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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to examine the acceptability of male homosexuals in law enforcement as determined by those currently employed as sworn officers in Southern California. Law enforcement has historically been reluctant to accept "outsiders" within its ranks. It has only been within the last 25 years that women and minorities have sought to enter the law enforcement profession in significant numbers, and it took legislative action and law suits to make this a reality. This reluctance, on the part of law enforcement, often resulted in monetary awards to the plaintiffs frequently costing law enforcement agencies millions of dollars.

In order to prevent this repeat of history, it is important to know the degree of acceptability of male homosexuals entering law enforcement in Southern California. The results of this study can then be used by law enforcement administrators in developing policies and strategies that might reduce or eliminate law suits by gay police officers claiming harassment and/or discrimination because of sexual orientation.

The findings of this study support the conclusion that gays entering the law enforcement profession will receive a "luke-warm", if that, welcome by current law enforcement officers in Southern California. The data were analyzed
using both univariate and bivariate statistics.

The social issue of homosexuality will be at the forefront in the last decade of the 20th century. Its potential for impact upon law enforcement cannot be taken lightly. In the 1990s, homosexuality will be what the abortion issue has been in the 1980s.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION
HOMOSEXUALITY AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Homosexuality and Society

It has often been pointed out by foreign observers of American society that our sexual morality is significantly different from that found in any European country. While the American society has its historical roots in Europe it has, over time, developed many moral patterns peculiar to itself (Bell, 1966, p. 13).

American attitudes toward sex in general have been termed "erotophobia" - that is, involving exaggerated anxieties and fears of sexual behavior of all types with excessive attempts to place such activities under societal control via regulation. Foremost among such concerns has been male homosexual behavior. According to Kinsey:

In our American culture there are no types of sexual activity which are as frequently condemned because they depart from mores and publicly pretended custom as homosexual activities. There are practically no European groups unless it be England, and few if any cultures elsewhere in the world which have become as disturbed over male homosexuality as we have here in the United States (Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gephard, 1953, p. 477).

Historic Images of Homosexuality

Homosexuality and its images have been identified throughout history. As Alfred Kinsey observed, "The homosexual has been a significant part of human history, primarily because it is an expression of capacities that are
basic in the human animal" (Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin, 1948, p. 666). There have been historical periods in which homosexuality has been condemned as well as celebrated by various cultures. Christian dogma has considered homosexual behavior in all circumstances utterly immoral and inexcusable (West, 1967, p. 96). From the Biblical perspective, the Christian Church developed and promulgated attitudes that cast homosexuality in a despicable light, and voiced the need for punishment. In the St. Joseph's edition of the Holy Bible, Leviticus 20:13 says "If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them shall be put to death for their abominable deed; they have forfeited their lives."

It appears that only male homosexuality is forbidden and no reference to women lying with women is made. This seems to reflect a separate and distinct difference to how homosexual males and homosexual females are viewed. However, there have been references in the Old Testament that among the ancient tribes of Israel, homosexuality was both practiced and condemned (West, 1967, p. 22). Under Jewish rabbinical law, acts of anal intercourse between males, whether committed for secular reasons or as part of a heathen religious rite, merited death by stoning (Epstein, 1948, p. 136). The Catholic Church views homosexuality as an intrinsic moral evil, and the inclination itself must be
seen as an objective disorder (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1988, p. 206).

At other times in history, homosexuality has been considered a celebrated event, and it seems to have reached its pinnacle during ancient Greece. In classical Greece, homosexuality achieved social recognition as an acceptable and expected form of love between normal males, most appropriately between youths and somewhat older men who could set a good example (Eglington, 1964, p. 22). Homosexuality to the Greeks was, in their eyes, the highest and noblest of passions. There is no indication as to why the ancient Greeks tolerated homosexuality to the extent they did, or why that eventually changed.

Leaving the ancient world and coming nearer to home, the history of our own culture shows that cultivation of a severely repressive attitude has consistently failed to eradicate homosexuality. Even in periods when detection meant death, the practice was known to be wide-spread (West, 1967, p.36). The popular notion that this is a social problem of just the present day, due to a recent relaxation of moral standards, can be disproved by even the briefest excursion into history (Taylor, 1953, pp.26, 76).

Our society's attitudes toward sex, and more specifically toward homosexuality continue to be influenced by Judeo-Christian tradition and can be traced back to its
early history. In early Christian history, homosexuality was associated with paganism, and homosexual acts were defined as foreign, unfamiliar and eventually unnatural (West, 1967, p. 73). With the spread of Christianity, homosexual behavior was condemned by ecclesiastical law, which later became the basis of English common law and American State Law (Weinberg & Williams, 1974, p. 18). Many of the opinions, values and attitudes, that people have about homosexuality can be traced back to their religious beliefs which have traditionally condemned such activity. Kinsey et al. (1953) ascribed the source of antihomosexual attitudes to the Judeo-Christian tradition.

American Puritanism perpetuated and strengthened even further our society's attitudes toward homosexuality. The Puritans viewed all sex as evil and dangerous and encouraged its repression. Sexual acts should not be a source of pleasure, they believed, and should occur only within marriage for the purpose of procreation. Thus, homosexual behavior was regarded as a classic sin. The "Puritan Ethic" has led to the belief that pleasure for its own sake is immoral (Blumenfeld & Raymond, 1988, p. 233). Clearly, homosexual sex flies in the face of such beliefs. Held by one of the earliest and most powerful groups in the country, Puritan beliefs influenced the culture of the United States profoundly regarding sex, and more
specifically, homosexuality. This influence is still present in American society.

Legal Images of Homosexuality

In the history of Western civilization, not only homosexuality but all sexual behavior has been restricted within a legal framework. The history of legal involvement with homosexuality is very extensive, going back well into the first millennium B.C., and it looks to continue long into the future (Dynes & Donaldson, 1992, p. 8). The political control of sexual behavior is in most instances a consequence of Judeo-Christian ethic. In Europe, ecclesiastical law incorporated ideas from Jewish tradition, Christian teaching and Roman law as a basis for criminalizing and punishing homosexual behavior with the prosecution of homosexuals directed mostly against males (Diamont, 1993, p. 6). According to West, homosexual offenses under ecclesiastical law were punishable by torture and death. Punitive attitudes toward homosexuality began to diminish under the liberalizing effect of Napoleonic Code. Today, most European countries no longer consider homosexuality in itself a crime if it does not include public indecency, coercion or minors (West, 1967, pp.74-75).

American laws controlling sexual behavior vary from one State to the next. At one time in our country's history, solitary masturbation, and pre-marital or adulterous sexual
behavior were all crimes in one State or another. However, only the anti-homosexual laws were widely enforced by the police and males more often than females appeared to be the focus of this enforcement. Kinsey et al. (1948) discovered that in New York City there were three arrests of females for engaging in homosexual activity within a ten year period, but all of these cases were dismissed, although there were tens of thousands of arrests and convictions of males charged with homosexual activity in the same period of time (pp. 35, 37, 77, & 233). Most states continue to have felony statutes mostly referring to sodomy or "crimes against nature." States also have statutes covering homosexual misdemeanors which carry lesser punishments, but can be more easily held to apply to any and every sexual act or gesture. Thus statutes covering "out-rages to public decency" can be used for controlling male sexual urges, or loitering around public restrooms. Appendix A highlights the current (1992) status of sodomy restrictions by State.

The courts, up to and including the United States Supreme Court, have addressed the issue of privacy and sex. In Bowers v. Harwick (1986), the United States Supreme Court ruled that gays have no constitutional privacy right to have sex: the Constitution does not "confer a fundamental right upon homosexuals to engage in sodomy" (Mohr, 1988, p. 49). As of 1961, all states had bans on non-procreative sex.
Subsequently, sodomy laws in many states have been repealed by the state legislatures or portions ruled unconstitutional. Some have argued that the criminal justice system has been maintained to protect certain segments of society from homosexuals rather than protect the public. In the past, the mere fact of an arrest, even when police had insufficient evidence to obtain a conviction, often resulted in the loss of jobs and credit, as well as diminished opportunities for future employment (Simpson, 1976, pp.138-139). The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) has occasionally been called upon to defend the claims of fundamental civil liberties for homosexuals.

Homosexuality and Law Enforcement

The enforcement of the laws governing homosexual behavior lies with law enforcement which has historically been society's control agent (Humphreys, 1972, p. 98). The historical relationship between law enforcement and the homosexual community can best be defined as confrontational. Homosexuals have claimed that law enforcement has not been sympathetic in dealing with homosexuals, and that enforcement tactics have been surreptitious, often including brutality and entrapment. Such tactics often lead to public exposure of homosexuals or extortion by the police (Dynes & Donaldson, 1992, p. 12).
Police attitudes toward gays can be traced historically. These attitudes, some still present today, can be attributed to police leaders and the police subculture. There are several examples which illustrate the attitudes and confrontational relationship that have existed between these groups. In 1971, a group of homosexuals were set upon by a gang of youths at a public beach near Bridgeport, Connecticut. A severely injured homosexual female reportedly crawled toward a uniformed policeman crying for help. "The law don't protect queers," he is reported as saying (Humphreys, 1974, p. 25). In another case, a homosexual man who was beaten by officers in a movie theater was awarded $87,000 in damages by a Federal Court Jury (AELE Liability Reporter, p. 164). This feeling of contempt cannot be ignored in the study of homosexuals entering the law enforcement profession and the homosexuals' acceptance into its culture. In his book, "The Light from the Second Story Window" David Allen describes the sentiments existing between the police and homosexuals. His fictional character wants to know who will save the homosexuals from the treachery of the police. His response is that perhaps Adolf Hitler will come back to life and do it (Allen, 1972, p. 13).

Two historical events in the history of the homosexual movement illustrate the confrontational relationship between
the gay community and law enforcement. Probably the most significant event for the gay movement was the Stonewall Riots which occurred in late June of 1969 and included three days of street violence and demonstrations. The disruptions were sparked by drag-queens resisting arrest in a routine police raid of a Greenwich Village gay bar, the Stonewall Inn. Such raids, in which police harassed homosexuals, were a common occurrence in the 1950s and the 1960s in many U.S. cities. This incident seemed to bring a sense of empowerment to homosexuals and marked a turning point for gays in the United States.

The second event occurred on November 27, 1978 in San Francisco. On that day, a former policeman and city supervisor, Dan White, left his home with a gun and headed for City Hall. Once there, he crawled through a window to avoid metal detectors. First, he proceeded to Mayor George Moscone's office where he shot him four times at close range, killing him. He then walked down a hallway to the office of gay City Supervisor Harvey Milk, where he shot him five times, killing him too.

Harvey Milk was a visible spokesperson for the gay right issues and Mayor Moscone, although not gay, was an ally of Milk. Dan White, on the other hand, was a long-time foe of the gay community in San Francisco and was upset by
the relative political gains of the San Francisco gay community during the past years.

After the killings, White was captured by the San Francisco Police Department and tried for the murders of Moscone and Milk. According to Shilts (1982), the police and fire departments of San Francisco reportedly raised over $100,000 for White's defense (Shilts, 1982, p.100). Graffiti soon appeared across the city with such epithets as: "Kill Fags: Dan White for Mayor"; "Dan White showed you can fight City Hall" and "Why did Harvey Milk die a faggots death? Because he got blown away" (p.100).

On May 21, 1979 White was convicted of a reduced charge of voluntary manslaughter and was sentenced to prison for six years. Though he was convicted of the deaths of two elected city officials, he received a relatively light sentence. The gay community became angered at the verdicts. They believed that if White was gay and killed two heterosexual elected city officials the verdict and sentence would have been different. As a result of the verdict, the gay community of San Francisco in a dramatic mass uprising "trashed" the front of City Hall and "torched" a dozen police cars in what has come to be called, after the killer, the White Night Riots.

In the past decade, relations between police and gay organizations appear to have improved in many cities, with
police forces appointing liaison officers, conducting sensitivity training, and in some cases, recruiting gay and lesbian candidates for the police force (Dynes & Donaldson, 1992, p. 12). This has not always been the case, and may not be the situation in all communities. For example, a survey of lesbian and gay men reported that a substantial percentage interviewed had experienced brutality and verbal harassment by the police. However the decriminalization of sodomy laws in many states, combined with the general increase in public tolerance of alternative life-styles, has led to a decline in harassment and in many areas the end of entrapment (Freiberg, 1985, pp. 10-11).

The homosexual movement in the United States today has made considerable strides in gaining "rights" for homosexuals. Legislatures have enacted laws to limit discrimination against homosexuals in areas such as housing and employment. Political candidates have promised to change past military policies which excluded gays from becoming part of the United States armed forces; and even law enforcement - which is often described as a paramilitary organization - has had to change its philosophy and hiring practices and admit homosexuals into the law enforcement family (Swanson, Territo & Taylor, 1988, p. 224).

Sweeping changes in police policies regarding the hiring of homosexuals have taken place since the gay rights
movement that began in 1969. The chasm between police departments and gays seems to have narrowed in the past 25 years. Recently, in New York City, a celebration took place as the gay community celebrated the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall Riots. But, this celebration also focused on changes by the New York City Police Department. The Department looked the other way on June 26, 1994 when several of the thousands of gays in an illegal parade whipped off their clothes and marched past St. Patrick's Cathedral. The participants had been denied a permit because the city had already sanctioned a far larger gay parade. At the same time, the department has allowed lesbian officers to use the departmental motto "New York's Finest" as the name of their softball team in the recent gay games (Hays, 1994, p. A-3).

The Los Angeles Police Department has stepped up efforts to recruit gays. Gay community leaders in Los Angeles called these recruitment efforts "a historic event...a significant signal to the lesbian and gay men" that things are changing in the department once feared and hated for its raids on gay bars and alleged discrimination against gay officers (Merl, 1993, p. B-13).

And recently, the FBI was ordered by Attorney General Janet Reno to discard a policy making it difficult for homosexuals to be hired. Until 1979, the FBI had banned
homosexuals and since then its policy has been that homosexual behavior made it "significantly more difficult to be hired" (Skorneck, 1993, p. A-5). The official policy in Washington had long been that, due to their vulnerability to blackmail, homosexuals are to be considered poor security risks (Humphreys, 1972, p. 22).

Many large urban police agencies (e.g., Los Angeles, New York and San Francisco) have taken steps to openly recruit homosexuals. Some police departments no longer question applicants about their sexual preference either on their applications, during oral interviews or when administering the polygraph examination. There is no single explanation for this change of attitude, but it is likely linked to an overall change in society's social and sexual mores as well as concerns by police administrators that if they do not voluntarily take the lead the federal courts may be called upon to intercede on the behalf of homosexuals, as the courts have already done in the case of minorities and women (Swanson et al., 1988, p. 224).

However, public opinion polls still reflect a divided country on the issue of homosexuality. In a 1992 Gallup Poll, the majority of respondents (57 percent) continue to find homosexuality unacceptable as an alternative life-style (Gallup, 1990, p.103). On the other hand, despite a 15-percentage point increase since 1982 in public support for
giving gays equal protection on the job (from 59 percent to 74 percent), over the same period acceptance of homosexuality as a life-style has increased only marginally (from 34 percent to 38 percent). This lack of public support for homosexuality as an alternative life-style can only have profound affects upon law enforcement personnel whose responsibility it has been to keep homosexual behavior suppressed through the enforcement of laws. It is this problem that makes accepting gays into law enforcement more difficult. Accepting "outsiders" is one thing, but accepting deviant "outsiders" is another. The acceptance of homosexuals tends to go against the law enforcement officers' value system. These are generally the same values held by mainstream society. This predicament is especially difficult for the rank-and-file law enforcement officers. Public opinion polls record extensive opposition to homosexuals doing men's work. By large pluralities, the public disapproves of gay men working as judges, doctors, policemen, and government officials (Levitt & Klassen, 1974; Schneider & Lewis, 1984, p. 18; Gallup, 1990).

Statement of the Research Problem

It seems evident that homosexuals have been, and will be, entering the ranks of law enforcement in the years to come. The main problem seems to be the rank-and-file law enforcement acceptance of homosexuality. The purpose of this
study is to examine this problem using various dimensions of the acceptability of male homosexuals in law enforcement in Southern California, as determined by those currently employed as sworn personnel in city and county law enforcement agencies.

The problem is worthy of study because law enforcement has historically been reluctant to accept "outsiders" within its ranks. It has only been within the last 25 years that women and minorities have sought to enter the law enforcement profession in significant numbers, and it took legislative action and law suits to make this a reality. This reluctance on the part of law enforcement often resulted in monetary awards to the plaintiffs, frequently costing city and county law enforcement agencies millions of dollars. For example, it was during this period that the courts stepped in and determined, based on the 14th Amendment and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, that there was discrimination by police departments on the basis of sex and race (Balkin, 1988, p. 30). Through the courts' intervention, police departments were forced to change their policies, if not their attitudes.

A parallel exists between the other "outsiders" (i.e. women and minorities) trying to enter the law enforcement profession, and the hiring of gays, an issue that will be more completely treated in the review of the literature.
Evidence supports that the acceptability of women and minorities in law enforcement has not been without cost. This reasoning may, then, suggest that the acceptability of gays in law enforcement may be rather stormy.

In order to prevent a repeat of history, it is important to know the degree of acceptability of male homosexuals entering law enforcement in Southern California. The results of this study can then be used by law enforcement administrators in developing policies and strategies that might reduce or eliminate lawsuits by gay police officers claiming harassment and/or discrimination because of their sexual orientation.

Methodology

The degree of acceptability of male homosexuals in law enforcement can be investigated by the use of a survey instrument randomly administered to city and county sworn law enforcement personnel in Southern California. The results of the survey will then provide law enforcement administrators with a gauge by which to study the degree of acceptability of homosexuals in law enforcement.

For the purposes of this study, sworn personnel are those individuals defined as a peace officer in section 830 of the penal code of the State of California (refer to Appendix B). Homosexuality is defined as the primary sexual
orientation of an individual involving same-gender sexual interaction.

Acceptability will be operationalized as the affirmation of the gay police officer by the heterosexual rank and file thereby permitting him to be part of the police subculture. This subculture helps to define the "cop's world" and each officer's role in it. Critical to the subculture is the sharing of common symbols, beliefs, and values. The concept of acceptability will be measured by determining whether: (1) heterosexual police officers are willing to talk with gay police officers or whether the gay police officers will get "the silent treatment"; (2) gay police officers will be included in the "teasing" and "horseplay" often associated with police camaraderie; (3) heterosexual police officers are willing to back gay police officers on calls that they are not sent to and that generally do not require additional officers (rolling by a traffic stop); (4) heterosexual police officers willing to assist a gay police officer on situations that are new to the gay officer and explain to him the proper or an easier method to deal with the situation; and (5) heterosexual police officers are willing to discuss homosexual issues in front of a gay police officers. These factors tend to demonstrate whether one is accepted into the police subculture or not, and will be measured via a survey instrument.
The social issue of homosexuality will be at the forefront of American society in this last decade of the 20th century. Its potential for impact upon law enforcement cannot be taken lightly. As noted by Wilson (1992, p.37), "In the 1990s homosexuality will be what the abortion issue has been in the 1980s."
Attitudes Toward Hiring Women in Law Enforcement

As indicated in Chapter One, the difficulties of accepting other "outsiders" (women and minorities) in law enforcement bears a striking resemblance to problems associated with accepting still another subset of "outsiders," male homosexuals. Since the acceptability of other "outsiders" (women and minorities) has not been without a cost, a brief examination of women and minorities in policing would be instructive vis-a-vis the acceptance of homosexuals.

The history of acceptance of women into law enforcement has been rather turbulent. Even though women have been in policing since 1910 (Higgins, 1951, p. 824), they were typically regarded as specialized social workers (Simpson, 1977). Equality for women in policing still did not exist up until the late 1960s and early 1970s. Studies of policewomen on patrol began to appear in the early 1970s. Several studies were completed and the main conclusion generated by these studies was that women can handle uniformed patrol work (Bartlott & Rosenblum, 1977; Bloch & Anderson, 1973, 1974; Sherman, 1975; and Sichel et al., 1978). Moreover, other studies show that policewomen are accepted by the public (Armat, 1981; Garmire, 1974; and
Linden, 1984). The problem with women in policing, it seemed, was not their inability to do the job but rather the attitudes of policemen and police supervisors as a reflection of the police subculture.

In these respects, Bell (1972) described a study of police chiefs supervising policewomen in 42 major U.S. cities. Seventy percent of them felt policewomen, properly trained, were as good as policemen (p.117). However, Bell also cited other studies in which supervising officers felt policewomen were weak, undependable and not suited for patrol work (p.115). Charles (1981), Hindman (1975), Hunt (1990), Linden (1984), and Vega and Silverman (1982) also documented the reasons most commonly given by policemen for their negative attitudes toward women. For example, male officers believed that women were not strong enough or aggressive enough for patrol work. These are qualities that go against the "macho" image of police officers often associated with the police subculture and the police officer working personality.

Other studies, such as Aucion and Barentine (1973) found that most policemen feel women are incapable of doing patrol work. Ayood (1978) found that policemen tend to view policewomen as incompetent. Muro (1979) found that the average policeman feels women have no place in the field. Sherman (1973) discovered almost all policemen believe women
are unfit for police work. More recently, Daum and Johns (1994) discovered that 42 percent of the female officers they surveyed indicated they did not feel accepted by male officers, and 55 percent expressed the opinion that male supervisors did not accept them (p.46).

Studies have also been done examining how policemen express negative attitudes towards policewomen. Wexler and Logan (1983) described anti-woman remarks (in their presence), comments about a woman's sexual orientation, and refusals to talk to the women at all. Women describe spending eight hours in a patrol car with a policeman who did not say a word to them (pp.48-49). Frequent sexual jokes and gossip remind the women that they are desired sexual objects, visible outsiders, and feared competitors (Martin, 1993, p. 336). Since the majority of officers are men and prefer to work and socialize with each other, women tend to feel left out and disenfranchised from the organization; others feel that there are more "men-only" outings among male officers (Daum & Johns, 1994, p. 47). Lehtinen (1976) summed up the women's situation by observing that they are fighting injustice within the police department more than on the streets. "The only trouble with women in policing is men in policing (Lehtinen, p. 55)."

One respondent in the Daum and Johns (1994) study stated, "Just let me feel good about being a female cop (p.47)."
It would appear from the studies cited that the reason policemen have such negative attitudes toward policewomen would involve cultural values (both of society and the police subculture) about sex roles and work. The role of women in our society has changed and as a result those male qualities often associated with the police image (strength, courage and authority) have also been changed. Homant (1983), in studying police personalities, concluded that policemen are typically isolated, suspicious, conservative and defensive, making them not very open to new experiences (p.16).

The police subculture is based on mutual trust of fellow officers who have similar backgrounds, attitudes, and values, including shared definitions of their masculinity. This solidarity, it could be argued, is undermined by women in policing since women are not like men.

Even though studies have shown that women can perform the job of police officers, lawsuits nonetheless continue due to sexual discrimination and harassment as a result of policemen's attitudes toward these outsiders. A 1987 study found that sexual harassment cost the Federal Government $267 million between 1985 and 1987 - $204 million in lost productivity, $37 million to replace federal workers who left their jobs and $26 million in medical leave due to stress as a result of sexual harassment (Thomann &
Serritella, 1987, p. 31). More recently, Mahoney (1995) reported that a former Newport Beach police dispatcher received $113,000 to settle her complaint against the former chief and one of his captains; and, two Long Beach policewomen received $906,300 and $803,700 respectively as part of a $3.1 million jury award for sexual harassment (p.4). Female officers continue to struggle to gain acceptance from their male counterparts. They also sense some degree of ostracism from the male social network, which affects female officers negatively. There is the potential for these same attitudes to be displayed against male homosexuals in law enforcement.

Attitudes Towards Hiring Minorities in Law Enforcement

The acceptance of minorities into the police profession has also not been without cost. It was not until the racial turmoil of the 1960s that some police agencies began to actively open their doors to minorities. Other police agencies resisted until forced to pursue minority recruitment by the Federal courts. "The recruitment and hiring of minority officers has been approached by many police administrators with less than genuine enthusiasm (Maghan, 1993, p. 348)." Instead of viewing the recruitment of minorities as a means to reflect the cultural diversity of a community, police administrators - at times - viewed it more as a political necessity.
A significant part of the lack of acceptance of minorities by police agencies can be traced back to the bitter relationship that existed between minorities and the police. Minorities, like homosexuals, often encountered the police as an alien, occupying force; relationships between police and minority community members were often abrasive, mortifying and humiliating (Walker, 1982, p.98). According to Alex (1976), blacks in the ghetto identified the police as an instrument through which injustice was imposed and sustained (p.115). These factors often resulted in a lack of minority participation in police recruitment efforts.

The few blacks who elected to enter law enforcement entered a world traditionally controlled by white males. Many white officers felt that the police occupation was legitimate and properly reserved for their own ethnic group. White policemen were often contemptuous of and aggressive toward blacks who they thought would take away white jobs. The new black policeman was subject to racial prejudice, isolation and segregation (Alex, 1976, p. 1).

The police subculture often requires the sharing of ideology and values. To the white policemen, black policemen did not share their ideology or values. In his study of black police officers in the New York Police Department, Alex identified certain prejudices held against black officers by their white counterparts. According to
Alex (1976), white officers felt that by allowing blacks, and other minorities, to join the force there would be a decline in standards, a decline in physical requirements, a decline in written test standards, and a decline in character and moral standards (pp.29-43). White officers also felt certain jobs were given to black policemen because of race rather than qualification. White policemen felt that since very few blacks passed the written entrance exam that this was proof they were not qualified to be policemen (Alex, p. 38). Moreover, whites have maintained a position of dominance in the law enforcement profession, relegating blacks to subordinate roles and denying them access to job opportunities and advancement (Leinen, 1984, p. 10).

The patterns of discrimination against black officers often continued after they are hired. Prior to the mid-1960s, most black officers were concentrated in areas populated heavily by members of their own race. Until 1960 blacks were rarely assigned to patrol cars or desk jobs. Discrimination against blacks also appeared in the area of special assignments (i.e. detective jobs). Other discriminatory practices directed at black officers, continued into the mid-1960s. For example, in 1967 the President's Crime Commission discovered that in some cities the legal authority of an officer to arrest a white suspect
depended heavily on whether the cop was white or black (Leinen, 1984, pp. 14-15).

Racial discrimination was also believed to prevail in the area of performance evaluations as well. Several studies showed that blacks were found to be victims of a biased rating system (Snibbe & Snibbe, 1973, pp. 354-381). Finally, it appears that until fairly recently (mid-1970s) blacks have been virtually excluded from leadership and supervisory positions in most police agencies.

For years the traditional hiring practices of police agencies appeared to avoid the hiring of minorities. As with women in law enforcement, the Federal courts had to intervene and establish racial quotas in order to ensure greater participation of minorities in police departments. During the early 1970s several large U.S. cities, Cleveland, Chicago, Philadelphia, New York, Los Angeles and San Francisco, were ordered by the Federal courts to institute racial quotas in their hiring process. Several respondents in Stephen Leinen's study of black police officers felt that the greatest long-term gains in the area of civil rights were indeed attained through court action and litigation (Leinen, 1984, p.42).

Black police officers have made considerable strides since the early 1900s when they first entered law enforcement. Many of the situations described earlier no
longer exist, but that is not to say that racial prejudice has disappeared.

The type of negativism described above is not limited to women and minorities; it can be equally applied to gays. In his book *Gay Cops*, Stephen Leinen quotes gay police officers from New York City on some of the reactions of heterosexual police officers toward homosexuals and gay police officers. The following examples range from verbal intimidations and denial of police services to outright criminal violations committed by the police themselves. These examples serve as an indicator of how heterosexual police officers feel about homosexuals.

Degrading comments and innuendos:

Oh God, I've seen that a lot. I work in the village. The cops are so abusive. They make fun of them and they curse at them because they are gay. They whistle, taunt them. It's open season on gays... A sergeant had these two gay guys locked up. They're in the cell and he says out loud, "This AIDS thing is really doing a great job. All we have to do is just sit around and wait." They bring in people, drag queens, and ask, "What's that?"

Police cars would ride by and [the cops inside] would say [to gay men], "Hello, girls," on the car speaker.

A gay couple went into the precinct to complain about an assault on one of them. Someone said, "If you didn't live that life style, you wouldn't have to worry."

Two gay victims were in my radio car and another car pulls alongside us. My partner referred to them as "these fags," we have to take a report from.
I locked up this guy one time and he had this tube of KY [Jelly] in his shirt pocket. And so when I had to search him, I had to take this out and a couple of officers made some comments, you know, "Is this your toothpaste," and stuff like that. They do as much as they can get away with...a lot of sick humor, off-handed remarks.

Outright harassment:

So they go into the bathroom [in the subway station], catch the people who are having sex. They humiliate those people, really scare them, you know, like, "We are going to call your wife." They cause a lot of stress, anxiety. The guy doesn't know that they won't call his wife.

Cops used to single out gay bars to give summonses, tag cars parked around the bars. Incidents like this have declined, but they will never end.

Front of a gay bar in Queens. Summons all the cars-wheels not to the curb, shit like that. Just the gay bars. Straight bars up the block, no summonses. The idea was to bang them, bang them, bang them (p.38).

Denial of police services:

This may sound like vulgar police jargon but there's a temptation not to take the complaint [from a gay person] but to give him a stroke job and throw the report away once he's left [the precinct].

I've seen officers on a lot of occasions say to another cop, "I had to take a report from this fag," as if the person didn't count for nothing.

I was in the ___ Precinct on patrol. I had a foot post and a gay person had been mugged. I called for a car for assistance. The car responded and berated the gay for being a faggot. They cursed him, kicked him out of the car, and then lectured me about not calling them to this kind of bullshit.
Physical assaults and shakedowns:

I was riding in the backseat of a radio car when the driver approached a male who was obviously gay, near the piers on the west side. The male was taking a piss and the driver got out of the car and ordered him to stop. The guy didn't stop soon enough so the cop shoved him into the bushes and came back to the car and said something like, "Fuck that goddam faggot, teach him a lesson."

They were always shaking down gays. They'd catch two guys in a car and it was "shakedown time (p. 39)"

From conversations with men and women in Leinen's study, it would appear that the most compelling source of information affirming the discredited status of gays in law enforcement is personal, that is, on-the-job observations of homophobic co-workers reactions to police officers who have come out as well as those who are only suspected of being gay (Leinen, 1993, p.39).

The following comments illustrate the types of defamation and ego-damaging statements cops either attach to or scrawl on precinct lockers and bathroom walls about gays. Most, not surprisingly, are of a sexually explicit nature graphically depicting or suggesting men having sex with other men.

Things like, "He's a faggot, we saw him with other men. He sucks dick, gets fucked in the ass; time to suck cock; fucking queer," a condom stuck on someone's locker, those kind of things.

From the locker rooms to the toilets, there's faggot this and faggot that. Up your ass here and all that other stuff. And they really mean it. There's a lot of hate toward gay people, really.
They're real cruel. They write things all over the locker, all over the bathroom walls. They put ____'s name all over the bathroom walls and this other guy, that ____'s the "catcher" and ____'s the pitcher. And drawings of intercourse and things like that. And they slander the other person's reputation.

They put pictures of cutouts of guy's genitals on lockers, drawings, pretty good drawings too, of men having sex with statements like, "Fuck me with your big dick." They had a full spread on one guy's locker.

I had a problem once and they put down "____ is a homo" in large print on the bulletin board because I was spotted going into a restaurant in the West Village. Now, the restaurant is not a gay restaurant, but a straight restaurant. Somebody saw me there (p. 41).

Dunn (1993) describes how a gay police officer in Los Angeles was identified at roll call as "faggot." This same officer received an "AIDS survival kit"; had his locker glued shut; had a photo of Rock Hudson put on his locker; had "beware" scrawled on his police car and, received no back up on certain calls. These examples illustrate a similar pattern of harassment that accompanied women and minorities when they first began to enter the law enforcement profession. As gays begin to enter law enforcement is significant numbers, this type of behavior is likely to increase.

Attitudes Toward Hiring Gays in Law Enforcement

The situation facing police administrators and the acceptance of gay police officers seems to be headed in a
similar direction as with women and minorities. Namely, there will ultimately be court intervention unless action is taken to mitigate the situation. This evidence illustrates a parallel that exists between women and minorities when they first entered law enforcement, and that of gays today. Even under the current legal climate with respect to sexual orientation, there has been blatant vocal resistance to the recruiting of gay police candidates from within the wider police community itself. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), for example, had long decried the hiring of gays. The organization believed that a police officer should conduct his private life so that the public will regard him as an example of stability, fidelity and morality (Leinen, 1993, p. 8). The inference here seems to be that gays are not stable, trustworthy or morally principled.

Also, in a 1982 interview with the Los Angeles Times Los Angeles Police Chief Daryl Gates said he personally thinks homosexuality is "unnatural" and professionally believed that gay officers would never fit in to the urban police force.

Many police unions and fraternal organizations oppose the hiring of gay police officers. According to Leinen (1993), in New York City in 1984, shortly before the department began a campaign to actively recruit homosexuals,
Phil Caruso, head of the 25,000 member Patrolman's Benevolent Association, vowed to fight, in court if necessary, efforts on the part of the New York Police Department to recruit from the gay community. Caruso believed that gays could not hold the dignity and image of a police officer. Some fraternal organizations felt that by permitting gays into policing the moral foundation of law enforcement would be questioned (p.8-9).

Programs that encourage the hiring of homosexuals for police positions have also come under fire by individual high-ranking police officials in direct opposition to their department's official policies. According to Leinen (1993), one large police agency elected to hire gays to teach at the police academy on gay issues. A deputy chief went so far as to liken the idea of gays teaching police recruits to "thieves, prostitutes, and narcotic addicts teaching classes on their activities (p.10)."

Theoretical Perspectives on Homosexuality

Attitudes toward gays and lesbians are often discussed in a cultural context. Social groups create social categories which define subgroupings of people. These categories (e.g., class, caste, race, gender) can be so deeply ingrained in individual's understandings of the world that they appear to be "natural" rather than products of social interaction. In the United States today, we primarily
categorize people as heterosexual or homosexual, with some allowance for bisexuality (Herek, 1984, p. 3). In our society, sexual contact between members of the same sex is considered extremely undesirable (West, 1967, p. 29).

Historically, there are several theories to explain society's attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. William James (1890) believed that being repulsed by the idea of intimate contact with a member of the same sex is instinctive, and exists more strongly in men than in women (James, 1890, pp. 437-438). Edward Westermarck (1908) assumed that the attitude of society toward homosexual practices is due to "the feelings of aversion or disgust which the idea of homosexual intercourse tends to call forth in normally constituted adult individuals whose sexual instincts have developed under normal conditions" (Westermarck, 1908, p. 483). While Sigmund Freud (1905/1961) did not see homosexuality as a disease or illness, he did think of it as a developmental phenomenon related to infantile sexuality. He assumed that all men and women had strong attractions to their same-sex parent but these feelings were usually repressed in dissolving the complete Oedipus complex. Sandor Ferenczi (1914/1956) suggested that heterosexual men's feelings of asperity, hostility, and resistance toward male homosexuality really are reaction-formations and defense symptoms erected against affection
for the same sex (Ferenczi, 1914, p. 315). Krafft-Ebbing (1922) wrote that homosexuality was the result of physical degeneracy and hereditary defects and was both constitutional and a disease. Lenz (1951) suggested that man is born with innate attraction for the other sex and repulsion for his own. Even the mere thought of being obliged to sleep in the same bed with another man is abhorrent. When that is not the case, the man is not normal (Lenz, 1951, p. 100). Kinsey, Pomeroy and Martin (1948) saw homosexuality as a condition of expect variation in orientation.

However, Ford and Beach (1951) and Gregersen (1983) reported that same gender interactions have been reported in sufficient numbers of social settings to suggest they fall within the normal range of human behavior. According to Ford and Beach (1951) homosexuality is as old as humanity itself and can therefore be considered natural (p. 125).

Many early studies have shown that Americans hold strong attitudes regarding homosexuality. Simmons (1965) asked a sample of 134 respondents which characteristics they believed were true of homosexuals: 72 percent thought of homosexuals as sexually abnormal, 52 percent as perverted, 40 percent as mentally ill, 40 percent as maladjusted and 29 percent as effeminate. Rooney and Gibbons (1966) in a study of 353 respondents found that 87 percent believed that
homosexuals are psychologically disturbed and 69 percent that they are dangerous because they try to seduce young boys. Other studies also document America's fear of homosexuality. A 1966 National Opinion Research Center poll of a nationwide probability sample of 946 persons found that a third of the public believed homosexuality to be a social danger. A Harris poll in 1965 placed homosexuals third on a list of persons considered most harmful to the nation; only Communists and atheists were seen as more dangerous.

Churchill (1967) believed that prejudice against homosexuals is an extension of the negative attitudes that Americans have toward "deviant" aspects of sexual life. He also argues that in contemporary American society the attitude toward male homosexuality has reached such phobic proportions that any behavior suggestive of homosexuality is condemned and avoided. He says that certain behaviors, interests and professions are seen as being appropriate for men only, while others are appropriate only for women.

Steffensmeier (1970) found that two-thirds of his 373 respondents believed that homosexuality is a sickness; 38 percent that homosexuality is dangerous, and about 20 percent that homosexuals are effeminate.

Empirical Research

Since the 1970s, there has been a significant increase in the amount of empirical research on attitudes toward gay
men. Studies have documented the attitudes of particular occupational groups toward lesbian and gay men. These studies include such occupational groups as physicians and mental health professionals, college students and police officers. Studies have also documented the characteristics of people who have negative attitudes toward homosexuality, and studies have examined attitudes toward the employment of homosexuals.

Review of the Research on Helping Professions and Their Attitudes Toward Gays

Law enforcement is considered a helping profession, similar to physicians, nurses, and mental health workers. Therefore, a brief review of the literature discussing these other helping professions' attitudes toward homosexuality is worthy of discussion because it will provide a baseline on the attitude of the helping professions toward homosexuals.

Although the topic of AIDS is not the focus of this research, it will be discussed briefly in this section. Certain theoretical studies cited below examine AIDS in a prejudicial context. It would appear that the researchers are measuring prejudicial attitudes against gays who are HIV positive. These studies are cited because there is a strong association between being gay and AIDS. AIDS is often described as a gay disease, and persons infected with the virus have been subjected to various forms of discrimination.
These perceptions may result in additional prejudices against suspected or openly gay males, and will most likely be projected in the form of negative attitudes.

**Physicians**

In studies involving physicians, Richardson, Lochner, McGulgan and Levin (1987) discovered that heterosexual physicians were more prone to blaming the gay community for AIDS, and felt more anger and less sympathy towards homosexual persons. Kelly, St. Lawrence, Smith, Hood and Cook (1987) discovered that physicians considered AIDS patients responsible for their illness. Prichard et al. (1988) discovered that physicians reported feeling uncomfortable with homosexual individuals, and that nearly ten times more male than female physicians admitted to such a discomfort. Rizzo, Marder and Willke (1990) discovered that physicians who had a higher perceived risk of exposure to the HIV virus felt a greater reluctance to treat AIDS patients. Finally, Hayward and Shapiro (1991) found that 23 percent of the physician respondents would have preferred not to care for gay patients and 11 percent would have preferred not to treat any homosexual men.
Nurses and Other Hospital Staff

In studies involving nurses and other hospital staff, Scherer, Wu, and Haughey (1991) discovered that out of 581 registered nurses (R.N.'s) 25 percent admitted that their attitudes toward homosexual persons had become more negative since the AIDS crisis. Twenty-five percent said they would feel uncomfortable in a professional relationship with a homosexual patient. Kelly, St. Lawrence, Hood, Smith and Cook (1988) found that nurses held more negative attitudes toward AIDS patients than toward leukemia patients. Nurses were more negative toward homosexual patients regardless of their diagnosis, suggesting that sexual orientation, not the HIV antibody status, was a critical factor in their prejudice.

Marran van Servellen, Lewis, and Leake (1988) examined the attitudes of 1,019 R.N.s and discovered that 39 percent admitted to experiencing a moderate to high level of discomfort in caring for male homosexual patients. In a study conducted of 237 hospital workers at an AIDS inpatient-care facility, Pleck, O'Donnell, O'Donnell and Snarey (1988) found that a small minority held extremely negative views towards AIDS. Five percent believed that AIDS was punishment from God for immorality. Other findings suggested a more moderate level of prejudice: 16 percent were morally offended by AIDS patients, 17 percent would
terminate a relationship with a friend who contracted AIDS and 20 percent felt less tolerant of homosexuality because of the AIDS crisis. A large percentage (42 percent) felt that they should not be required to work with AIDS patients, and 60 percent believed that a person with AIDS should not be permitted to work in a hospital.

Mental Health Professionals

In studies involving mental health professionals, Thompson and Fishburn (1977) discovered that 86 percent of the 64 respondents (graduate students in counseling) felt that most mental health professionals were not prepared for dealing with homosexual clients. By gender, 96 percent of the males felt ill-equipped to treat gay clients compared to 76 percent of the females. Nearly one-third believed homosexual persons were far more likely to need counseling than heterosexuals. Garfinkle and Morin (1978) found that therapists rated the homosexual clients as more stereotypically feminine than a psychologically healthy person. Of special note is that this finding corresponds to previous studies that showed that males were more critical and prejudiced than females in attitudes toward homosexual persons.

Lief (1977) described the results of a survey of 2,500 psychiatrists' attitudes toward homosexuality. A total of 69 percent viewed homosexuality as a psychiatric
disturbance, and 73 percent agreed that homosexual males were generally more unhappy than their heterosexual counterparts. Respondents appeared more tolerant of lesbians as only 55 percent believed them less capable to mature loving relationships. Finally, 43 percent believed homosexuality to be a risk when holding positions of responsibility. Garnets, Hancock, Cochran, Goodchilds and Peplau (1991) obtained responses from 2,544 licensed psychologists, revealing that 58 percent of the respondents identified specific incidents of bias in providing psychotherapeutic services to homosexual clients.

Although these studies tend to examine AIDS in a prejudicial context, the results suggest that bias and prejudice against homosexuals exists in the helping professions, and its impact upon one's attitude toward homosexuals cannot be ignored.

Studies on Negative Attitudes Toward Gays

Other studies have found that persons with negative attitudes toward lesbian and gay men generally are less likely to have had personal contact with lesbian or gay men (Hansen, 1982; Millham, San Miguel & Kellog, 1976; and Weis & Dane, 1979), and are less likely to report having engaged in homosexual behaviors, or to identify themselves as lesbian or gay (Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin & Gerhard, 1953; Mosher & O'Grady, 1979). Research by Larsen, Reed and
Hoffman (1980) found that persons with negative attitudes toward lesbian and gay men were more likely to perceive their peers as manifesting negative attitudes, especially if the person is male.

In studying areas of residence, Hansen (1982), Levitt and Klassen (1974), and Stephan and McMullin (1982), determined that people with negative attitudes toward gays tend to have resided in areas where negative attitudes are the norm (mid-western and southern states), especially during adolescence, and according to Glenn and Weaver (1979), Snyder and Spreitzer (1976), and White (1979) people having negative attitudes toward gays are often older and less-well educated.

People who are more religious, attend church more frequently and who subscribe to a conservative religious ideology tend to possess more negative attitudes toward gays (Alston, 1974; Hansen, 1982; Larson, Reed and Hoffman, 1980; Larsen, Cato and Reed, 1983; and Weis and Dane, 1979). Studies by Brown and Amoroso (1975); Dunbar, Brown and Amoroso (1973); Krulewitz and Nash (1980) and Laner and Laner (1979,1980) determined that people with more negative attitudes towards gays are more likely to express traditional, restrictive attitudes about sex roles. Finally, people with more negative attitudes toward gays are more likely to manifest a high level of authoritarianism and
related personality characteristics (Karr, 1978; Larson, et al., 1980; and Sobel, 1976).

It appears that heterosexuals tend to have more negative attitudes toward homosexuals of their own sex than of the opposite sex (Millham et al., 1976; Steffensmeier and Steffensmeier, 1974; Weinberger and Millham, 1979), with more negative attitudes exhibited by males than by females (Brown and Amoroso, 1975; Hansen, 1982; Larsen et al., 1980; Millham and Weinberger, 1979; Price, 1982; Weis and Dain, 1979). Some researchers, however, have failed to find a sex difference (Glenn and Weaver, 1979; Levitt and Klassen, 1974).

A significant correlation has been consistently observed between antigay attitudes and high scores on measures of authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1988; Herek, 1988; Hood, 1973; Karr, 1978; and Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980).

Studies on Gays and the Workplace

Other studies reported that discrimination in the workplace against gay men (Levine, 1979) and lesbians (Levine & Leonard, 1984) was a widespread problem. Paralleling the changing social attitudes in general, progress has been made toward greater acceptance of gays and lesbians in the workplace. Schneider and Lewis (1984) discovered that the public endorses the principle of equal job opportunities for homosexuals; however, the general
public also favors banning gay men from particular lines of work. Americans oppose employing homosexuals for either jobs typically done by men or jobs involving maternal duties. They also discovered that the public disapproves of homosexuals working as clergy, teachers, principals and camp counselors.

Harry (1982) discovered that Americans perceive homosexuals as "swishy pansies" and "cultivated fops", and therefore consider gay men as unfit for the jobs traditionally assigned to men (pp. 181-183). Levitt and Klassen (1974) and Schneider and Lewis (1984) discovered that the public disapproves of gay men working as judges, doctors, policemen, and government workers. Additionally, they discovered by overwhelming majorities, the public approves of homosexuals working as artists, beauticians, musicians, florists and retail clerks. Davidson and Gordon (1979) discovered that stereotypes foster the belief that homosexuals are suitable for traditionally feminine jobs, "womens work" (pp.72-75).

Police Officers' Attitudes Toward Gays

Specific studies on examining police officers attitudes toward homosexuality has not been examined thoroughly in the literature. It was, however, discussed by Neiderhoffer (1969) in his examination of the authoritarian police personality. According to Neiderhoffer, the typical police
officer has a working-class background, but the occupational role requires that he display middle-class behavior and ideology partially because he is supposed to keep the public conduct as nearly conventional as possible (p.106).

The authoritarian police personality tends to lend credence to the belief in police machismo. The strong sexual component supposedly typical of the authoritarian personalities can be separated into three different dimensions: (1) a positive emphasis upon sexuality and virility as the sine qua non of a real man; (2) an ambivalence toward, and vague distrust of, women; and (3) the possibility of latent homosexuality related to a fear of masculine inadequacy (Neiderhoffer, p. 119).

In terms of homosexuality, Neiderhoffer suggested that of all occupations the police are apparently the most free from the taint of homosexuality. The slightest indication of effeminacy would bar an applicant from entering law enforcement, or dismissal if currently employed as a police officer. In studying the most disliked segments of the police clientele, Neiderhoffer discovered that a cop-fighter was the most disliked followed second by homosexuals (p.123).

According to the theory of "The Authoritarian Personality" persons with high authoritarianism possess a strong inclination to punish violators of sex mores.
[homosexuals and sex offenders] (Adorno, et al., 1950, pp.240-241). These inclinations are part of the occupational ideology of police officers and is a thread woven through the police officer's value system. These inclinations may well be present today in the police subculture.

Thus, based on the foregoing discussion of the research problem and review of relevant studies bearing on this investigation, a research design and survey instrument was developed.

Summary

The review of the literature demonstrates the general negative public response to homosexuality that dominates our culture. This general antihomosexual attitude seems prevalent in the United States and is supported by several scientific research studies and national opinion polls.

The public is divided on its views of accepting homosexuality as an alternative life-style. Historically, the acceptance of homosexuality as a life-style has increased only marginally. The research has shown that the American public supports barring homosexual men from professions of authority and influence. This would most certainly include the law enforcement profession.

The research also identified certain characteristics of people who hold negative attitudes toward gay men. Police
officers possess some of these characteristics i.e., less likely to have had personal contact with homosexuals; less likely to report having engaged in homosexual behaviors; likely to be less well-educated; and, more likely to express traditional, restrictive attitudes about sex roles.

The studies support the notion that the pattern of discrimination that manifests itself with other "outsiders" is likely to occur with gays.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This study involved the administration of a survey instrument to randomly selected law enforcement officers in Southern California. The survey instrument was designed to measure the attitudes of current male law enforcement officers toward the hiring of male homosexuals in law enforcement. In order to insure confidentiality, anonymity and concerns raised by police chiefs, the names of the cities or counties participating in this study will not be used. The participating agencies police an estimated population of 2 million people and employ an estimated 2,330 law enforcement officers. However, out of the 12 police agencies originally selected to participate in this survey, only seven agencies ultimately elected to participate thereby reducing the population to 1,745 law enforcement officers. Of these, a total of 226 law enforcement officers were randomly selected to participate in this research. A total of 123 questionnaires were returned for a return rate of 54 percent which is an adequate response rate for analysis and reporting (Babbie, 1983, p.242). However, of these 123 returned questionnaires nine of them were not used because the respondent failed to complete a substantial number of questions.
Research Subjects

To examine the issue of the acceptability of male homosexuals within Southern California law enforcement agencies, a random sample of sworn male officers was used. This study used male officers only as subjects because the research supports the notion that heterosexuals tend to have different attitudes toward homosexuals of their own sex than of the opposite sex (Millham et al., 1976; Steffensmeier & Steffensmeier, 1974; and, Weinberger & Millham, 1979), with more disapproving attitudes exhibited by males than by females (Brown & Amoroso, 1975; Hansen, 1982; Larsen et al., 1980; Millham & Weinberger, 1979; Price, 1982; and, Weis & Dain, 1979). The demographic variable of gender was coded to eliminate any questionnaire which indicated a female response.

To address this in the random selection procedure, the agency contact person was instructed as follows: if one of the randomly selected subjects is either a female or a male officer who for whatever reason would be unable to participate in the survey (i.e. off on extended leave due to injury, or recently retired) you will move up to the next male officer. If this occurs more than once, you will alternate between moving up to the next available male officer and moving down to the next available male officer.
Sampling Design

The research design utilized a stratified disproportionate sampling design. This design was selected because it insured that the appropriate numbers of elements were drawn from homogeneous subsets of the population. Random selection was accomplished by using a systematic sampling technique, that is, every (Kth) sworn employee of all the incorporated cities and the sheriff's office was selected on the following basis. For the participating cities, 1 out of 4 sworn employees was randomly selected, and for the sheriff's department 1 out of 12 sworn employees was randomly selected. This provided for a sample size of 226, and achieved a large enough subsample of each strata for analysis, N=114.

This research design also allowed the participating law enforcement agencies to maintain control of their employee rosters which would mitigate any confidentiality issues. In distributing this survey, a contact person at each agency was used to assist in the dispensing of the survey instrument to those employees randomly selected. The contact person was selected by the agency head. The Institutional Review Board required that each agency head provide a waiver authorizing the researcher to administer the questionnaire to randomly selected officers of the particular agencies participating in this research. The
waivers are on file at the California State University, San Bernardino, Department of Criminal Justice.

Additionally, instructions to the respondents were outlined in a cover letter attached to each questionnaire (Appendix D). In this cover letter, the respondents were instructed that the completion of the questionnaire would act as a declaration of informed consent. The only person to contact the respondents was the person identified by each participating agency department head (police chief or sheriff). Respondents were instructed in their right not to participate and instructed that if they had any questions or concerns regarding their participation in this study, or if they were interested in obtaining the results of this study, they could contact the researcher at the California State University, San Bernardino, Department of Criminal Justice.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was a questionnaire consisting of 47 questions. The questionnaire was designed to measure three primary aspects or dimensions. First, questions were designed to measure the respondent's attitudes toward certain goals of the homosexual movement (i.e. equal rights in job opportunities, acceptability of homosexuality as an alternative life-style, etc...). Second, questions were designed to measure the dimension of social cohesion in terms of at work job relationships (i.e. socializing off-
duty with male homosexual police officers, talking with male homosexual police officers at the police department, etc...). Finally, questions were designed to measure the concept of task cohesion. These questions were designed to measure whether or not the mission of the police department would be accomplished regardless of the sexual orientation of the police officers (i.e. heterosexual officer willing to assist a gay officer unfamiliar with a work procedure, heterosexual officer willing to back a gay officer on a traffic stop, etc...).

In order to measure these dimensions a seven-point Likert Scale was used. The scale was designed to measure how the respondents felt about certain statements regarding homosexuality. Since the topic under study is a contemporary issue on which a wide range of intensities exist, a maximum number of responses (7) was used. Basically, the respondents were presented with a statement in the questionnaire and asked to indicate whether he "strongly disagrees" (1) or "strongly agrees" (7) with the statement. The respondent then circled a number from 1 to 7 to indicate how he felt about the particular statement. To assist in further understanding this scale the following values were offered: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, and 7 = strongly agree. This particular format was used in
questions 1 through 29. Questions 30 through 34 used the same seven-point Likert scale but went from "strongly object" (1) to "not object" (7). Questions 35 through 40 required one of two responses following a statement "should" (1) and "should not" (2). These questions were designed differently in order to determine how the respondents felt about gays and certain occupations. By limiting the respondents field of response, the two choices offered would better determine the feelings of the respondents. One question (41) required the respondent to select one of three responses. The questionnaire is seen in appendix C.

In order to better understand the acceptability of homosexuals in law enforcement a summated acceptability score was calculated. The questionnaire was designed so that the higher the summated acceptability score the more likely one is to accept gay officers; and, the lower the summated acceptability score the less likely one is to accept gay officers. Therefore, the lowest possible score was 34 and the maximum possible score was 238. The summated acceptability score was calculated by adding the scores for questions 1 through 34.

Six of the questions were designed to obtain demographic information. The demographic questions and how they were coded are illustrated below.
Please indicate whether you are:
1. male
2. female

Your age is:
1. 21-29
2. 30-39
3. 40-49
4. 50 +

To what political party are you currently registered?
1. democratic party
2. republican party
3. other (please specify) ____________
4. none

Your ethnicity is:
1. American-Indian, Native American, Alaskan
2. Black non-Hispanic, Afro-American
3. Chicano, Mexican-American, Latino, Hispanic
4. White, Caucasian non-Hispanic
5. Asian, Oriental, Pacific Islander
6. Other ________________

Please indicate your highest level of education
1. high school/GED
2. some college
3. Associate's Degree
4. Bachelor's Degree
5. Master's Degree
7. Doctoral Degree

Your current rank is
1. police officer/corporal/detective
2. first line supervisor (sergeant)
3. middle management position (lieutenant/captain)
4. police administration (above rank of captain)

These questions were designed to measure the demographic variables of gender, age, political affiliation, ethnicity, educational level and current rank.

After the survey instrument was constructed, a pretest was conducted using law enforcement officers from a Southern
California police department not selected to participate in the research. This step was completed to insure that there was both reliability and validity in the questionnaire itself. The only problem that surfaced during this procedure was the use of the word "deviant" in question 21. It seemed some of the pretest respondents wanted to interpret this word differently. However, the word remained in the question since it captured the essence of what the researcher wanted. The majority of the questions used were obtained from other questionnaires measuring people's attitudes toward homosexuality. Other questions were modified to address the law enforcement segment of this research.

To complete the discussion of methodology, the criteria for measurement quality regarding the questionnaire will be examined. The criteria for measurement quality involve the concepts of reliability and validity.

According to Babbie (1989), reliability is a matter of whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, would yield the same result each time. There are a number of techniques available to researchers to deal with the problem of reliability. The technique used in this research involved using established measures that have proven their reliability in other research.

The majority of the questions used in this research
came from previous questionnaires designed to measure people's attitudes toward homosexuals and homosexuality. Questions were obtained from Gallup Polls, a questionnaire by Klassen, Williams and Levitt, 1989, and the RAND Corporation.

In order to determine the reliability of these measures, a brief overview of the above sources is in order. The questions obtained from the Gallup Poll were previously administered to a minimum of 1,000 subjects. National telephone samples consisted of unclustered direct-assisted, random digit telephone samples using a proportionate, stratified sampling design. The design of the sample for personal (face to face) surveys is that of a replicated area probability sample down to the block level in case of urban areas and to segments of townships in the case of rural areas. Since sampling surveys are subject to sampling error, Gallup uses tables for the recommended allowance for sampling error of a percentage.

The Klassen, Williams and Levitt study choose basic sociological and psychological variables that in the past had shown strong correlations with attitudes and values regarding homosexuality. They utilized a pretest to measure reliability with additional follow-up. This study had a sample size of 3,018 respondents.
The relevant data from the RAND Corporation study came from various surveys. Studies cited were obtained from the General Social Survey (GSS) which is conducted annually by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. Each year the GSS contains a nationally representative sample of about 1,500 noninstitutionalized adults.

The National Survey of Adolescent Males (NSAM) was also included in the RAND Study. The NSAM was a 1988 nationally representative survey of 1,800 noninstitutionalized, never-married 15 to 19 year old males conducted by the Sociometrics Corporation for researchers at the Urban Institute.

The Monitoring the Future (MTF) survey also provided data used by the RAND Corporation. The MTF is an annual study of the lifestyles and values of youth. All results presented in the RAND study were from a 1991 survey, which contained a nationally representative sample of 15,676 high school seniors. Certain questions used in this study were from these previously identified research studies.

The other criterion for measurement quality is validity. According to Babbie (1989), validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration. One way to deal with this issue is to use face validity. Babbie
(1989) defines face validity as that quality of an indicator that makes it seem a reasonable measure of some variable. In this particular research, by knowing how respondents (law enforcement officers) feel about homosexuals and homosexuality, it would serve as a reasonable collective indicator to the acceptability of male homosexuals in law enforcement.

Data Analysis

This study used a univariate analysis (measures of central tendency, percentages) which permitted the researcher to describe the attitudes of law enforcement officers and evaluate those attitudes in light of policy implications. The analysis of the data was done using SPSS (The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). This method provided a means to summarize the distribution of attributes on a single variable. The dependent variable in this research was the summated acceptability score. The independent variable of rank will have three levels police officer/corporal/detective; first line supervisor (sergeant); and middle management (lieutenant/captain). A classification of police administration (above the rank of captain) existed but none of the respondents had this level of rank. It is hypothesized that the rank-and-file officers will have a lower summated acceptability score than the other ranks, thereby, thus less likely to accept gays in law
enforcement. In analyzing the summated scores by rank, a one-way analysis of variance and a multiple comparisons t-test of all combinations (MODLSD) was used. Also, ANOVA procedures were conducted on the following demographic variables: age, and political party, comparing each to the summated acceptability scores. The other demographic variables of ethnicity and education were compressed and analyzed using t-tests against the summated acceptability scores. This is further described in Chapter 5 which discusses the bivariate analysis of the data.

Limitations

One of the biggest limitations of this study was that the data were only reflective of law enforcement officers from a specific geographical area of Southern California, thereby limiting any generalizability to the law enforcement population as a whole.

Even though the response rate was acceptable, it did present limited concerns. Basically, one out of two respondents returned the questionnaire, which lead the researcher to believe that even though the return rate was acceptable, a topic less sensitive may have yielded a better response rate.

Additional limitations centered on the survey instrument itself. In order to satisfy the confidentiality issues raised by the police chiefs, a contact person from
each agency was instructed on the method of dispensing the questionnaire. There is no evidence to support the notion that the questionnaire was distributed incorrectly, but since the contact persons were not supervised, errors could have occurred.
CHAPTER 4
INTRODUCTION
UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The following analysis will discuss the acceptability of homosexuals in law enforcement. It has already been demonstrated that law enforcement historically has been reluctant to accept outsiders. Using the history of other outsiders as a yardstick, it would seem appropriate to predict that gays will not be accepted by the rank and file law enforcement officers into the police profession.

Methods of Analysis

The analysis of these data will be divided into several different areas. First, the frequency distribution for demographic variables will be discussed. Secondly, there will be an analysis of three primary aspects or dimensions. These dimensions are: the goals of the homosexual movement, social cohesion and task cohesion. These dimensions will be discussed using univariate analysis. Since the level of measurement is ordinal, an analysis will be done using the median and mode and percentages. Finally, an analysis of the summated scores by police rank will be provided to show the differences, if any, between the ranks for which data were obtained (police officer/corporal/detective; first line supervisor [sergeant]; and middle management [lieutenant/captain]). This analysis of data will be
completed using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). This statistic will test the differences between the groups (rank) and their summated acceptability scores. The dependent variable in this research will be the summated acceptability score and the independent variable of rank will have three levels. It is hypothesized that the rank-and-file (police officer/corporal/detective) will have a lower summated acceptability score. Thus, this group will be less likely to accept gays in law enforcement. The discussion of bivariate analysis will be covered separately in Chapter 5.

Analysis of Demographic Variables

The frequency distribution for demographic variables is in Table 1. Each of these variables will be discussed briefly in order to highlight its significance as applied to this research.

GENDER: The gender variable was a nominal level measurement. All of the respondents were males for reasons previously cited.

AGE: The age variable was a ordinal level measurement. Eighty percent of the respondents in this study were under 40 years of age with the majority of those between 30 and 39 years of age.

REGISTERED POLITICAL PARTY: The level of measurement for political party was nominal. Almost three-quarters
(71.9 percent) of the respondents were registered Republicans, with only 15 percent identifying themselves as Democrats. The remainder were not currently registered or belonged to some other political party.

ETHNICITY: Ethnicity was a nominal measurement. Almost three-quarters of the respondents (71.1 percent) were white with Chicano respondents being the second largest group (16.7 percent). Each of the other ethnic choices had less than five percent.

EDUCATION: This variable was an ordinal level of measurement and the modal category (44.7 percent) of the respondents having had some college. The percentage of respondents possessing college degrees grew smaller with each successive level of formal degree. Only 2 percent of the sample had no college education.

RANK: Almost three-quarters (73.7 percent) of the respondents were line level personnel (police officers/corporals/detectives) with the remaining percentages being first line supervisors (16.7 percent) and middle management positions (9.6 percent). This was an ordinal level of measurement.

Goals of the Homosexual Movement

Nineteen questions were designed to measure the respondents' attitudes toward certain goals of the homosexual movement. These questions were 1, 2, 3, 7, 8,
Table 1
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL PARTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Line Supervisor</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In analyzing this section univariate analysis was used. Each of the above questions will be discussed briefly in the following tables to highlight their significance.

Table 2
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 1
"I think male homosexuals should be afforded equal rights in terms of job opportunities."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the respondents (57.8 percent) support equal job opportunities for gays. The median score was 5 and the modal score was 7.

Table 3
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 2
"I think homosexuals should be permitted to legally marry."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly eight out of ten respondents (79.8 percent) felt that gays should not be permitted to marry with over two-thirds (64.9 percent) feeling very strongly that gays not be permitted to marry. Both the median score and modal
score were 1.

Table 4
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 3
"I believe that male homosexuals should be permitted to claim their partner as a dependent for purposes of employee benefits."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost three-quarters (71.1 percent) of the respondents believed that male homosexuals should not be permitted to claim their partner on employee benefits, and over half the respondents (56.1 percent) believed this very strongly. Both the median score and modal score were 1.

Table 5
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 7
"I think male homosexual relationships between consenting adults is morally wrong."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly two-thirds (64.9 percent) of the respondents disagreed and believed that homosexual relations between consenting adults was not morally wrong, and over half of these (51.6 percent) disagreed strongly. Again, both the
median score and modal score were 1.

Table 6
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 8
"I feel that male homosexuality should be considered an acceptable alternative life-style."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consensus of the respondents (68.4 percent) was that homosexuality should not be considered an acceptable life-style with almost half the respondents (48.2 percent) feeling strongly about this. The median score was 2 and the modal score was 1.

Table 7
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 10
"I would permit my child to go play at the home of a playmate who lives with a male homosexual parent."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the respondents (59.6 percent) would not let their child go play at the home of a playmate who lived with a male homosexual parent, with four out of ten (42.1 percent) strongly holding this position. The median score was 3 and the modal score was 1.
Table 8
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 11
"I think that male homosexual couples should be permitted adopt children."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 7, the respondents displayed strong emotions when it came to issues involving gays and children. Eight out of ten respondents (81.6 percent) maintained a position that gays should not be permitted to adopt with a significant number (65.8 percent) in the strongly disagree category. Both the median score and modal score were 1.

Table 9
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 12
"Men become homosexual because of genetic or biological factors."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though not the majority, 44.7 percent of the respondents did not agree with this statement and a large number remained neutral. The explanation may be a result of inconclusive studies because of the "genetic" versus "personal preference" when it comes to explaining why
someone is gay. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 1.

Table 10
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 14
"I think that male homosexual relations between consenting adults should be legal."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents tended to disagree with the statement that male homosexual relations between consenting adults should be legal (43.9 percent), but not by much. Slightly fewer (36.9 percent) agreed with the statement with the remainder staying neutral. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 1.

Table 11
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 15
"I think that states should prohibit particular sexual practices conducted in private between consenting adult men and women."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight out of ten respondents (81.6 respondents) believed that states should not prohibit particular sexual
practices conducted in private between consenting adult men and women. Over half the respondents (58.8 percent) felt strongly about it. The median score was 1 and the modal score was 1.

Table 12
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 17
"I think male homosexuals should be permitted to serve in the armed forces."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were equally divided on whether male homosexuals should be permitted to serve in the armed forces. The research showed that 43 percent of the respondents disagreed and 48 percent agreed. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 1.

Table 13
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 19
"Men become homosexuals because they want to."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although 46.5 percent of the respondents believed that men become homosexuals because they want to, approximately three out of ten (30.7 percent) remained neutral on the
issue. As discussed earlier, inconclusive scientific evidence to support this position could explain the large neutrality. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 7.

Table 14
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 29
"I think that states should prohibit particular sexual practices conducted in private between consenting adult male homosexuals."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost three-quarters (72.8 percent) of the respondents believed that states should not prohibit particular sexual practices conducted between consenting adult male homosexuals, and 48.2 percent strongly disagreed. The median was 2 and the mode was 1.

Attitudes Toward Occupations

Questions 35 through 40 were designed to determine which occupations, if any, the respondents believed "should" (1) or "should not" (2) be occupied by gays.
Table 15
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTIONS 35 THRU 40
"Do you think homosexuals should or should not be hired for each of the following occupations."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Should %</th>
<th>Should Not %</th>
<th>Should N</th>
<th>Should Not N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Person</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firemen</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Teacher</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem. Teacher</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historically, the public has not wanted homosexuals in positions of public responsibility, particularly when moral leadership is explicitly involved (Klassen et al., 1989, p. 174). To a degree, the respondents in this research tended to agree with the findings of Klassen et al., however, not to the degree found in the Klassen study.

It would appear that respondents tended not to favor gays in occupations that had significant influence over children. For example, 45.6 percent of the respondents believed that gays should not be high school teachers and almost half (48.2 percent) believed that gays should not be elementary school teachers. Four out of ten (40.4 percent) of the respondents believed that gays should not be firemen and 36.8 percent of the respondents believed that gays should not be permitted in the police profession. Occupations that have negligible influence or authority over others (i.e., sales person) are felt to be more permissible by the respondents.
An analysis was completed on this dimension by obtaining the summated score for the goals of the homosexual movement. The lowest possible score was 13 and the highest possible score was 91. The minimum score calculated was 24 and the maximum score calculated was 70. The median was 41 and the mode was 47. For comparison, the median and modal scores would fall between 3 and 4 on the seven-point Likert scale used in this study. Overall this would indicate that the respondents "slightly disagree" with this dimension and are not entirely in harmony with the goals of the homosexual movement.

**Social Cohesion**

Seven questions were designed to measure the respondents' attitudes toward social cohesion. These questions were 4, 5, 9, 18, 21, 27, and 28. Social cohesion at work, while helpful, is not really a necessary ingredient in accomplishing the mission of law enforcement. However, the police culture is very clannish and the need to belong socially is very strong. Indeed, the police literature commonly discusses the subcultural nature of law enforcement (Martin, 1980, p.107-108; and Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993, pp.89-112).
Table 16
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 4
"I would be willing to have lunch with a male homosexual police officer."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four out of ten respondents (46.4 percent) said they would be willing to have lunch with a gay police officer while three out of ten respondents (35.1 percent) showed a negative response. The median score was 4 - indicating a neutral position, but the modal score was 1 - indicating the largest category of respondents would not be willing to have lunch with a gay officer. However, the modal category (1) was barely larger than the neutral, slightly agree, and strongly agree categories.

Table 17
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 5
"I would socialize off-duty with a male homosexual police officer."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents (59.6 percent) indicated they would not be willing to socialize off duty
with a gay police officer with 38.6 percent of the respondents indicating a strong negative feeling in their response. The median score was 2 and the mode was 1.

Table 18
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 9
"I could be friends with a male homosexual."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost one-quarter of the respondents (23.7 percent) remained neutral on whether they could be friends with a male homosexual. Four out of ten (47 percent) said they could be friends with a gay person and three out of ten (35.1 percent) said they could not. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 4.

Table 19
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 18
"Being around male homosexuals make me feel uncomfortable."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost one-quarter of the respondents (24.6 percent) remained neutral when asked if being around homosexuals made them feel uncomfortable. However, 42.1 percent said that being around gays did not make them feel uncomfortable.
Finally, 32.3 percent of the respondents felt being around gays made them uncomfortable. The median score and modal score were 4.

Table 20
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 21
"Male homosexuality is deviant."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roughly one-quarter (23.7 percent) of the respondents remained neutral on whether male homosexuality was deviant. Nearly half of the remaining respondents (49.2 percent) regarded homosexuality as deviant. The remaining 27.2 percent disagreed. Both the median score and modal score were 4.

Table 21
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 27
"I feel that male homosexual police officers would be socially ostracized in my agency."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents feel that gays would not be socially ostracized by their agency (64.9 percent). This seems to reflect a more open organizational atmosphere.
toward gays. Although, 20.1 percent think gays would be ostracized by their agency with the remaining respondents registering a neutral response (14.9 percent). The median score was 3 and the mode was 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 28
"Being around homosexuals makes me feel uncomfortable."

Over one-quarter (26.3 percent) of the respondents had no opinion when asked if being around homosexuals makes them feel uncomfortable. Nonetheless, 43.9 percent disagreed and 29.9 percent agreed with the statement. The median and modal scores were 4.

Further analysis was completed on this dimension by obtaining the summated score for social cohesion. The lowest possible score was 7 and the highest possible score was 49. The minimum score calculated was 15 and the maximum score calculated was 42. The median score was 29 and the modal score was 28. For comparison purposes, the median and mode score would fall near the number 4 on the seven-point Likert scale used in this study. This would indicate that the respondents are "neutral" on this dimension.
Task Cohesion

Fourteen questions were designed to measure the respondents' attitude toward task cohesion. These questions are 6, 13, 16, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 41. Task cohesion is critically important in the overall operation of an organization. Professionalism, a shared mission, the cultivation of a common "police persona," and the existence of common external threats is far more important than affective ties [social cohesion] (RAND, 1993).

Table 23
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 6
"I would be reluctant to provide emergency first aid to a fellow officer known to be a male homosexual."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of AIDS continues to play a major role in the gay issue. This research illustrates that over half (56 percent) of the respondents would be reluctant to provide first aid to a known homosexual officer, with 36.8 percent of the respondents feeling "strongly" about this statement. On the other hand, 34.2 percent of the respondents would provide first aid to a gay officer. The median score was 5 and the modal score was 7.
Table 24  
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 13  
"If my law enforcement agency began hiring male homosexual police officers, I would consider laterally transferring to another department, or if I were eligible, retire."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if they would consider laterally transferring to another department, or retiring if their law enforcement agency began hiring male homosexual police officers, the overwhelming majority of the respondents (73.7 percent) said they would not leave their organization just because of gays. A meager 14.1 percent of the respondents said they agreed with the statement. The median and modal scores were 1.

Table 25  
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 16  
"If a male homosexual police officer made a 'routine' traffic stop in a neighboring beat, I would drive by his location just to check on his welfare (assume here there is no department policy against this activity)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, almost nine out of ten (89.4 percent) respondents indicated that they would check on the safety of
a gay officer, with over half (52.6 percent) strongly agreeing with this statement. However, 10.5 percent said they did not agree and would therefore not check on the welfare of a gay officer. Both the median and modal scores were 7.

Table 26

RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 20
"Allowing male homosexual police officers into law enforcement may cause some problems, but I think law enforcement will manage."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six out of ten (67.5 percent) respondents agreed with the statement that allowing male homosexual police officers into law enforcement may cause problems, but that law enforcement will manage. Approximately one-quarter (25.4 percent) strongly agreeing with this statement. On the other hand 20.2 percent disagreed with the statement. The median and modal scores were 6.
Table 27
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 22
"If a male homosexual police officer employed by my agency came out publicly (newspapers) proclaiming his homosexuality, I believe this action would tarnish the image of my law enforcement agency."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the respondents (61.4 percent) said that if a male homosexual police officer employed by their agency came out publicly proclaiming his homosexuality this action would tarnish the image of their law enforcement agency, and nearly one-third (32.5 percent) strongly agreed. Approximately one-third (28.1 percent) disagreed with this statement. The median score was 5 and the modal score was 7.

Table 28
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 23
"I would feel uncomfortable talking about gay issues in the company of male homosexual police officers."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many respondents (45.6 percent) said that they would feel uncomfortable talking about gay issues in the company of male homosexual police officers. Slightly less
(38.6 percent) disagreed with the statement. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 7.

Table 29
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 24
"I would talk with a male homosexual police officer at the station (prior to briefing, checking out equipment) in front of my heterosexual peers."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over two-thirds of the respondents (69.3 percent) said they would talk to a male homosexual police officer at the station in front of their heterosexual peers. However, 14 percent did not agree and the remainder indicated a neutral response. The median score was 6 and the modal score was 7.

Table 30
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 25
"If I was at the station and observed a male homosexual police officer having difficulty with a procedure, I would be willing to assist that officer."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost nine out of ten respondents (89.4 percent) said they would be willing to assist a gay officer, and 57 percent strongly agreed with the statement. The median and
modal scores were 7.

Table 31
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 26
"The presence of homosexuals in the work place would raise my personal fear of contracting the HIV virus."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost half the respondents (49.1 percent) agreed with this statement with 21.9 percent strongly agreeing.

However, almost four out of ten respondents (39.5 percent) indicated they disagreed with the statement. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 7.

Attitudes Toward People We Work Closely With

Tables 31 through 36 pertain to questions about people one might work with and each question begins with the following statement:

"We can choose our friends, but we can't always choose the people we work closely with. Here is a list of some different types of people. For each one, would you indicate the extent you would strongly object or not object to working around them."
Table 32
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 30
"People who are homosexual"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exactly half of the respondents (50.0 percent) indicated they would not object to working with a homosexual. Almost four out of ten respondents (38.6 percent) said they would object. The median score was 4.50 and the modal was 7.

Table 33
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 31
"People who are handicapped."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six out of ten respondents (60.5 percent) indicated they would not object to working with a handicapped individual. However, almost one-quarter (21.9 percent) remained neutral on the issue. The median score was 5 and the modal score was 7.
Table 34
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 32
"People who smoke."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were nearly divided on working with smokers with 40.4 percent saying they object and 45.6 percent saying they do not object. The median score was 4 and the modal score was 1.

Table 35
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 33
"People who have AIDS."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of AIDS continues to be one with strong feelings. Almost three-quarters of the respondents (73.7 percent) indicated that they objected to working with people who have AIDS with 43.9 percent strongly objecting. Only 12.2 percent said they did not object. The median score was 2 and the modal score was 1.
Table 36
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 34
"People who use obscene or profane language."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the respondents (69.3 percent) do not object to working with people who use obscene or profane language. The median score was 6 and the modal score was 7.

Table 37
RANGE OF ANSWERS TO SURVEY QUESTION 41
"If you had a choice between whether to work with a female officer or a male homosexual officer, which would you choose?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Homosexual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were equally divided on working with a female (48.2 percent) and choosing "it does not matter" (50.9 percent). Only one respondent said he would prefer to work with a male homosexual police officer.

An analysis was completed on the dimension of task cohesion by obtaining the summated score for task cohesion. The lowest possible score was 14 and the maximum score was 98. The minimum score calculated was 43 and the maximum score calculated was 83. The median score was 63 and the mode score was 64. For comparison purposes, the median and
modal scores would fall between the numbers 4 and 5 on the seven-point Likert scale used in this study. Overall, this indicates that the respondents "slightly agree" with this dimension.

A summated acceptability score (across all items) was calculated for all respondents. The lowest possible score was 34 and the highest possible score was 238. The minimum score calculated was 74 and the maximum score calculated was 187. The median score was 130.5 and the modal score was 141. For comparison purposes, the median score (130.5) would fall between 3 and 4 on the seven-point Likert scale indicating an overall "slightly disagree" position on the acceptance of homosexuals. The modal score (141) would fall between 4 and 5 indicating a "slightly agree" position on the acceptance of homosexuals. The mode score was closer to 4 than 5 on the Likert Scale.

Summary

The univariate analysis of the data provided insight into how the respondents felt about male homosexuals. This was done by calculating the summated acceptability score for each of the three dimensions, and by calculating an overall summated acceptability score across all categories.

By understanding these data, police administrators can begin to address policy issues directed toward reducing their liability in the area of harassment and discrimination.
based upon sexual orientation.
CHAPTER 5
INTRODUCTION
BIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The following analysis will discuss the results of bivariate analysis of the data. First, the discussion will address the analysis of variance on rank and the summated acceptability score. The hypothesis originally proposed was that the rank-and-file would have a lower summated acceptability score than the other classifications (police sergeants and above). Secondly, an analysis was completed on the demographic variables to determine if there were any differences across any of the categories. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if differences existed between the groups (age and political party) and the summated acceptability score. Also t-tests were completed on the demographic variables of ethnicity and education after the categories were collapsed to determine if differences existed between these groups and the summated acceptability score.

Bivariate Analysis on Categories

A more precise analysis was completed on the total summated score (dependent variable) and the independent variable of rank (police officer/corporal/detective; first line supervisor [sergeant]; and, middle management position [lieutenant/ captain]). There were no respondents in the
rank of police administration. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if differences existed between the groups (ranks) and the summated acceptability score.

The hypothesis and the results obtained in the statistical analysis will be explained in this section. As seen in Table 38, the hypothesis that the rank and file would have a lower summated acceptability score toward gays in law enforcement is not supported by these data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95.1929</td>
<td>47.5964</td>
<td>.0853</td>
<td>.9183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>61971.2720</td>
<td>558.2997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>62066.4649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewing an F-distribution table indicated that an F-value of 3.07 is needed to reject the null hypothesis for df=2 and 111 at the .05 level of significance. The obtained F-ratio of .0853 is significantly less than the tabled critical value.

In this study, the F-value probability of .9183 is larger than the alpha level (.05), thus rejecting the hypothesis and supporting the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis is supported, in that the category means do not differ. Therefore, the population means are equal. There
are no acceptability differences among the ranks.

A multiple comparisons t-test of all combinations (MODLSD) was also calculated as part of the statistical procedure. Multiple comparison tests are used to determine which population means are different. These tests set up more stringent criteria for declaring differences than does the usual t-test. The data support the conclusion that no two groups are significantly different at the .05 level of significance.

Further analysis was completed on the remaining demographic variables to determine if there were any differences across any of the categories.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was calculated on the demographic variables of age and political party affiliation. Table 39 shows the results of the ANOVA summary on the variable of age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1101.3327</td>
<td>367.1109</td>
<td>.6624</td>
<td>.5769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60965.1322</td>
<td>554.2285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>62066.4649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewing an F-distribution table indicated that an F-value of 2.70 is needed to indicate that there is a
statistical significance for $df=3$ and 110 at the .05 level. The obtained F-ratio of .6624 is notably less than the tabled critical value. The F-value probability of .5759 is larger than the alpha level (.05), thus indicating that age is not a factor.

An ANOVA analysis was completed on the variable of political party. The category of "other" was eliminated from the analysis due to the small number of respondents selecting this category (2 respondents). Table 40 shows the results of the ANOVA summary on the variable of political party.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1084.8050</td>
<td>542.4025</td>
<td>.9873</td>
<td>.3758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60981.6599</td>
<td>549.3843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>62066.4649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewing an F-distribution table showed that an F-value of 3.07 was needed to indicate that there was a statistical significance for $df=2$ and 111 at the .05 level. The obtained F-ratio of .9873 is less than the tabled critical value. The F-value probability of .3758 is larger than the alpha level (.05), thus indicating that political party is not a factor.

Additionally, t-tests were conducted on the remaining
demographic variables of ethnicity and education to
determine if any differences existed across these variables. The variable of ethnicity was collapsed to two means, whites and minorities. Also, the variable of education was collapsed to two means, those without a college degree and those with a college degree.

The t-test results for ethnicity and total summated acceptability score is shown in table 41.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>128.7273</td>
<td>3.631</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>129.7901</td>
<td>2.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-value which is significant at the .05 level for df=112 is equal to 1.980. Since the t-value of .22 is less than 1.980, it is concluded that there are no significant differences between ethnicity (minorities and whites) and the summated acceptability score.

The t-test results for education and total summated acceptability score is shown in table 42.
Table 42
T-TESTS FOR EDUCATION AND TOTAL SUMMATED ACCEPTABILITY SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No college degree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>130.5472</td>
<td>3.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>128.5574</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-value which is significant at the .05 level for df=112 is equal to 1.980. Since the t-value of .45 is less than 1.980, it is concluded that there are no significant differences between education (those without a college degree and those with a college degree) and the summated acceptability score.

Summary

Although the results of the bivariate analysis failed to illustrate statistical significance between any of the variables, this does not mean that the results are insignificant. An analysis of why there was no significance needs to be discussed and explained. This discussion will be done in Chapter 6 - Summary and Conclusions.
CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to examine the acceptability of male homosexuals by law enforcement personnel, specifically in Southern California.

Throughout its history, law enforcement has been reluctant to accept outsiders (i.e. women and minorities). History and the review of the literature support the reluctance of law enforcement in accepting outsiders within its ranks. It has only been within the last 25 years that women and minorities had sought to enter law enforcement in significant numbers. It ultimately took legislative action and law suits to make this a reality. The consequence of this action by law enforcement resulted in monetary awards to women and minorities.

A parallel exists between the situation that previously faced women and minorities entering law enforcement profession and the hiring of gays. Evidence supports that the acceptability of women and minorities has not been without a cost to law enforcement agencies country wide. This reasoning may then suggest that the acceptability of gays in law enforcement will be very similar.

By knowing the level of acceptability of male homosexuals in law enforcement, we may prevent a repeat of
history. The results of this study can then be used by police administrators in developing policies and strategies that might reduce or eliminate lawsuits by gay police officers claiming harassment and/or discrimination because of sexual orientation.

This study examined the attitudes of law enforcement personnel by calculating a total summated acceptability score. Also, three dimensions were examined to determine the level of acceptability by the respondents for each of these dimensions. The hypothesis presented was that the rank-and-file police officers would have a lower acceptability score than the other classifications. Finally, an analysis was completed on the demographic variables to determine if there were any differences across any of the categories.

Methodology

Research Design

This research employed a stratified disproportionate sampling design. This design was selected because it insured that the appropriate number of elements were drawn from homogeneous subsets of the population. Random selection was accomplished by using a systematic sampling technique, that is, every (Kth) sworn employee of all incorporated cities and the sheriff's office was selected on the following basis. For the participating cities, 1 out of
every 4 sworn employees was randomly selected, and for the sheriff's department 1 out of every 12 sworn employees were randomly selected.

Subjects

Originally, 12 police agencies and one sheriff's department were selected to participate in this survey. However, only seven agencies ultimately elected to participate thereby reducing the population from 2,330 law enforcement officers to 1,745 officers. Of these, a total of 226 law enforcement officers were randomly selected to participate in this research. This study used male officers only for reasons previously cited in this research.

Survey Instrument

This research used a questionnaire consisting of 47 items to determine the acceptability of male homosexuals in Southern California law enforcement agencies. The questionnaire was designed to measure three aspects or dimensions: attitudes toward the goals of the homosexual movement, social cohesion, and, task cohesion. In order to measure these dimensions a seven-point Likert scale was used. Basically, the respondents were presented with a statement in the questionnaire and asked to indicate whether they "strongly disagree" (1) or "strongly agree" with the statement.
Variables

The independent variable in this research was the rank of the respondents which consisted of three levels. The dependent variable in this research was the summated acceptability score.

Procedures

Instructions to the subjects were outlined in a cover letter attached to each questionnaire. In this cover letter, the respondents were instructed that the completion of the questionnaire would act as a declaration of informed consent. The only person to contact the respondents was the person identified by the agency head to assist in this research. Respondents were instructed that if they had any concerns or questions regarding their participation in this study, or if they were interested in obtaining the results of this study, they could contact the researcher at the Criminal Justice Department, California State University, San Bernardino.

Summary of Results

Univariate Analysis of the Data Summary

These data support the conclusion that gays entering the law enforcement profession will receive a "luke-warm" welcome, if that, by current law enforcement officers in Southern California.
Discussion of Goals of the Homosexual Movement

Each of the dimensions discussed (goals of the gay movement, social cohesion, and task cohesion) support this conclusion. The respondents do not support certain goals of the homosexual movement. A basic goal of the homosexual movement is to achieve acceptance by society as a whole. Certain questions dealing with adoption, gay marriages, and dependent employee benefits received little support from the respondents. For the heterosexual police officer to accept such components would require near complete identification with the homosexual subculture. This, however, is a goal that is not likely to be reached. This incongruity between the homosexual components and the traditional American values, as portrayed by the dominate heterosexual culture, will most likely continue to foster antigay sentiment by the heterosexual segment of our society.

Discussion of Social Cohesion

The respondents had an overall neutral response on whether they would socialize with gays. Socialization into the police culture is critical because it defines one's identity. An element of this socialization requires the sharing of values and beliefs. Since police officers are notably conservative, emotionally and politically, a neutral response for this dimension is not surprising. Respondents supported this belief by their unwillingness to socialize
off-duty with a male homosexual police officer (table 17). Several questions on this dimension had a high percentage of respondents indicating a neutral (4) response. Understanding Skolnick's (1966) sketch of the police officer's working personality seems to explain this response (i.e. social isolation, social solidarity). Police tend to be viewed as a homogeneous occupational group somehow quite different from most other men, and any outsider is likely to be viewed with caution and suspicion.

Discussion of Task Cohesion

Finally, the dimension of task cohesion received the highest acceptability score of the three dimensions. The results of this dimension reaffirm the requirement for police solidarity when confronting the dangers of police work. The respondents indicated that they would be willing to assist gay officers, would be willing to safety check gay officers on calls, and approximately half the respondents said they could work with a gay officer.

However, even though this dimension received the highest acceptability score, areas of concern were identified. For example, the data showed that respondents viewed people who smoke and homosexuals as equally objectionable (table 32 and 34). Also, when asked if they would rather work with a female, a homosexual male officer, or either, the respondents were equally divided on working
with a female (48.2 percent) and choosing either (50.9 percent). Only one respondent indicated that he would choose a gay officer. The results suggest that male heterosexual officers are not quite ready to work with gays, and a significant number would rather work with a female officer.

**Policy Issues for Dimensions**

The results of these dimensions raise specific policy issues for today's police administrators. Police administrators cannot ignore the fact that gays, as with women and minorities in the past, have emerged as a major political and cultural force within our pluralistic society. Historically, law enforcement has not kept pace with the cultural diversity it serves.

In order to address this policy issue, law enforcement administrators should consider the following recommendations.

1. *Develop an specific policy prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation.* A policy such as this indicates top management's intolerance of discriminatory personnel actions and sets the atmosphere of the organizational climate toward same-gender activities. Any organization-wide policy will require top management's support to succeed. The policy should clearly identify the behaviors prohibited, and should specify the consequences
for engaging in inappropriate behavior.

2. Educate all employees about the policy. Merely having a policy is not sufficient. Written literature or training programs should be publicized and used to educate employees about specifics of the policy.

3. Implement diversity training. It is critical that employees do more than just read the organization's antidiscrimination policy. Employees need to be sensitized to others' perspectives and lifestyles. Role playing and videos have been found to be effective training techniques.

4. Document performance appraisal information and employee's job related activities. As part of their job requirements, supervisors and/or managers may have to reprimand, transfer, demote, or terminate an employee for job related reasons. Documentation of employees' past job performance is needed to determine appropriate and fair personnel action. It also prevents an employee from claiming that disciplinary action was based on sexual orientation.

5. Sanction support groups for gays and lesbians. By supporting such groups the organization demonstrates its acceptance of gays and lesbians in their workforce. Management need not initiate the formation of such groups. Hundreds of support groups currently exist for employees. The two most notable gay police support groups are New
York's Gay Officers Alliance League (G.O.A.L.) and Southern California's gay officers support group, Pride Behind the Badge.

AIDS: A Significant Policy Issue

The most significant finding of this research which would impact policy decision by police administrators dealt with AIDS. The majority of respondents had very strong feelings when this issue was measured. For example, over half the respondents (56 percent) said they would be reluctant to provide first aid to a known homosexual police officer. When asked if the presence of homosexuals in the workplace would raise their personal fear of contracting the HIV virus, almost half (49.1 percent) said it would. On another question, almost three-quarters of the respondents (73.7 percent) indicated they objected to working with people who have AIDS.

Since studies have found a high correlation between perceived personal risk and negative attitudes toward people with HIV/AIDS (Bliwise, Grade, Irish and Ficarrotto, 1991), its impact upon the police organization and the acceptance of gays cannot be ignored.

It is estimated that as many as one million Americans may be infected with the AIDS virus (Kolota, 1991). Since the median incubation period between infection with the HIV and the manifestations of illness is almost ten years
(Bacchetti & Moses, 1989), many people appear healthy but are able to still transmit the virus to other people.

In the early days of the AIDS epidemic, many police administrators believed that AIDS was not a problem likely to affect many law enforcement officers. The perception was that this virus was mainly confined to "high-risk" individuals not likely to seek employment in policing. However, that view may not be correct today. Not only have the number of HIV infected persons in the general population increased, but law enforcement agencies may contain more persons drawn from the "high-risk" backgrounds (i.e. homosexual/bisexual men and individuals with a history of intravenous drug use) than is commonly believed. For these reasons, police agencies are likely to confront an increasing number of situations in which personnel issues related to HIV arise.

Historically, police departments have not been friendly places for gay applicants. Although few, if any, police organizations had explicit bans that prohibited the hiring of homosexuals, these applicants were often screened out in the recruitment process. This occurred because many administrators believed that homosexuality was not compatible with the conduct expected of police officers. In addition, sodomy laws which exist in a number of states were sometimes cited as a justification for excluding gays
(Gallagher, 1992, p.21). Also, the paramilitary image of law enforcement discouraged some gay people from applying.

In recent years, much has changed. Not only have gays achieved greater societal acceptance, but there continues to be political support for the idea that sexual orientation should not be a barrier for employment. As a consequence, some police agencies are openly recruiting gay officers (Berrill & Herek, 1992). In other cases, the screening process is no longer being used to exclude qualified gay applicants. While there have always been gay people working in law enforcement (usually closeted), the number is likely to increase as this type of job discrimination becomes less socially acceptable.

As the number of Americans infected with the AIDS virus rises and as more individuals from the "high-risk" groups seek to enter law enforcement, police administrators will be forced to confront several policy issues. According to Blumberg (1989), as the number of gays entering law enforcement rises, departments will have to decide if potential recruits should be tested for HIV as part of the pre-employment process. Also, should qualified applicants who are HIV positive be permitted to enter law enforcement? What does an agency do if an officer becomes infected with the HIV virus? Should the employee be permitted to continue working with the police agency? These are only some of the
critical policy issues police administrators will need to address in the very near future.

Proper education and training are the key for addressing AIDS in the workplace. First, there are many police officers who are misinformed regarding HIV (Yearwood, 1992). Second, accurate information can teach the police officer how to avoid the types of "high-risk" behavior in their personal lives that could transmit the virus. Third, educated officers will understand that casual contact with infected individuals poses absolutely no danger. Fourth, a clear understanding of HIV should result in fewer incidents where police feel compelled to take what may seem like inappropriate action, such as wearing yellow gloves at a gay rights demonstration to avoid infection (Kantrowitz, 1987). Education will demonstrate that AIDS poses far less risk to officers than the other types of duties that police officers routinely encounter as part of their job (Blumberg, 1990; Hammet, 1988).

**Bivariate Analysis of the Data**

The bivariate analysis failed to indicate a statistically significant affect between the different variables and the total summated acceptability score. The fact that there was no effect is important in and of itself. This analysis would suggest that in law enforcement there is an organizational culture - which knows no barrier - that
seems to influence attitudes in the law enforcement profession. Like a tribe or an ethnic group, every occupational group develops recognizable and distinctive rules, customs, perceptions, and interpretations of what they see, along with consequent moral judgements (Skolnick & Fyfe, 1993, p. 90). This persona is instilled from the day an applicant is accepted into the profession. The attitudes and beliefs of the organization are absorbed by the individual officer, and soon these characteristics define who he is.

The police culture is often viewed as having machismo qualities. Stereotypically speaking, these qualities are not seen in gays. The police and their culture can be characterized as possessing qualities that are complex and often a combination of values. According to Mark Baker (1985), police officers lean to the right politically and morally. "They advocate the straight and narrow path to right living," he writes. "They believe in the inviolability of the marriage vows, the importance of the family, the necessity of capital punishment (p.211)."

Police departments tend to draw their recruits from the more socially conservative elements of the community. As a result, police departments tend to be fundamentally conservative organizations, both politically and socially. This conservative position can be translated into negative
views on the largely white, male, heterosexual rank-and-file toward outsiders, and the history of women and minorities in policing support this notion.

Police departments are tightly knit cultures consisting of people drawn together by their responsibility to protect one another. Police officers look out for one another, and when there are problems police officers work them out on their own. One's co-workers are often considered family, both on and off duty. Camaraderie is high in the police profession, but its price is conformity.

The police culture is a significant barrier to the acceptance of gays into the law enforcement profession. The police culture is slow to change, and is characteristically suspicious of anyone not possessing the values and beliefs of the dominate culture.

Police administrators should realize that they would have a difficult time changing employees' attitudes toward gays, and should therefore focus on changing employees' behavior toward gays.

Limitations of the Research

These data were obtained from surveying law enforcement officers currently working in the police profession on their attitudes toward hiring gays in policing. First of all, this research limited its respondents to male officers only. The reasons have been previously outlined in this study.
The cities and counties participating in this research did not have established gay communities as found in larger, more established urban areas. This may have had some influence over the respondents. By not working in neighborhoods housing large number of gays, the respondents may have let stereotypes influence their attitudes. Police officers working in gay neighborhoods may possess a more acceptable attitude toward gays than others.

Since the respondents surveyed all came from a Southern California law enforcement agencies, the generalizability of the research is limited. However, in his book *Gay Cops*, Stephen Leinen, discusses similar outcomes.

Even though the response rate was acceptable, as defined by Babbie (1989), it did pose limited problems. In essence, one out of two respondents returned the questionnaire, which lead the researcher to believe that even though the rate was acceptable, a topic less sensitive may have yielded a better response rate.

Finally, additional limitations centered on the survey instrument itself. In order to satisfy the confidentiality issues raised by the police chiefs, a contact person from each agency was instructed on the method of dispensing the questionnaire. There is no evidence to support bias on the part of the contact person or that the questionnaires were distributed incorrectly, but since the contact persons were
not supervised errors could have occurred.

Suggestions for Future Research

Every research should raise additional areas of study, and this research is no exception. Once a gay police officer has entered the law enforcement profession he should be treated no differently than his heterosexual counterparts. One area of future research involves the police organization's rating system. Will gay police officers be subject to biased rating systems because they do not fit the social or organizational mold of a police officer or police supervisor? Unless an organization can prevent such bias (which would impact job opportunities and promotions for gays), it is clear that the courts will intervene to prevent such discrimination.

As our society continues to become more diverse, other outsiders will seek entry into the law enforcement profession. Assimilation into the law enforcement profession is no simple task. The characteristics of law enforcement personnel are such that accepting change and outsiders is difficult and often met with resistance.

The next wave of outsiders waiting to enter the law enforcement profession in significant numbers is on the horizon. This wave will most likely be those persons who have one or more physical or mental disabilities.

However, unlike gays, Federal legislation is already in
place pertaining to persons who have physical or mental disabilities. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was enacted on July 26, 1990. One of its purposes was to integrate persons with disabilities into the mainstream of society.

According to the 1990 census, the United States currently has a population of approximately 250 million. It is estimated that there are 43 million Americans who have physical or mental disabilities. This means that one out of six Americans has some type of disability.

While the ADA has significant implications for the criminal justice system, law enforcement is mentioned only once, and even that is only in reference to persons with a history of drug use. Yet experts believe the impact on criminal justice is major.

The ADA may very well be the most significant piece of legislation affecting law enforcement since the Civil Rights Act. It will cause police agencies throughout the United States, as well as other employers, to adjust and, in some cases, completely overhaul their recruitment and selection procedures. Furthermore, if departments do not immediately develop changes in their personnel policies by the time the Act becomes applicable, they will expose themselves to substantial liability (Appro Exchange, 1991).

Law enforcement administrators at one time thought that AIDS and gays would not become a law enforcement issue, but evidence has proven otherwise. As with gays, law enforcement administrators must develop policies today, to
deal with personnel issues of the future.
## APPENDIX A
### CURRENT STATUS OF SODOMY RESTRICTIONS, BY STATE (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sodomy Restrictions</th>
<th>No Sodomy Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas*</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas*</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana (1)</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts**</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (2)</td>
<td>Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota**</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri*</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana*</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma*</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee*</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas (3)</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Restriction applies to same-gender sex only.

**Sodomy laws remain in force, but states ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.


1. Louisiana's sodomy law was recently struck down in trial court (*State v. Baxley*) on the grounds that it violated the state constitution's guarantee to the right of privacy. The state is appealing the decision.

2. Michigan's sodomy law (felony) was ruled unconstitutional as applied to private consensual adult behavior (*Michigan Organization for Human Rights v. Kelley*, No. 88-815820). The decision by the state's attorney general, a named defendant in the case, not to appeal left in question the broader precedential application of the ruling. Since no appeal was taken, the ruling may only apply to Wayne County where it was issued.

3. Texas' sodomy statute (misdemeanor) is currently under review by the state supreme court in a declaratory relief action (*Morales v. State of Texas*, D-2393) where the lower courts ruled the statute unconstitutional.
APPENDIX B
CALIFORNIA PENAL CODE SECTION 830.1

California Penal Code 830.1. Persons who are peace
officers; extent of authority.

(a) Any sheriff, undersheriff, or deputy sheriff,
employed in that capacity, of a county, any chief of police,
employed in that capacity, of a city, any police officer,
employed in that capacity and appointed by the chief of
police or the chief executive of the agency, of a city, any
chief of police, or police officer of a district (including
police officers of the San Diego Unified Port District
harbor Police) authorized by statute to maintain a police
department, any marshall or deputy marshall of a municipal
court, any constable or deputy constable, employed in that
capacity, of a judicial district, any port warden or special
officer of the Harbor Department of the City of Los Angeles,
or any inspector or investigator employed in that capacity
in the office of a district attorney, is a peace officer.

APPENDIX C
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Directions: for each of the following, please circle only ONE number which best indicates your feelings. Please keep in mind that a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement and a 7 means you strongly agree with the statement.

1. I think male homosexuals should be afforded equal rights in terms of job opportunities.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

2. I think male homosexuals should be permitted to legally marry.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

3. I believe that male homosexuals should be permitted to claim their partner as a dependent for purposes of employee benefits.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

4. I would be willing to have lunch with a male homosexual police officer.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

5. I would socialize off-duty with a male homosexual police officer.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

6. I would be reluctant to provide emergency first aid to a fellow officer known to be a male homosexual.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

7. I think that male homosexual relationships between consenting adults is morally wrong.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

8. I feel that male homosexuality should be considered an acceptable alternative lifestyle.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

9. I could be friends with a male homosexual.
   (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

10. I would permit my child to go play at the home of a playmate who lives with a male homosexual parent.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

11. I think that male homosexual couples should be legally permitted to adopt children.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)
12. Men become homosexual because of genetic or biological factors.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

13. If my law enforcement agency began hiring male homosexual police officers, I would consider laterally transferring to another department, or if I were eligible, retire.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

14. I think that male homosexual relations between consenting adults should be legal.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

15. I think that states should prohibit particular sexual practices conducted in private between consenting adult men and women.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

16. If a male homosexual police officer made a "routine" traffic stop in a neighboring beat, I would drive by his location just to check on his welfare (assume here there is no department policy against this activity).
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

17. I think male homosexuals should be permitted to serve in the armed forces.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

18. Being around male homosexuals make me feel uncomfortable.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

19. Men become homosexuals because they want to.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

20. Allowing male homosexual police officers into law enforcement may cause some problems, but I think law enforcement will manage.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

21. Male homosexuality is deviant.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

22. If a male homosexual police officer employed by my agency came out publicly (newspapers) proclaiming his homosexuality, I believe this action would tarnish the image of my law enforcement agency.
    (strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)
23. I would feel uncomfortable talking about gay issues in the company of male homosexual police officers.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

24. I would talk with a male homosexual police officer at the station (prior to briefing, checking out equipment) in front of my heterosexual peers.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

25. If I was at the station and observed a male homosexual police officer having difficulty with a procedure, I would be willing to assist that officer.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

26. The presence of male homosexuals in the work place would raise my personal fear of contracting the HIV virus.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

27. I feel that male homosexual police officers would be socially ostracized in my agency.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

28. Being around homosexuals makes me uncomfortable.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

29. I think that states should prohibit particular sexual practices conducted in private between consenting adult male homosexuals.

(strongly disagree) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (strongly agree)

Directions: for each of the following, please circle only ONE number which best indicates your feelings. Please keep in mind that a 1 means you strongly object with the statement, and a 7 means you do not object with the statement.

30. We can choose our friends, but we can't always choose the people we work closely with. Here is a list of some different types of people. For each one, would you indicate the extent you would strongly object or not object to working around them.

People who ...
are homosexual

(strongly object) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (not object)
31. are mentally handicapped
   (strongly object) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (not object)

32. smoke cigarettes
   (strongly object) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (not object)

33. have AIDS
   (strongly object) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (not object)

34. sometimes use obscene or profane language
   (strongly object) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 (not object)

Directions: for each of the following, please circle only ONE number which best indicates your feelings.

35. Do you think homosexuals should or should not be hired for each of the following occupations...

   Salespersons
   1. should
   2. should not

36. Doctors
   1. should
   2. should not

37. Firefighters
   1. should
   2. should not

38. High school teachers
   1. should
   2. should not

39. Police officers
   1. should
   2. should not
40. Elementary school teachers
   1. should
   2. should not

41. If you had a choice whether to work with a female officer or a male homosexual officer, which would you choose?
   1. female officer
   2. it does not matter
   3. male homosexual officer

Directions: for each of the following, please circle only ONE number for your response.

42. Please indicate whether you are:
   1. male
   2. female

43. Your age is:
   1. 21-29
   2. 30-39
   3. 40-49
   4. 50 +

44. To what political party are you currently registered?
   1. democratic party
   2. republican
   3. other (please specify) ______________
   4. none
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45. Your ethnicity is:
1. American-Indian, Native American, Alaskan
2. Black non-hispanic, Afro-American
3. Chicano, Mexican-American, Latino, Hispanic
4. White, Caucasan non-hispanic
5. Asian, Oriental, Pacific-Islander
6. Other ____________________

46. Please indicate your highest level of education
1. high school/GED
2. some college
3. Associate's Degree
4. Bachelor's Degree
5. Master's Degree
6. Doctoral Degree

47. Your current rank is
1. police officer/corporal/detective
2. first line supervisor (sergeant)
3. middle management position (lieutenant/captain)
4. police administration (above rank of captain)

THIS CONCLUDES THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE TAKE A LITTLE EXTRA TIME TO BE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL THE QUESTIONS ON EACH OF THE SIX PAGES. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME. PLACE THE QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE AND MAIL OUT.
Dear Law Enforcement Officer,

You have been randomly selected to participate in this research project. This research project is concerned with your feelings and attitudes towards homosexuals in law enforcement. This research is being conducted by James Doyle under the supervision of Professor Donald B. Lindsey, Criminal Justice Department, California State University, San Bernardino.

The purpose of this research is to identify potential problem areas for law enforcement and to assist police agencies in developing policies and guidelines, thereby allowing the law enforcement profession to adjust to the changing social conditions.

The completion of this questionnaire will act as a declaration of informed consent, your signature or other identification will not be needed. Your responses will be treated with complete confidentiality and full anonymity is assured. Upon completing the questionnaire, please place it in the self-addressed stamped envelope and mail it out. Since this participation is voluntary, you have the right to withdraw your participation from the study at any time. The expected duration of your participation in completing this questionnaire is approximately 10 minutes.

If you are interested in obtaining the results of this study, it will be available at the Pfau Library on the California State University, San Bernardino campus upon completion. Any respondent having any questions or concerns regarding their participation in this study may contact me by writing me care of the Criminal Justice Department, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, California, 92407.

I would appreciate your early reply and would hope to receive your response within ten (10) days. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation and time.

Sincerely,

JAMES DOYLE
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