4-13-2020

Exploring Gendered Environments in Policing: Workplace Incivilities and Fit Perceptions in Men and Women Officers

Rachael Rief
University of Nebraska at Omaha, rrief@unomaha.edu

Samantha S. Clinkinbeard
University of Nebraska at Omaha, sclinkinbeard@unomaha.edu

Recommended Citation

Rief, R. M. & Clinkinbeard, S. S. Exploring gendered environments in policing: Workplace incivilities and fit perceptions in men and women officers. Police Quarterly, 23(4), 427-450. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611120917942

UNO LIBRARIES
LIBRARY.UNOMAHA.EDU

Exploring Gendered Environments in Policing: Workplace Incivilities and Fit Perceptions in Men and Women Officers

Rachael M. Rief[1] and Samantha S. Clinkinbeard[1]
[1]University of Nebraska Omaha, Omaha, NE, USA

Abstract

Research indicates that women are still underrepresented in policing and that police culture is not fully accepting of its sisters in blue. As police organizations strive toward building an inclusive workforce, we must understand how women, already in the field, view their place and experiences within their jobs, organizations, and workgroups. Thus, in the current research, we use a comparative sample (n = 832) of male and female officers to examine perceptions of fit in the job, organization, and workgroup, and how these perceptions relate to reports of workplace incivilities. Findings indicate that women "fit in" with the job and the broader agency, but they are less likely than men to feel they belong within their workgroup. This relationship was partially mediated by workplace incivilities, indicating that women's experience of subtle forms of discrimination partially explains their lower levels of fit in their workgroup.

In general, the most satisfied workers tend to make the best workers (Oswald et al., 2015; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). The list of factors that contribute to job satisfaction is long. Important to that list is the extent to which employees feel that they belong to, match, or fit with their career field, coworkers, and organization (Gabriel et al., 2014; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Those who feel a connection and see a match between their skills and the job are more likely to stick around, work hard, and recommend the job to others (Cable & Judge, 1996; Dawley et al., 2010; Gabriel et al., 2014). As in any other career field, this idea is true in policing. The concept of fit may be especially important in policing, however, as some groups, such as women and people of color, have historically been left out and had to fight their way in, against resistance. When a group has been historically excluded, establishing fit may take more effort and resilience because structures and cultures were not developed with them in mind. In the current article, we examine (a) the extent to which women police officers perceive that they fit in the environmental context of policing, (b) the extent to which their perceptions align (or not) with those of their male counterparts, and (c) the extent to which artifacts of the traditional (exclusionary) structure and culture explain the relationship between gender and environmental fit perceptions. We argue that officers' perceptions of fit, and factors that influence it, are important to understand to improve the retention of current officers and recruitment of new ones. Further, the existence of gender differences may signal areas in need of attention, particularly when it comes to improving the representation and integration of women in the historically male-dominated field of policing.

Policing started as a career for men, but significant social and political change allowed women to break into the field. Because of extended provisions to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and various lawsuit-driven consent decrees, policing experienced multiple periods of growth in the representation of women during the latter part of the 20th century (Archbold & Schulz, 2012). The number of women in the field drastically increased from about the 1980s to 1990s; however, since the early 2000s, growth has stalled (Cordner & Cordner, 2011; Kringen, 2014; Lonsway et al., 2003). Women represent about 47% of the total U.S. labor force

(United States Department of Labor, 2017) but only 12% to 13% of the U.S. police population (Hyland & Davis, 2019; United States Department of Justice, 2019). Representation is even lower for women of color. Women rep- resented 12% of law enforcement in 2016, but only 2% of all officers were Hispanic females, and only 3% were Black females (Hyland & Davis, 2019). Further, although research on retention is lacking, that which does exist indicates that even when they do join, women are often retained at lower rates than men (Doerner, 1995; Felkenes et al., 1993).

Women's stunted entry and retention may be attributed to a variety of inter- nal and external factors, including gendered processes, gender socialization, and masculine police subcultures (Brown, 2007; Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019; Corsianos, 2009; Garcia, 2003; Morash & Haarr, 2012). The masculine subculture is one of the most visited factors in the literature because it is known to cultivate adverse experiences for women (Rabe-Hemp, 2009; Silvestri, 2017). Women are often thought of as less capable of meeting the physical demands of the job, which can result in discriminatory assignment of duties (Brown & Fielding, 1993; Prenzler & Sinclair, 2013). Women are assigned to specific units or roles, such as caring for victims or settling disputes, which are thought most "suitable" for their gender; these same roles carry less prestige and go unrewarded socially and professionally (Garcia, 2003; Martin, 1999). The masculine nature of the field may also present itself through internal policies, such as requiring women to cut their hair before entering the academy or not getting a promotion even though they are fully qualified (Brown & Silvestri, 2019; Kringen & Novich, 2018). The masculine subcultures, which embodies traditional police values, brings about negative experiences for women via informal social interactions (Brown, 2007). For example, women may be perceived as a threat and face backlash if they fail to follow ascribed feminine roles, but if they do, they may sacrifice advancement opportunities, professional camaraderie, and a place in the "boys' club" (Brown, Baldwin, et al., 2019; Martin, 1979; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Shelley et al., 2011). In these ways, policing remains a gendered institution with gendered processes, narrowly defining women's roles and devaluing feminine traits (Archbold & Schulz,

2012; Garcia, 2003).

The repercussions of the masculine subculture and women's overall lack of acceptance in the field not only leads to social isolation but also makes them frequent victims of harassment, discrimination, and incivility in the workplace (Rabe-Hemp, 2008). In a study on discriminatory experiences of senior women in policing in England and Wales, policewomen were more likely to suffer discriminatory treatment than their civilian counterparts (Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019). In another study, Seklecki and Paynich (2007) found that 39% of women indicated that they felt less welcome than males, and 32% reported being treated worse than men did when they started their careers. Similarly, one study found that about 93% of women, compared with almost 83% of men, reported experiencing some form of harassment (i.e., unwanted sexual attention, quid pro quo harassment, and gender harassment) within the last year (Lonsway et al., 2013). The harassment and marginalization of women occurs even in departments with somewhat higher proportions of women, both in the United States and other Western countries such as the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Canada (Brown, Baldwin, et al., 2019; Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019; Langan et al., 2019; Marsh, 2019).

There are plenty of messages indicating that policing is still a "man's world" and several mechanisms through which women may be penalized for their gender. The extra cognitive and emotional energy that women officers must spend to *manage* their gender, navigate the highly masculine culture, and ignore messages suggesting they do not belong is likely to threaten their perceived fit within the policing environment. A better understanding of how officers view their positions at the job, organizational, and workgroup level and how gendered artifacts of the environment help explain these perceptions of environmental fit may provide insight on how to improve overall representation and experiences. The next sections describe the gendered nature of organizations, some of the consequences (e.g., incivilities in the workplace) of the gendering of police organizations and person-environment (P-E) fit as a framework for assessing the organizational environment of policing.

Literature Review

Gendered Organizations

   In her early work, Joan Acker (1990, 1992) suggests that within organizations, there are social structures, and within each social structure, gender has some role. The institutional structures across the United States were all created by men and largely remain under the influence of men, except for women's role in the family (Acker, 1992). Within gendered institutions, men have a much more dominant role, while women are excluded from many important practices such as supervisory positions or ones that involve decision-making roles (Acker, 1990). Later, Acker (2006) more broadly suggests that inequalities are embedded within organizations and are a result of societal processes and norms. She describes these as "inequality regimes" where the practices within the workplace exist to maintain gender, race, and class inequalities (Acker, 2006). In this way, inequalities are defined as systematic disparities related to the goals, resources, and organization of work. These processes cause disadvantages to members of certain social groups, affecting everything from requirements of the work to organizational hierarchy (Acker, 2006). As a result, practices related to the marginalization and exclusion of women may have been built into various gendered processes, and women may continue to experience harassment and struggle to gain acceptance. To make progress in the field, women have to adhere to the gendered rules and processes, both formal and informal.

   While there has been much progress made over the years, in terms of women's integration into the field, policing continues to mirror Acker's (1990) definition of a gendered organization. There remain various cultural values, symbols, processes, and structural elements that support the masculine nature of the field (Schuck, 2019; Silvestri, 2017). Gendered processes are evident in police culture through the special attention paid to characteristics such as aggression and physicality (Morash & Harr, 2012; Rabe-Hemp, 2009; Shelley et al., 2011). For example, female officers were significantly more likely than males to agree that they were underestimated due to their physical build and to believe gender biases existed in their department (Archbold et al., 2010). Women also continue to face

organizational barriers that may prevent them from entering areas, such as special weapons and tactics (SWAT) teams, deemed "unsuitable" for women (Archbold & Schulz, 2008; Dodge et al., 2011; Rabe- Hemp, 2008), and they may have to deal with policies (e.g., haircut policies in the academy) that force them to change their gender expression to gain organizational acceptance (Kringen & Novich, 2018). Women are also disproportionately represented in gendered positions (e.g., sexual assault cases, victims' units, and work with juveniles) within the organization (Jordan, 2002; Matusiak & Matusiak, 2018; Miller, 1999; Shelley et al., 2011).

Elevated levels of discrimination and social isolation for women are also common by-products of the gendered organizational structure and the masculine culture of police organizations (Archbold et al., 2010; Brown, Baldwin, et al., 2019; Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019; Shelley et al., 2011). Female officers are often subject to being bullied by someone more senior than them, having a male col- league take credit for their work, or being passed up for a promotion opportunity, even though they may be more qualified than their male counterparts (Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019). Women are also perceived as weak by men who, as a result, may behave in a chivalrous manner coming to their "rescue" (Brown, Baldwin, et al., 2019; Langan et al., 2019; Marsh, 2019). In these ways, women are not treated as equal to males, which may leave them feeling disrespected, unaccepted, and socially isolated. Because women continue to feel unaccepted and have these adverse experiences, it is important to understand the organizational structures, subcultures, and environments in which they work.

P-E Fit

Both the physical elements of an environment and the psychological response to it combine to affect an individual's behavior and perceptions (Bretz & Judge, 1994). This interaction between the physical elements of an individual's environment and their psychological response to it is described as a P-E interaction (Cable & Judge, 1996). Early P-E theories, such as the theory of work adjustment, focus on the values of an individual and that of the work environment and whether

these values are congruent (Bretz et al., 1994; Cable & Judge, 1996). These values, or enduring beliefs that specific actions are more preferable than others, guide an individual's attitudes, judgments, and behavior (Chatman, 1989). The value fulfillment that occurs in a work environment affects important outcomes such as job satisfaction (Cable & Judge, 1996). In other words, when individuals are in environments that support their preferences or beliefs, they will be more comfortable and successful (Bretz et al., 1994; Nye et al., 2012). Through this framework, the theory of P-E fit, broadly defined as the similarities between an individual's characteristics and their work environment, has emerged (Kristof, 1996).

As environmental fit perspectives developed, researchers identified types of it. Person-job (P-J) fit is the match between the capabilities of an individual and the demands of the job (Edwards, 1991). Person-organization (P-O) fit is the match between an individual's characteristics and that of the organization (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001). Person-group (P-G) fit is the extent to which an individual perceives compatibility between their characteristics and members of their workgroup (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). A workgroup can range from the immediate workgroup to a larger unit within the organization (Kristof, 1996).

Generally, findings from the research indicate that an individual's perception of the work environment is related to important work variables (e.g., job satisfaction, turnover intent). Studies in occupational psychology found fit was strongly and negatively correlated with adverse outcomes such as turnover intent and psychological distress and positively associated with desired out- comes such as job satisfaction (e.g., Dawley et al., 2010; Garbriel et al., 2014; Lyons et al., 2005, 2014). Research also suggests that each type of fit is unique, and individuals can distinguish between them. Saks and Ashforth (1997) found that job fit was related to outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment, while measures of organizational fit were only associated with turnover intent. In a review of the literature, Kristof (1996) notes group fit and organization fit are distinct because groups often have different values and norms than that of the larger organization to which they belong. Therefore, fit may vary from the person and

group to the person and organization (Kristof, 1996).

Fitting into each work environment (e.g., job, organization, and workgroup) may be especially important to women in gendered organizations with masculine subcultures. Acker (1992) suggests that there are different types of processes and mechanisms to keep women out of the field. These mechanisms likely exist within various environmental levels of the job and may look different in each. For example, unfair haircut or maternity policies could interfere with agency or organization fit, undue emphasis on physical fitness for selection may influence perceived match to job characteristics, and sexist jokes or exclusion from the "boys' club" could negatively affect perceived fit within the workgroup. The extent to which fit is impacted may depend on how prevalent and pervasive the masculine culture is in the agency or department. That is, in a gendered organization, such as policing, where the processes and symbols are oriented around masculinity, full integration and P-E fit are likely more difficult for women to achieve (Schuck, 2019). To tap into women's struggle, we look at how they fit into each environment and whether fit differs from their male counterparts.

Current Study

Acker (1990) suggests that organizations are gendered, whether or not they appear so to the casual observer. By-products of the gendered organizational structure and the masculine culture of police organizations include elevated levels of discrimination and social isolation for women, also referred to as workplace incivilities (Archbold et al., 2010; Brown, Baldwin, et al., 2019; Shelley et al., 2011). The existing body of research acknowledges structure and culture as deterrents to women's acceptance in the field but fails to examine how cultural values might play out at different environmental levels. The P-E fit framework acts as a way to examine these environmental levels but is rarely examined in a gendered way. Considering that inequality regimes are present in various processes and structures of the organization (Acker, 2006), it is important to understand gender differences at multiple levels within a workplace, like the job, organization, and workgroup. We investigate fit at multiple levels and examine the extent to which gendered by-

products of the culture, such as work- place incivilities, may impact fit.

We build on previous research by assessing aspects of the gendered environment as they relate to women's experiences, using a quantitative approach and a comparison sample of male officers. Differential treatment is something that is often assumed by qualitative researchers examining women's experiences in the field. These qualitative studies have done an excellent job of unveiling the challenges women face in the field, but there remains limited evidence that indicates women's experiences and perceptions are notably different from their male counterparts. Where differences do exist, there is often little information on what factors might explain those differences. The current study is guided by the following three research questions (RQs). (RQ1) What is the relationship between gender and officers' perceptions of fit (job, organization, and group), and does it differ across types of fit? (RQ2) What is the relationship between gender and reports of workplace incivilities among police officers? (RQ3) Do workplace incivilities mediate the relationship between gender and perceptions of environmental fit?

Although research does not necessarily indicate how gender will impact fit at the different levels of the work environment (e.g., organizational and occupational), it does suggest variation in fit perceptions between the job, organization, and group. Each type of fit is unique to an employee's perception and thus distinctly influences job attitudes and work-related outcomes (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). In addition, Acker's work on inequality regimes and the centrality of masculinity in the culture of policing suggest that women and men may be treated differently and thus may have different perceptions of their environments. Therefore, we hypothesize the following: (H1) Perceptions of each type of fit will differ from one another and by gender. Previous research on women in policing (Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019; Rabe-Hemp, 2008) suggests that women continue to report discrimination and harassment in the workplace. Thus, we also hypothesize the following: (H2) Women will report more workplace incivilities than their male counterparts. Finally, we hypothesize the following: (H3) As gendered by-products of the culture, workplace incivilities will partially explain gender differences in

perceptions of fit. Although the link between workplace incivilities and fit has not been examined directly, research indicates that female officers report being made to feel less welcome and that gaining acceptance is often a struggle (Rabe-Hemp, 2008).

Data and Methods

Sample

The data for the current research comes from two Midwestern police departments. At the time of data collection in June 2018, the smaller department consisted of 341 commissioned officers. Of these 341 officers, 83.6% (285) were male officers, and 16.4% (56) were female officers. Almost 10% (34) of both male and female officers were officers of color. This department had 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents in 2018 and includes four precincts, the Northwest, Northeast, Southwest, and Southeast, and center of the city. At the time of data collection in July 2018, the larger department consisted of about 790 commissioned officers. Of these officers, 82.5% (652) were male, and 17.5% (138) were female. Approximately 20% (158) of both male and female officers were officers of color. This department had 2 officers per 1,000 residents in 2018, and precincts cover the Northwest, Northeast, Southwest, and Southeast regions of the city.

The demographic characteristics of survey respondents are presented in Table 1. Consistent with the larger population, most officers were male (669; 80.80%) and White (683; 83.39%).[1] Women represented 18.12% (150) of the sample, and 16.61% (136) of officers in our sample were non-White. The average length of employment was 14 years (*SD* ¼ 8.90). Most respondents were patrol officers (66.09%), and the remaining (33.91%) were detectives, sergeants, lieutenants, captains, deputy chiefs, chiefs, school resource officers, or training officers. Most officers were married (76.09%) and had at least one child (76.16%). Most officers (95.80%) had at least some college; 171 (22.44%) officers had some college, but no degree; 66 (8.66%) had an associate degree; 425 (55.77%) had a bachelor's degree; and 68 (8.93%) had a Graduate or Professional degree.

Table 1. Sample Demographics.

Demographic	Department 1 (n = 506)			Department 2 (n = 326)			Combined (n = 832)		
	M/%	SD	Range	M/%	SD	Range	M/%	SD	Range
Female	18.09%	–	0–1	18.15%	–	0–1	18.12%	–	0–1
Non-White	21.57%	–	0–1	8.98%	–	0–1	16.61%	–	0–1
Length of employment	14.03	8.23	1–37	14.16	9.85	1–47	14.08	8.90	1–47
Patrol officer	63.77%	–	0–1	69.93%	–	0–1	66.09%	–	0–1
Associate or higher	66.67%	–	0–1	84.38%	–	0–1	73.36%	–	0–1
Married	75.80%	–	0–1	76.57%	–	0–1	76.09%	–	0–1
Child	80.64%	–	0–1	68.77%	–	0–1	76.16%	–	0–1
Military	50.32%	–	0–1	74.65%	–	0–1	59.53%	–	0–1

Procedures

A copy of the survey was given to administrative personnel in each department for approval. Both departments approved participation; however, they had different preferences for survey delivery. The smaller department requested that all surveys be distributed online via their internal training system. The larger department asked for in-person delivery at roll calls for patrol officers and online distribution for the remainder of the department.

The research team worked with a point of contact from each police department to distribute the surveys online. We composed an email detailing the purpose and voluntary nature of the study with an anonymous link to the survey on Qualtrics. From there, the point of contact at each police department distributed the email to all commissioned officers. At the smaller department, the email and survey link were distributed via the online training system, and at the larger department, the emails were distributed using the internal employee email server. Approximately one week after the initial email, the agency contacts sent reminder emails. The reminder email contained the same anonymous link to the survey and stated that the opportunity to take the survey was closing. In addition, the smaller department's training system reminded officers when they logged in that they had unfinished asks

(i.e., the survey).[2]

In-person surveys were distributed to patrol officers in the larger department at roll calls. One member of the research team visited each of the four precincts multiple times across 2 days, which enabled us to sample officers from each of the three shifts and all three crews. Patrol had three different crews assigned to each shift, with two crews per precinct on shift on any given day. We sampled at least two crews from each shift (e.g., morning, afternoon/swing, and night) from each of the four precincts. To reach those that had the day off, we attempted to go the following day. However, this method did not work out for one precinct, and we missed the possibility to sample the crews that had the day off. Some officers were missed if they were on vacation or medical leave, and we were not able to allow the entire population of patrol officers to participate.

Our overall response rate, for both departments, was 79.7%. The smaller of the two departments consists of 341 commissioned officers, of which, 326 returned a survey, making our response rate approximately 96% for this department. The larger of the two departments consisted of 791 total commissioned officers at the time of data collection. We collected a total of 472 surveys for a response rate of 64%. The larger response rate from the smaller of the two departments may be attributed to how surveys were distributed via an online training system, which sent reminders until tasks were complete.

Measures

P-E Fit. Previous research suggests P-E fit should be assessed for different levels or aspects of the work environment. Thus, we measured three levels: P-J, P-O, and P-G. P-J and P-O measures were the same as those used in previous research (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001), with minor adjustments. P-G fit was developed to follow the format of the other two measures but adapted to focus on the immediate workgroup.

Factor analysis was conducted on our measures of P-E fit. Principal component factoring and oblique rotation were used to examine the three items from the P-J fit scale, four items from the P-O fit scale, and three items from the P-

G fit scale (Mehmetoglu, 2016). We explored both a one-factor and a three-factor solution. All items had moderate loadings (all greater than .4) in the one-factor solution, indicating that these items represent the broader construct of P-E fit.[3] The three-factor solution improved residuals and loadings and indicated that the subscales represent different aspects of P-E fit. Analyses were repeated with one-factor solutions for each of the subscales.

P-J Fit. The first type of P-E fit measured was P-J fit. Perceptions of P-J fit are operationalized using Lauver and Kristof-Brown's (2001) measure. Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) used five items, three that measured P-J fit in terms of skill and two that measured P-J fit in terms of personality/temperament; the importance of measuring both was established by Edwards (1991). Due to space constraints, only three out of these five items were used, two that measured P- J fit in terms of skills and one in terms of personality/temperament. These items include "I have the right skills and abilities for this job," "My personality is a good match for this job," and "I am the right type of person for this type of work." Officers were asked: "Please answer the following questions about your current job." Responses were on a 5-point agreement scale (1 = *strongly dis- agree*, 2 = *somewhat disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *somewhat agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Items were averaged, with higher scores indicating a greater level of perceived job-fit. All items loaded cleanly on one factor and yielded an *alpha* reliability score of .85.

P-O Fit. Perceptions of P-O fit are operationalized using a measure that Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) adapted from Cable and Judge (1996). This measure includes four items asking about the degree to which an individual's characteristics and values fit within the organization (entire department). The P-O fit questions began with the following instruction, "Please think about the agency where you work." Respondents were then asked to rank the following statements on a 5-point agreement scale "My values match or fit the values of this agency," "I am able to maintain my values at this agency," "I fit in well within this agency," and "My agency appreciates me." Answers were coded on a 1 to 5 scale from *strongly*

disagree to *strongly agree*. All the items loaded cleanly on one factor and yielded an alpha reliability score of .88. Higher scores indicate greater perceived P-O fit.

P-G Fit. Similar to P-O fit, P-G fit is described as the extent to which a person perceives their characteristics as similar; however, instead of being similar to an organization, P-G fit is specific to the workgroup or team an individual works in (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Thus, we created and used P-G fit measures for the current study that appear similar to that of the P-O fit measures, but instead of specifying organization, the P-G fit questions lead with "Please think about your IMMEDIATE WORKGROUP, CREW, OR UNIT (i.e., those people you work most closely with regularly)." The following are statements about the degree to which an individual's characteristics and values fit within their work- group. These statements included "My values match or fit the values of my immediate workgroup," "I fit in well with the members of my workgroup," and "The members of my workgroup value me." Respondents indicated their level of agreement on a 5-point scale. Items were coded on a 1 to 5 scale from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* and averaged into a scale. All items loaded cleanly on one factor and had an *alpha* of .89. Higher scores for this scale indicate greater perceived P-G fit.

Workplace Incivilities. We used measures of perceived workplace incivilities to better understand women's experiences in the field (Cortina et al., 2001). Workplace incivility is a nonviolent form of discrimination and may be less overt than what is typically described as discrimination (e.g., denying compen- sation or benefits to employees based on some characteristic such as race or gender). Specifically, workplace incivilities are behaviors that violate the work- place norm of mutual respect (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). This behavior is characterized as rude and discourteous and indicates a general lack of disrespect for others (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Workplace incivilities may include ignoring or excluding someone from professional camaraderie or doubting someone's ability to do his or her job.

Perceived workplace incivilities were operationalized through a measure

used by Adams and Buck (2010) and adapted from Cortina et al. (2001). Due to space considerations in our survey, we dropped the item that had the lowest factor loading during Cortina et al.' (2001) research and development of the scale. Items measured the frequency in which participants experienced disrespectful, rude, or condescending behavior from superiors or coworkers. The wording of the prompt was modified to match the population of interest. The question asked, "During your time as a police officer in your current department, how often have you been in a situation where any of your colleagues " An example of one of the six items that followed was, "Put you down or was condescending to you?" Respondents were asked to rate each item on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from *none of the time* (1) to *most of the time* (5). All items loaded cleanly on one factor.[3] Higher scores for this scale indicate a greater perceived frequency of workplace incivilities (*a* ¼ .92).

Demographics and Occupational Characteristics. The primary predictor of interest was gender (1 = *female*, 0 = *male*). We also controlled for several other demo-graphics and occupational variables in our analyses, which may influence either perceived fit or workplace incivilities. These included race (*non-White* = 1); agency (*smaller agency* = 1, *larger agency* = 0); rank (*patrol* = 1, *higher rank* = 0); mode (*paper* = 1, *online* = 0); education (*associate or higher* = 1); married (*married* = 1); whether an officer had at least one child (*child* = 1 and *no child-* = 0); military (*military experience* = 1); and length of employment.[4]

Analysis

The analysis for the current research involved running *t* tests to explore gender differences in the outcome variables of interest, which include the three types of fit, and workplace incivilities. The second stage of the analysis involved running a series of linear regression models exploring gender, one for each of the three types of fit, and one for workplace incivilities. Finally, we conducted mediation analysis to explore the extent to which the relationship between gender and fit could be explained by incivilities in the workplace using the *paramed* command in Stata, bootstrapped standard errors, and 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals

(10,000 replications; Emsley & Liu, 2013; VanderWeele & Vansteelandt, 2014).

Results

RQ1: What is the relationship between gender and officers' perceptions of fit (job, organization, and group), and does it differ between types of fit? (H1): Perceptions of each type of fit will differ from one another and by gender.

To determine if there was a statistically significant difference between males and females in their level of fit, we conducted t tests (see Table 2). There were no statistically significant differences by gender for P-J or P-O fit, but there was for P-G fit. In other words, there were no differences in males' or females' perceived ability to do the job and no differences between men's and women's perceived compatibility between their characteristics and values and those of the organization. Only P-G fit differed significantly by gender; indicating women perceived their characteristics and values to be less compatible with that of their work- group's than their male counterparts did, which partially confirmed our hypothesis. Further, participants distinguished between the types of fit, rating job fit highest ($M = 4.59$, $SD = 0.56$), followed by group fit ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.75$) and organization fit ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.85$).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Fit and Workplace Incivilities by Gender.

	Overall sample		Males	Females		
Variable	M (SD)	Range	M (SD)	M (SD)	t value	p value
P-J fit (N=797)	4.59 (0.56)	1–5	4.60 (0.53)	4.54 (0.68)	−1.23	.22
P-O fit (N=795)	3.96 (0.85)	1–5	3.98 (0.82)	3.87 (0.95)	−1.32	.19
P-G fit (N=794)	4.25 (0.75)	1–5	4.30 (0.69)	4.02 (0.93)	−4.13	.00
Workplace incivilities (N=786)	2.02 (0.74)	1–5	1.96 (0.70)	2.30 (0.85)	5.10	.00

Note. P-J=person-job; P-O=person-organization; P-G=person-group.

Following the t tests, we used an ordinary least squares regression (OLS) to

examine the relationship between fit and gender while controlling for demo-graphics and other occupational characteristics. The results from Model 1 (see Table 3) indicate that job fit does not differ significantly by gender, but it does according to length of employment and rank; officers employed longer reported higher levels of job fit, and patrol officers have lower levels of job fit than officers of higher rank (e.g., sergeants, lieutenants, captains). None of the other controls were significant predictors of job fit. The results of Model 2 (see Table 3) indicate organization fit also did not differ by gender but did differ significantly by length of employment, rank, and agency. Officers employed longer reported higher levels of organization fit. Patrol officers reported lower levels of organization fit than those of higher rank. Officers from the smaller department perceived a slightly higher level of organization fit than officers from the larger department. Finally, the results of Model 3 (see Table 3) indicate group fit differed significantly by gender, rank, and marital status. Female officers reported lower levels of group fit than male officers, patrol officers reported lower levels than officers of higher rank (e.g., sergeants, lieutenants, captains), and married officers had slightly lower levels than unmarried officers.

Table 3. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression Results Predicting Perceived Person-Environment Fit.

Variable	M1: Person-job fit (n = 736) b (SE)	β	M2: Person-organization fit (n = 736) b (SE)	β	M3: Person-group fit (n = 736) b (SE)	β
Female	−0.008 (0.054)	−.006	−0.101 (0.085)	−.047	−0.299 (0.084)	−.156***
Non-White	−0.009 (0.055)	−.006	−0.039 (0.085)	−.018	−0.075 (0.073)	−.038
Length of employment	0.007 (0.002)	.118**	−0.012 (0.004)	−.133**	−0.000 (0.032)	−.002
Patrol officer	−0.190 (0.051)	−.169***	−0.508 (0.079)	−.292***	−0.236 (0.068)	−.153**
Associate or higher	−0.043 (0.045)	−.036	0.036 (0.067)	.019	−0.016 (0.061)	−.010
Married	−0.004 (0.054)	.003	0.007 (0.078)	.037	−0.144 (0.071)	−.084*
Child	0.013 (0.059)	.011	−0.011 (0.081)	−.005	0.054 (0.078)	.031
Military	0.035 (0.043)	.033	−0.068 (0.068)	−.041	−0.016 (0.061)	−.011
Department 2	0.036 (0.053)	.033	0.188 (0.080)	.111*	0.040 (0.073)	.027
Online	−0.105 (0.066)	−.093	−0.110 (0.099)	−.062	0.003 (0.089)	.002
Intercept						
R^2	.047		.066		.042	
F	3.930		6.05		3.44	

Note. Unstandardized coefficients. SE = robust standard error.
*p <.05. **p <.01. ***p < .001.

RQ2: What is the relationship between gender and reports of workplace incivilities among police officers? (H2): Women will report more workplace incivilities than their male counterparts.

To answer the second RQ, we conducted another OLS regression. As the results from Model 4 in Table 4 indicate, the reported frequency of workplace incivil- ities differed significantly by gender, length of employment, rank, and agency. Confirming our hypothesis, females reported significantly higher frequencies of workplace incivilities. Officers who have been employed longer reported more incivilities, as did patrol officers and officers from the larger department.

Table 4. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression Results Predicting Workplace Incivilities.

M4: Workplace incivilities ($n = 735$)			
Variable	b (SE)	β	p value
Female	0.286 (0.077)	.153	.000***
Non-White	−0.036 (0.075)	−.018	.629
Length of employment	0.015 (0.003)	.188	.000***
Patrol officer	0.137 (0.065)	.091	.036*
Associate's or higher	0.039 (0.058)	.024	.503
Married	−0.002 (0.070)	−.001	.982
Child	0.004 (0.075)	.003	.953
Military	0.081 (0.061)	.056	.186
Department 2	−0.139 (0.070)	−.095	.047*
Online	0.147 (0.085)	.096	.083
Intercept			
R²	.075		
F	6.480		

Note. Unstandardized coefficients. SE = robust standard error.
*$p < .05$. ***$p < .00$.

RQ3: Does workplace incivilities mediate the relationship between gender and perceptions of fit? (H3): As gendered by-products of the culture, workplace incivilities will partially explain gender differences in perceptions of fit.

To answer the final RQ, we conducted a mediation analysis. Following previous research (e.g., Preacher & Hayes, 2004, 2008), the relationship between the initial independent variable and the dependent variable does not need to be con- firmed for a mediation to occur. Thus, even though gender was not a significant predictor of Job or Organization fit, we performed a mediation test to check for inconsistent mediation or what is also known as indirect-only mediation (Zhao et al., 2010). There was no evidence of inconsistent or indirect mediation for P-J or P-O fit. Concerning P-G fit (see Table 5), gender remains a significant predictor of group fit even with the inclusion of workplace incivilities; however, the strength of the effect is reduced slightly. The results from the formal mediation analysis (see Table 5) indicated that there was a significant indirect effect of gender, which operated through workplace incivilities on group fit.

Table 5. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression Results Predicting Group Fit ($n = 735$).

Direct effects	b (SE)	B	p value
Female	−0.202 (0.078)	−0.105	.010*
Workplace incivilities	−0.337 (0.046)	−0.328	.000***
Non-White	−0.093 (0.067)	−0.046	.168
Length of employment	0.005 (0.003)	0.059	.136
Patrol officer	−0.191 (0.065)	−0.123	.003**
Associate's or higher	−0.005 (0.057)	−0.003	.927
Married	−0.145 (0.067)	-0.085	.029
Child	0.055 (0.071)	0.032	.442
Military	0.008 (0.057)	0.005	.892
Department 2	−0.007 (0.066)	−0.005	.914
Online	0.057 (0.082)	0.037	.484
Indirect effects			b [95% CIs]
Female → Incivilities	–	–	−0.12* [−0.24, −0.05]
Intercept			
R^2			.142
F			9.15

Note. Unstandardized coefficients. Bootstrapped and bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals in square brackets (10,000 replications). SE = robust standard error; CIs = confidence intervals.
*$p<.05$. **$p<.01$. ***$p<.001$.

Discussion

In 2015, President Obama's Task Force on 21st Century Policing identified increasing female representation as one way to improve police–community relationships. This focus on developing a more diverse police force has been ongoing for over a century and has resulted in a body of research on women's experiences in the field, but much remains to be learned as the gaps persist. If the field of policing is going to effectively address recruitment and retention of women, the problem needs to be attacked from multiples angles, including understanging how cultural structures may be related to integration within the organization. As such, we explored whether female and male officers varied in their perceptions of environmental fit and at what level (i.e., job, organization, work- group) differences existed. We also went beyond just describing simple gender differences by examining workplace incivilities as one possible contributor to those differences. Our findings suggest the masculine subculture (Brown, 2007) still exists, particularly at the workgroup level.

We found that of the three types of fit (job, agency, and workgroup), gender was significantly associated with perceptions of workgroup fit but not job or organization, indicating that women felt well suited for the tasks of the job, and their values aligned with the agency values and mission. This finding coincides with other research, which suggests that women in policing perform as well as men and that police organizations are evolving in a way that puts less value on gender in some areas (Rabe-Hemp, 2008). A problem, however, arises with group fit, which was significantly different for females and males and may indicate that women are still feeling less than fully integrated within the workgroup. This finding is important because workgroups include people that officers spend most of their time with and, in turn, have the most influence on outcomes, such as an officer's job satisfaction and performance. Altogether and per Acker (1992), these findings highlight the importance of paying attention to how gender may be incorporated into various substructures of an organization, particularly workgroup environments.

In addition to the findings discussed earlier, we found that gender was associated with workplace incivilities. Overall, reports of workplace incivilities were

relatively low for both men and women, but women reported significantly more. This may be evidence of the continued existence of "inequality regimes" (Acker, 2006). In particular, our findings suggest that masculinity may still play a central role in the culture of policing with women being identified as outsiders who are less deserving of respect and inclusion.

Finally, we found that workplace incivilities partially mediated the relationship between gender and group fit but not the other types of fit. That is, women's lower levels of perceived fit in the workgroup are partially explained by their elevated levels of workplace incivilities, as compared with men. Put another way, due to these experiences of workplace incivilities, as potential by-products of a gendered organization and its masculine culture, women may feel their values fail to fit with the values of their workgroup. Cementing the importance of group fit, issues at the workgroup level may be most salient because they are likely to be encountered daily, and those we interact with most frequently are likely the ones that have the most psychological impact on feelings of acceptance. It is, therefore, imperative that departments address women's roles in the field, including those at seemingly trivial levels, such as workgroups. As Acker (1992) pointed out, in gendered organizations, females are excluded from many important practices and have unequal roles. By tapping into perceived workplace incivilities, it is evident that women feel socially excluded and disrespected in their workgroups and remain in unequal positions compared with males.

Collectively, our findings highlight the importance of exploring nuance within women's experiences because, just as police culture may not be completely monolithic (Ingram et al., 2013), neither are officers' on-the-job experiences. When work-related outcomes such as fit, satisfaction, and commitment are assessed generally, variation may be obscured, but with a narrower scope, like that used in the current study, findings related to women's experiences are more telling. By identifying variation in more specific areas by gender, we can discover specific areas and elements of the job that are most troubling but also those that are most enjoyable for women. For example, a female officer may dread roll call because she often has to put up with sexist jokes, a form of incivility, which she tolerates

because she has high job fit and enjoys the nature of the job, including working with citizens and making a difference in the community. Understanding officer fit at different levels then can better inform strategies for improving upon areas of concern. These implications are pivotal to improving women's position in the field, but we must also note that workplace incivilities only partially, not fully, explain the gender difference. Thus, future work is necessary to identify other potential circumstances or cultural by-products, aside from incivilities, that help explain differences in men's and women's perceived environmental fit.

Although it was not of focus in the current study, there was a consistent effect of rank on each type of fit and workplace incivilities. Patrol officers reported lower levels of fit at all levels and reported more workplace incivilities than higher ranked officers. Patrol officers may experience lower levels of fit in the job because they deal with a wide array of duties, some of which they may not enjoy or see as relevant to the job (Reuss-Ianni & Ianni, 1983). Further, their values may not be congruent with the values of the organization because they have less hand in creating organizational policies and procedures. They may also not have to correspond with other officers in their workgroup during a typical shift, aside from a patrol partner, as much as higher rank officers might have to, which may result in feeling they do not belong in their workgroup.

Aspects of police culture may help explain the higher levels of workplace incivilities reported by patrol officers. There are cultural differences between patrol officers and officers of higher rank (Skolnick, 1994). For one, as a work-group, patrol officers may be much less professional. They might have to put up with more informal social interactions (Waddington, 1999). Some of these inter-actions may be perceived as offensive. For example, patrol officers may be more prone to highlight masculinity than those of higher rank as a result of the physicality of their jobs, through sexist and gendered jokes. Informal interactions might also be viewed as a coping mechanism for the stressful nature of their job or even as a way to build camaraderie with their colleagues and allow them to distinguish themselves from those they police (Waddington, 1999).

Although it was not explored here, there might also be a relationship between

gender and rank. Women in patrol have to manage the culture of masculinity that exists in informal interactions during roll call or out on the streets which may also explain the lower fit at the workgroup level. At the same time, women are promoted less often than men (Shjarback & Todak, 2019), which is often attributed to their inability to commit as much time as men (Silvestri, 2007, 2017). When they are promoted, they may face resistance because they are getting further from the "appropriate" roles for women. Because women remain in these low-ranking positions and, instead, see their male counterparts promoted, often with fewer qualifications than they have (Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019), they likely feel disrespected, isolated, and marginalized. In turn, these feelings of disrespect may lead to higher reports of workplace incivilities. More research is necessary to understand the types of resistance and incivilities women experiences at different ranks and how it might interfere with perceived fit within the context of policing.

Limitations

The current research is not void of limitations. First, the models we used accounted for a modest proportion of the variation in each outcome, indicating there are other important variables to be explored. That said, our findings pro- vide evidence that more attention should be paid to gendered experiences at various points within the police organization. Second, there are clear gender disparities in representation in policing, but gender as a dichotomous indicator likely obscures important information related to fit due to gender differences. Additional measures of gender roles and self-concept should be investigated as they relate to environmental fit and the experience of discrimination. Third, to measure workplace incivilities, we asked: "During your time as a police officer in your current department" Officers with more years on the job reported more incivilities, but that may be an artifact of a longer period of exposure. A better approach would have been to limit reports of incivilities to the recent past (e.g., last 12 months) to capture behaviors most likely to affect current fit perceptions and potentially strengthen models. Finally, we analyzed workplace incivilities as a mediator between gender and perceptions of fit, but it could be that perceptions of fit also influence

workplace incivilities. For example, if an individual feels they "fit in," then they may be less likely to notice and/or experience workplace incivilities.

Conclusion

      Perceptions of environmental fit are associated with important outcomes such as job satisfaction and turnover (Nye et al., 2012; Saks & Ashforth, 1997). Departments looking to recruit and retain the best, most diverse workforce, should pay special attention to creating conditions that facilitate high levels of fit between employees and the job, organization, and workgroup. When it comes to recruiting and retaining women in policing, it may be especially important to focus on issues of workgroup fit. Our research indicates that although women perceive similar levels of job and organization fit, they experience lower levels of workgroup fit than men do. This finding can be partially explained by their more frequent experiences of incivility in the workplace. Future research should explicitly examine the relationship between incivilities, workplace fit, and retention among women in policing. More work is also needed to identify the specific elements within police culture and structure that cause women to feel like they do not fit in their workgroup environment. Examining characteristics at the workgroup level (i.e., from one crew to another) might illuminate which types of workgroups are most likely to facilitate high levels of fit.

      The current study was an important step forward in understanding women's experiences in the field, and why they may leave at a rate disproportionate to men. To the best of our knowledge, it was one of the first studies to examine how women feel they fit in individual police work environments, and how these feelings of fit are related to their experiences. In addition, it is one of few studies that directly compare male and female experiences. The findings generally indicate that there has been some progress made in policing and that gender may now be less important in certain environments, precisely the job, and organization, but gender continues to influence the workgroup environment as women continue to experience discrimination and disrespect. In line with recent research, it seems change is happening, but some cultural values persist and cause negative

experiences for women (Brown, Fleming, et al., 2019). As research progresses, we can only hope that findings will continue to shed light on ways to continue to recruit women and make their experiences better in the field.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

Notes

1. Most officers responded that they were either male or female; however, a little more than 1% of officer responded with the third category, "Other."
2. The survey was still voluntary because to get the task to disappear from their training task list, officers only needed to click the external survey link (i.e., survey completion was not required to clear it from their training task list).
3. Results of factor analyses are available upon request.
4. Coding of race and rank reflects that more than half of the final sample were White (78.43%) and Patrol officers (66.09%).

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, *4*(2), 139–158.

Acker, J. (1992). From sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, *21*(5), 565–569.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society*, *20*(4), 441–464.

Adams, G. A., & Buck, J. (2010). Social stressors and strain among police officers: It's not just the bad guys. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *37*(9), 1030–1040.

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Review*, *24*(3), 452.

Archbold, C. A., Hassell, K. D., & Stichman, A. J. (2010). Comparing promotion aspirations among female and male police officers. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *12*(2), 287–303.

Archbold, C. A., & Schulz, D. M. (2008). Making rank: The lingering effects of tokenism on female police officers' promotion aspirations. *Police Quarterly*, *11*(1), 50–73.

Archbold, C. A., & Schulz, D. M. (2012). Research on women in policing: A look at the past, present, and future. *Sociology Compass*, *6*(9), 694–706.

Bretz, J., & Judge, T. A. (1994). Person–organization fit and the theory of work adjust- ment: Implications for satisfaction, tenure, and career success. *Journal of Vocational behavior*, *44*(1), 32-54.

Brown, J. (2007). From cult of masculinity to smart macho: Gender perspectives on police occupational culture. *Sociology of Crime, Law & Deviance*, *8*, 205–226.

Brown, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Qualitative differences in men and women police officers' experience of occupational stress. *Work & Stress*, *7*(4), 327–340.

Brown, J., Fleming, J., Silvestri, M., Linton, K., & Gouseti, I. (2019). Implications of police occupational culture in discriminatory experiences of senior women in police forces in England and Wales. *Policing and Society*, *29*(2), 121–136.

Brown, J., & Silvestri, M. (2019). A police service in transformation: Implications for women police officers. *Police Practice and Research*, *0*(0), 1–17.

Brown, T. C., Baldwin, J. M., Dierenfeldt, R., & McCain, S. (2019). Playing the game: A qualitative exploration of the female experience in a hypermasculine policing environ- ment. *Police Quarterly*, *23*(2), 143–173.

Cable, D. M., & Judge, T. A. (1996). Person–organization fit, job choice decisions, and organizational entry. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *67*(3), 294–311.

Chatman, J. A. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. *The Academy of*

Management Review, 14(3), 333–349.

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

Corsianos, M. (2009). *Policing and gendered justice: Examining the possibilities*. University of Toronto Press.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(1), 64–80.

Dawley, D., Houghton, J. D., & Bucklew, N. S. (2010). Perceived organizational support and turnover intention: The mediating effects of personal sacrifice and job fit. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 150*(3), 238–257.

Dodge, M., Valcore, L., & Gomez, F. (2011). Women on SWAT teams: Separate but equal? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 34*(4), 699–712.

Doerner, W. G. (1995). Officer retention patterns: An affirmative action concern for police agencies. *American Journal of Police, 14*, 197.

Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In Cooper C. L. & Robertson I. T. (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology, 1991, Vol. 6* (pp. 283–357). John Wiley & Sons.

Emsley, R., & Liu, H. (2013). *PARAMED: Stata module to perform causal mediation analysis using parametric regression models*. http://econpapers.repec.org/software/boc bocode/s457581.htm

Felkenes, G. T., Peretz, P., & Schroedel, J. R. (1993). An analysis of the mandatory hiring of females: The Los Angeles Police Department experience. *Women & Criminal Justice, 4*(2), 31–63.

Gabriel, A. S., Diefendorff, J. M., Chandler, M. M., Moran, C. M., & Greguras, G. J. (2014). The dynamic relationships of work affect and job satisfaction with perceptions of fit. *Personnel Psychology, 67*(2), 389–420.

Gabriel, A. S., Diefendorff, J. M., Chandler, M. M., Moran, C. M., & Greguras, G. J. (2014). The dynamic relationships of work affect and job satisfaction with

perceptions of fit. *Personnel Psychology*, *67*(2), 389–420.

Garcia, V. (2003). "Difference" in the police department: Women, policing, and "doing gender." *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *19*(3), 330–344.

Hyland, S. S., & Davis, E. (2019, October). *Local police departments*, 2013: Personnel (NCJ 252835). Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Ingram, J. R., Paoline, E. A., & Terrill, W. (2013). A multilevel framework for understanding police culture: The role of the workgroup. *Criminology*, *51*(2), 365–397.

Jordan, J. (2002). Will any woman do? Police, gender and rape victims. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *25*(2), 319–44.

Kringen, A. L. (2014). Scholarship on women and policing: Trends and policy implications. *Feminist Criminology*, *9*(4), 367–381.

Kringen, A. L., & Novich, M. (2018). Is it 'just hair' or is it 'everything'? Embodiment and gender repression in policing. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *25*(2), 195–213.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology*, *49*(1), 1–49.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person– group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*(2), 281–342.

Langan, D., Sanders, C. B., & Gouweloos, J. (2019). Policing women's bodies: Pregnancy, embodiment, and gender relations in Canadian police work. *Feminist Criminology*, *14*(4), 466–487.

Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *59*(3), 454–470.

Lonsway, K. A., Moore, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., & Spillar, K. (2003). *Hiring & retaining women: The advantage to law enforcement agencies*. A report for the National Center for Women & Policing, a division of the Feminist Majority

Foundation. http://womenandpolicing.com/pdf/NewAdvantagesReport.pdf

Lonsway, K. A., Paynich, R., & Hall, J. N. (2013). Sexual harassment in law enforcement: Incidence, impact, and perception. *Police Quarterly*, *16*(2), 177–210.

Lyons, H. Z., Brenner, B. R., & Fassinger, R. E. (2005). A multicultural test of the theory of work adjustment: Investigating the role of heterosexism and fit perceptions in the job satisfaction of lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(4), 537–548.

Lyons, H. Z., Mehta, M., Velez, B. L., & Neill, N. (2014). Tests of the theory of work adjustment with economically distressed African Americans. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *61*(3), 473–483.

Marsh, C. (2019). It's a man's world, try to convince the men otherwise: The role of women in Irish policing. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *29*(3), 148–162.

Martin, S. E. (1979). Policewomen and policewomen: Occupational role dilemmas and choices of female officers. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, *7*(3), 314–323.

Martin, S. E. (1999). Police force or police service? Gender and emotional labor. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *561*(1), 111–126.

Matusiak, R. E., & Matusiak, M. C. (2018). Structure and function: Impact on employment of women in law enforcement. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *28*(4), 313–335.

Mehmetoglu, M. (2016). *Applied statistics using Stata: A guide for the social sciences* (1st ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Miller, S. L. (1999). *Gender and community policing: Walking the talk*. UPNE.

Morash, M., & Haarr, R. N. (2012). Doing, redoing, and undoing gender: Variation in gender identities of women working as police officers. *Feminist criminology*, *7*(1), 3–23.

Nye, C. D., Su, R., Rounds, J., & Drasgow, F. (2012). Vocational interests and performance: A quantitative summary of over 60 years of research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*(4), 384–403.

Oswald, A., Proto, E., & Sgroi, D. (2015). Happiness and productivity. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *33*(4), 789–822.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, *36*(4), 717–731.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior research methods*, *40*(3), 879–891.

Prenzler, T., & Sinclair, G. (2013). The status of women police officers: An international review. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, *41*(2), 115–131.

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, U.S. Department of Justice.

Rabe-Hemp, C. (2008). Survival in an "all boys club": Policewomen and their fight for acceptance. *Policing; Bradford*, *31*(2), 251–270.

Rabe-Hemp, C. E. (2009). POLICEwomen or policeWOMEN?: Doing gender and police work. *Feminist Criminology*, *4*(2), 114–129.

Reuss-Ianni, E., & Ianni, F. A. J. (1983). Street cops and management cops: The two cultures of policing (pp. 251-274). In T. Newburn (Ed.), *Policing: Key readings*. Routledge.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information sources, applicant perceptions of fit, and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*(2), 395–426.

Schuck, A. M. (2019). Women policing in the United States: Post-gender institutions. In C. Rabe-Hemp & V. Garcia (Eds.), *Women policing across the globe: Shared challenges and successes in the integration of women police worldwide* (pp. 31–47). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Seklecki, R., & Paynich, R. (2007). A national survey of female police officers: An over- view of findings. *Police Practice and Research*, *8*(1), 17–30.

Shelley, T. O., Morabito, M. S., & Tobin-Gurley, J. (2011). Gendered institutions and

gender roles: Understanding the experiences of women in policing. *Criminal Justice Studies*, *24*(4), 351–367.

Shjarback, J. A., & Todak, N. (2019). The prevalence of female representation in supervisory and management positions in American law enforcement: An examination of organizational correlates. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *29*(3), 129–147.

Silvestri, M. (2007). "Doing" police leadership: Enter the "new smart macho." *Policing & Society*, *17*(1), 38–58.

Silvestri, M. (2017). Police culture and gender: Revisiting the 'cult of masculinity.' *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, *11*(3), 289–300.

Skolnick, J. (1994). A sketch of the policeman's 'working personality'. In T. Newburn (Ed.), *Policing: Key readings* (pp. 264–279). Routledge.

United States Department of Justice. (2019). *Full-time law enforcement employees by population group: Percent male and female, 2018*. https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/ 2018/crime-in-the-u.s.-2018/tables/table-74

United States Department of Labor. (2017). *Women's bureau (WB) – Civilian labor force by sex 1948-2016 annual averages*.

VanderWeele, T. J., & Vansteelandt, S. (2014). Mediation analysis with multiple mediators. *Epidemiologic Methods*, *2*(1), 95–115.

Waddington, P. A. J. (1999). Police (canteen) sub-culture: An appreciation. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *39*(2), 287–309.

Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2010). Reconsidering Baron and Kenny: Myths and truths about mediation analysis. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *37*(2), 197–206.

Author Biographies

Rachael M. Rief, MA, is a doctoral student in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska Omaha. Her research focuses on women in policing, police culture, and organizational policy, and practice in policing.

Samantha S. Clinkinbeard, PhD, is an associate professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska Omaha. Her

research interests include delinquency and substance use, motivation and self-concept, life course transitions, and women in policing.