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 34a.

35. During your probationary period, how would you rate your job satisfaction? Would you say you were:

0=very unsatisfied; 1=unsatisfied; 2=satisfied; 3=very satisfied? *(circle answer)*

36. Is your rating of your job satisfaction during your probationary period affected by the extent to which you experienced harassment?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

Review answer to question 3a.
If respondent has not completed probation, skip to 49.
If respondent has completed probation, continue to 37.

Next I would like to ask you some questions regarding your experiences during <u>your first year off probation</u> (or however long they have been off probation).

37. How old were you when you completed your probationary period? _____ *(enter years).*

38. Were you married/in a relationship during your first year after completing probation?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 39.
If answer is yes, continue to 38a.

38a. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

If answer is no, skip to 39.
If answer is yes, continue to 38b.

38b. Were you married/in a relationship with another law enforcement officer at your agency?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

39. After completing probation, did any of your coworkers or superiors say you only completed probation because you were a female? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 40.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 39a.

39a. Can you recall a specific comment regarding you only completing probation because you are a female?

If recording includes a response, circle 39a.

40. During your first year after completing probation, did coworkers or supervisors make unwelcome gender related or sexual jokes in your presence? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never , skip to 41
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 40a.

40a. Can you recall a specific experience?

(*Prompts:* What was the joke? Was it a coworker or superior that told it?)

If recording includes a response, circle 40a.

41. During your first year after completing probation, did a coworker/superior treat you differently because of your sex (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored you)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to question 42.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to question 41a.

41a. Can you recall a specific incident?

If recording includes a response, circle 41a.

42. During your first year after completing probation, did a coworker/superior make offensive sexist remarks (for example, suggesting that people of your sex are not suited for the kind of work you do)? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to question 43.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to question 42a.

42a. Can you recall a specific remark?
(*Prompts:* What was the remark? Was the remark made by a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 42a.

43. During your first year after completing probation, was a coworker/superior condescending to you because of your sex? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1= occurred once or twice; 2= occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to question 44.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to question 43a.

43a. Can you recall a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 43a.

44. During your first year after completing probation, did coworkers/superiors touch you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never, skip to 45.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 44a.

44a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience? (*Prompts:* Where were you touched? Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 44a.

45. During your first year after completing probation, did coworkers/superiors pursue a date or sexual relationship with you despite your objections? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never occurred, skip to 46.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 45a.

45a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience? (*Prompts:* Was it a coworker or superior?)

If recording includes a response, circle 45a.

46. During your first year after completing probation, were you asked to participate in sexual relations to receive or maintain something relevant to your job? For example: a desirable shift, a passing evaluation, favorable review or recommendation? A promotion or raise? Would you say this:

0= Never occurred; 1=occurred once or twice; 2=occurred three or more times? *(circle answer)*

If answer is never , skip to 47.
If answer is occurred once or twice, or occurred three or more times, continue to 46a.

46a. Can you tell me more about a specific experience?

If recording includes a response, circle 46a.

47. During your first year after completing probation, how would you rate your job satisfaction? Would you say you were:

0=very unsatisfied; 1=unsatisfied; 2=satisfied; 3=very satisfied? *(circle answer)*

48. Is your rating of your job satisfaction during the first year after completing probation affected by the extent to which you experienced harassment?

0=no 1=yes *(circle answer)*

49. These interview questions have focused on your experiences of harassment during specific time frames in your career; however, it is understood that there may be incidents that have occurred outside of these specific times frames, or other incidents that the questions did not specifically address. Are there any other experiences that you can think of that have occurred outside of these specific time frames or at another agency you have worked at?

(*Prompts: Did it occur at your current agency? Do you remember approximately how old you were? What was your rank?*)

If recording includes a response, circle 49

APPENDIX F

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SAN BERNARDINO

Academic Affairs
Office of Academic Research • Institutional Review Board

June 14, 2016

CSUSB INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
Expedited Review
IRB# 15084
Status
APPROVED

Ms. Vanessa Michele Brodeur
c/o: Prof. Christine Famega
Department of Criminal Justice
California State University, San Bernardino
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

Dear Ms. Brodeur:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "Female Law Enforcement Officer's Experiences of Workplace Harassment" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The attached informed consent document has been stamped and signed by the IRB chairperson. All subsequent copies used must be this officially approved version. A change in your informed consent (no matter how minor the change) requires resubmission of your protocol as amended. **Your application is approved for one year from June 14, 2016 through June 13, 2017. One month prior to the approval end date you need to file for a renewal if you have not completed your research. See additional requirements (Items 1 – 4) of your approval below.**

Your responsibilities as the researcher/investigator reporting to the IRB Committee include the following 4 requirements as mandated by the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 listed below. Please note that the protocol change form and renewal form are located on the IRB website under the forms menu. Failure to notify the IRB of the above may result in disciplinary action. You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years. Please notify the IRB Research Compliance Officer for any of the following:

1) **Submit a protocol change form if any changes (no matter how minor) are proposed in your research protocol for review and approval of the IRB before implemented in your research,**
2) **If any unanticipated/adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research,**
3) **To apply for renewal and continuing review of your protocol one month prior to the protocols end date,**
4) **When your project has ended by emailing the IRB Research Compliance Officer.**

The CSUSB IRB has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional approvals which may be required.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, the IRB Compliance Officer. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillesp@csusb.edu. Please include your application approval identification number (listed at the top) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Judy Sylva

Judy Sylva, Ph.D., Chair
Institutional Review Board

JS/MG

c/o: Prof. Christine Famega, Department of Criminal Justice

909.537.7588 • fax: 909.537.7028 • http://irb.csusb.edu
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

REFERENCES

Babbie, E. (2008). *The basics of social research* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Bachman, R., & Schutt, R. (2008). *Fundamentals of research in criminology and criminal justice.* Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2010). *Women in law enforcement, 1987-2008.* Retrieved from https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/wle8708.pdf

Burke, R.J., & Mikkelsen, A. (2004). Gender issues in policing: Do they matter? *Women in Management Review, 20*(2), 133-143. DOI: 10.1108/09649420510584463

Cordner, G., & Cordner, A. (2011). Stuck on a plateau? Obstacles to recruitment, selection, and retention of women police. *Police Quarterly, 14*(3), 207-226. DOI: 10.1177/1098611111413990

De Guzman, M. C., & Frank, J. (2003). Policewomen and their problems: the Philippine context. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 27*(3), 396-412. DOI: 10.1108/13639510410553130

De Haas, S., Timmerman, G., & Hoing, M. (2009). Sexual harassment and health among male and female police officers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14*(4), 390-401. DOI: 10.1037/a0017046

Dowler, K. & Arai, B. (2008). Stress, gender, and policing: the impact of perceived gender discrimination on symptoms of stress. *International*

Journal of Police Science & Management, 10(2), 123-135. DOI: 10.1350/ijps.2008.10.2.81

Equal Employment Opportunity Committee. (2016). Harassment. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/harassment.cfm

Equal Employment Opportunity Committee. (2016). Sex-based discrimination. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sex.cfm

Fitzgerald, L., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: the sexual experiences questionnaire (SeQ-DoD). *Military Psychology, 11*(3), 243-263. DOI: 10.1207/s15327876mp1103_3

Hassell, K. D., & Brandl, S. G. (2009). An examination of the workplace experiences of police patrol officers: the role of race, sex, and sexual orientation. *Police Quarterly, 12*(4), 408-430. DOI: 10.1177/1098611109348473

Hay, M. S., & Elig, T. W. (1999). The 1995 department of defense sexual harassment survey: overview and methodology. *Military Psychology, 11*(3), 233-242. DOI: 10.1207/s15327876mp1103_2

Lonsway, K. A., Paynich, R., & Hall, J. N. (2013). Sexual harassment in law enforcement: incidence, impact, and perception. *Police Quarterly, 16*(2), 177-210. DOI: 10.1177/1098611113475630

Morash, M., Kwak, D., & Haarr, R. (2006). Gender differences in the predictors of police stress. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 29*(3), 541-563. DOI: 10.1108/13639510610684755

Rabe-Hemp, C. (2008). Survival in an “all boys club”: Policewomen and their fight for acceptance. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 31*(2), 251-270. DOI: 10.1108/13639510810878712

Seklecki, R., & Paynich, R. (2007). A national survey of female police officers: An overview of findings. *Police Practice and Research, 8*(1), 17-30. DOI: 10.1080/15614260701217941

Somvadee, C., & Morash, M. (2008). Dynamics of sexual harassment for policewomen working alongside men. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 31*(3), 485-498. DOI: 10.1108/13639510810895821

Somvadee, C., & Morash, M. (2009). Reasons for policewomen’s assertive and passive reactions to sexual harassment. *Police Quarterly, 12*(1), 63-85. DOI: 10.1177/1098611108327309

Thompson, B. M., Kirk, A., & Brown, D. (2006). Sources of stress in policewomen: a three-factor model. *International Journal of Stress Management, 13*(3), 309-328. DOI: 10.1037/1072-5245.13.3.309