An Examination of Eight Factors Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement

by

Helen Hae-Young Yu

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
November 16, 2011

Keywords: women, federal law enforcement,
retention, representative bureaucracy, decentralization

Approved by

Kathleen Hale, Co-Chair, Associate Professor of Political Science
Mitchell Brown, Co-Chair, Associate Professor of Political Science
Cynthia Bowling, Associate Professor of Political Science
Linda Dennard, Professor of Political Science and Public Administration
Greg Weaver, Associate Professor of Criminology

Abstract

Using a sample of 168 sworn female federal law enforcement officers with arrest and firearm authority and in-depth interviews with 20 of these women, this study examines eight factors that may or may not influence women's decision to remain in federal law enforcement. These factors include pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues, negative law enforcement work culture, perceived glass ceiling to promotions, sexual harassment and sexual discrimination, lack of high-ranking female role models, and lack of pregnancy-friendly policies and family-friendly policies. Five of the eight factors—pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues, negative law enforcement work culture, perceived glass ceiling to promotions, sexual discrimination, and lack of high-ranking female role models—are related to women's departure from federal law enforcement in bivariate analysis. Two of the eight factors—pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues and a perceived glass ceiling to promotions—are related to women's departure in federal law enforcement in multivariate analysis using the ordinary least squares method. In addition, two factors—number of high-ranking female role models and the number of permanent relocations—are related to women's departure in the near future from federal law enforcement in multivariate analysis using logistic regression. The interviews uncover additional challenges women face in federal law enforcement, including coping strategies, reasons why they stay despite the challenges, explanations for women's underrepresentation in this field, and suggestions

for retaining more women in federal law enforcement. Finally, implications for theory

and direction for future research are also discussed.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

viii

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

AFOSI	Air Force Office of Special Investigations
ATF	Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Forearms and Explosives
BFOQ	Bona fide occupational qualification
BJS	Bureau of Justice Statistics
BOI	Bureau of Investigation
BOP	Bureau of Prisons
CBP	Customs and Border Protection
DEA	Drug Enforcement Agency
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOT	Department of Transportation
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity
EEOC	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
EO	Executive Order
FAMS	Federal Air Marshal Service
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigations
FLEO	Federal Law Enforcement Officer
FLETC	Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
FMLA	Family and Medical Leave Act

GS	General Schedule
IACP	International Association of Chiefs of Police
IAWP	International Association of Women Police
ICE	US Immigration and Customs Enforcement
INS	US Immigration and Naturalization Service
IRS	Internal Revenue Service
JTTF	Joint Terrorism Task Force
LAPD	Los Angeles Police Department
LEAP	Law enforcement availability pay
NAWLEE	National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives
NCIS	Naval Criminal Investigative Service
NCWP	National Center for Women and Policing
OIG	Office of Inspector General
PDA	Pregnancy Discrimination Act
SAC	Special Agent in Charge
TDY	Temporary duty
US	United States
USA PATRIOT	United and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USDOJ BJS	United States Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics
USMS	United States Marshals Service
USPIS	United States Postal Inspection Service

USSS	United States Secret Service
VHA	Veterans Health Administration
WIFLE	Women in Federal Law Enforcement

Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

In 1970, approximately 43.3 % of women ages 16 and older are in the labor force (US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2007). By 2010, the percentage is greater than ever before with women encompassing 46.7 % of all working Americans (US Department of Labor 2011). The US Department of Labor (2011) projects that women will account for 51 % of the increase in total labor force growth between 2008 and 2018; however, despite their increase in participation over the past 40 years, the majority of women continue to work in traditionally female-dominated occupations such as secretaries and administrative assistants, registered nurses, elementary and middle school teachers, cashiers, retail salespersons, nursing and home health aides, waitresses, customer service representatives, maids and housekeeping cleaners, receptionists, and childcare workers (US Department of Labor Women's Bureau 2010).

In the past three decades, women make great strides in breaking into some male dominated or nontraditional occupations—those that have fewer than 25 % women in their employment—for reasons such as higher pay and a career ladder (US Department of Labor Women's Bureau 2009); however, law enforcement is not one of them despite the passage of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (Martin and Jurik 2006). According to the US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics (USDOJ BJS), in 2004, federal law enforcement

agencies have over 105,000 sworn officers[1] of whom 16.1 % are women, up from 14.8 %

in 2002 and 13.9 % in 1996 (Langton 2010; Reaves 1998, 2003, 2006) but far below

breaking the nontraditional threshold. The percentages are even lower in local and state

law enforcement. In 2007, women comprise just 12 % of officers in local police

departments (out of over 446,900 sworn officers), up from 10.6 % in 2000 and 7.6 % in

1987, and only 11.2 % of officers in sheriffs' offices (out of over 175,000 sworn

officers), a considerable drop from 15.6 % in 1997 and 12.6 % in 1987 (Langton 2010;

Hickman and Reaves 2006a, 2006b). In state law enforcement, women comprise only

6.5 % in 2007 (out of over 58,000 sworn officers), a slight decline from 6.7 % in 2003

but a sizeable increase from 3.8 % in 1987 (Langton 2010).

Women in federal law enforcement are the least visible of all women in

policing—because they transfer frequently and are often in agencies that avoid rather

than seek publicity, they receive little media attention (Schulz 2009). This is further

evident by the lack of existing research on women in federal law enforcement by the

policing research community and even more by those who study nontraditional

occupations (Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009). However, with over 100 federal law

enforcement agencies (Ackerman 2006; Bumgarner 2006) that employ over 105,000

sworn officers on behalf of federal agencies operating in all 50 states, the District of

Columbia, US territories and in an ever-increasing number of foreign countries, as well

as enforce a wide range of laws and regulations and offer unique opportunities for

interesting responsibilities and specialties (Reaves 2006), the women in federal law

enforcement are worth exploring, especially since the percentage of women in federal

---

[1] According to the US DOJ BJS, sworn officers are law enforcement officials who have the authority to
make arrests and carry firearms.

law enforcement has remain relatively static at a time when there is a vast increase in the overall number of federal law enforcement personnel in the past 10 years (Langton 2010). Why then are women underrepresented in federal law enforcement?

The purpose of this study is to identify those factors that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement. Research suggests that women are not making quick exits from the profession (IACP 1998), indicating that problems are not with recruiting but rather aspects of the job itself. What accounts for this turnover is not clearly understood, however, eight factors in particular appear to be salient: 1) perceived negative attitudes from male colleagues, 2) perceived negative law enforcement work culture, 3) perceived lack of promotional opportunities, 4) perceived lack of female role models, 5) perceived sexual harassment, 6) perceived sexual discrimination, 7) perceived gender specific obstacles of childcare and 8) perceived gender specific obstacles with pregnancy (Fry 1983; Keverline 2003; Martin 1980; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Timmons and Hainsworth 1989; Wexler and Logan 1983).

Studying the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement contributes to the study of public administration, especially in regards to passive and active representative bureaucracy. The literature of representative bureaucracy, which examines the relative reflection of population demographics in the composition of bureaucratic agencies, has grown rapidly in recent years (Bowling et al. 2006; Dolan 2000; Keiser et al. 2002; Kelly and Newman 2001; Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006; Naff 2001; Riccucci 2002; Sowa and Selden 2003; Wilkins 2006). This literature concerns not just with the composition of the bureaucracy to reflect the demographic characteristics of the public they serve (passive representation) (Denhardt and deLeon

1995; Krislov 1974; Krislov and Rosenbloom 1981; Meier 1975; Nachmias and Rosenbloom 1973; Saltzstein 1979; Selden 1997; Sowa and Selden 2003; Stein 1986; Wilkins 2006) but also the repercussions that representation has for policy-making and policy implementation (active representation) (Bowling et al. 2006; Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006; Sowa and Selden 2003). Scholars assert that under certain conditions, bureaucrats have the ability to "translate values linked to demographic origins into decisions that benefit individuals of similar origins" (Meier 1993, 1). These values can then conceive of directly influencing the behavior of the administrators, directing them toward using their discretion to foster an improvement for equity of those who have been underrepresented in the implementation of public programs (Mosher 1982; Rourke 1984; Sowa and Selden 2003). Research by Sowa and Selden (2003) strongly supports the conclusion that administrators who perceive themselves as possessing significant discretion and who assume the role of minority representative in their agencies are more likely to enact policy outcomes that favor minority interests.

Examining the applicability of representative bureaucracy to women in federal law enforcement is particularly appropriate due to the traditional views of law enforcement as a male-dominated profession (Brown and Sargent 1995; Dick and Jankowicz 2001; Franklin 2005; Hughes 2010; Martin and Jurik 2006; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Wood et al. 2004; Young 1991) even though research clearly demonstrates the advantages to hiring and retaining female law enforcement officers (Balkin 1988; Casidy, Nicholl and Ross 2011; Fry and Greenfeld 1980; Grennan 1987; Horne 2006; Horvath 1987; Martin 2001; Martin and Jurik 2006; Mayo 2006; NCWP 2002a, 2002b, 2003a; Pike 1985; Tuomey and Jolly 2009). If 46.7 % of all working Americans are women (US

4

Department of Labor 2011), why do women comprise only 16.1 % of all sworn officers in federal law enforcement? According to Kanter's (1977) theory of proportional representation or "tokenism," employment organizations having a very low percentage of minority workers place multiple stressors on those persons. Yoder (1994) further interprets Kanter's (1977) definition of tokenism by stating tokenism occurs whenever the minority makes up less than 15 % of the whole. Though women in federal law enforcement (barely) surpass this token threshold, Brown (1998), who concurs that the low number of women in organizations serve as an influential inhibitor in the equal treatment of women in the workforce, further suggests that until women reach a 25 % proportion of the total workforce, they will continue to suffer token status, which ultimately reinforces negative stereotypes (Krimmel and Gormley 2003). Dahlerup (1988; 2005) also extends Kanter's (1977) analysis and pin points 30 % as the crucial cut-off point for impact by a minority group. Until that minimum representation is met, women will not be able to make a substantial difference in promoting women-friendly policy change or to influence their male colleagues (Childs and Krook 2008).

As such, increasing women's representation in male dominated environments such as federal law enforcement may just require more women in positions of power (Stokes and Scott 2006; Warner, Steel, and Lovrich 1989). This assertion lends support to Dahlerup's (1988; 2005) argument that it's not always the numbers, i.e. 30 %, that count but the performance of a few outstanding women as role models. Female role models are important in federal law enforcement because without them, junior female federal law enforcement officers are excluded from informal networks that are essential to the police culture (Martin 1980; Wells and Alt 2005; Wexler and Logan 1983). In

addition, according to the representative bureaucracy literature, agencies with a higher percentage of sworn female officers and female administrative leadership are assumed to provide female officers with greater promotional opportunities (Martin 1980; Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006; O'Toole 1987; Schulz 2004) and help with retention of female officers (Kranda 1998).

Understanding the factors that explain the underrepresentation of female federal law enforcement officers is an important policy issue; however, the implementation and execution of policy is dependent on the centralization and decentralization of the American federal system, especially since federal law enforcement is decentralized in nature. In addition, decentralization lends support for discretion to play an important role in implementing and enforcing potential women-friendly policies. For example, since there are a wide variety of agencies at the state and in federal law enforcement, administrators exercise discretion to support or not support certain policy issues.

Federalism and Intergovernmental Relations

Overview

Articles I, II, and III of the US Constitution creates an elaborate system of checks and balances so that the power of the federal government is shared by the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government (Herman and Finkelman 2008). The Tenth Amendment (1791) further establishes the principle of federalism, a political system in which sovereignty (power) is shared between national (federal) and regional (state) governments (O'Toole 2006; Stephens and Wikstrom 2006), creating a vertical check on the federal government that complements the horizontal check on each branch (Herman and Finkelman 2008). As such, while there is only one national government,

6

there are also 50 sovereign state governments. Further, existing under the authority of state governments are thousands of counties and tens of thousands of municipal, township, and special district governments (Bumgarner 2006; O'Toole 2006). And in regards to law enforcement, no one law enforcement agency in the US exists that has total jurisdiction.

The Constitution is fairly cryptic about the nature of the relationship between the federal and state governments. The Supremacy Clause of Article VI is clear in stating that laws consonant with the Constitution will be supreme, regardless of whether some states disagree with those laws. Other provisions, however, establish parameters for allocating decision-making authority between the national government and the states. For example, Article I, Section 8, provides an affirmative list of powers granting Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce, coin money and declare war, on the theory that the federal government may wield those powers specify in the Constitution. Conversely, Article I, Section 9, lists a number of things Congress may not do, like suspend habeas corpus, grant titles of nobility or privilege the ports of one state over another. In addition, Article I, Section 10, prohibits the states from exercising power in certain areas where federal choices are intended to be exclusive. Despite this general attempt to define the allocation of powers, it is not always easy to determine. In addition, it can be equally difficult to decide the extent to which the Tenth Amendment limits the federal government's choices, or guarantees the states spheres of autonomy the federal government may not invade. As such, it comes as no surprise that questions about when state and local governments may autonomously create and enforce their own laws and

when they accede and cooperate with federal laws has been central throughout the history of our country (Herman and Finkelman 2008).

Judicial review has given the judiciary a place at the table of national power. Since 1803, the Court has defined the limits of government authority and drawn the line between the responsibilities of the states and the national government. The role of the Court as the arbiter of power has been a point of dispute ever since the judiciary began using judicial review. Whether the Supreme Court shall play an authoritative role in determining the boundaries of federalism is clearly an argument without resolution; however, the Court has redefined federalism several times, depending on emerging issues, changing values of society, and the jurists' interpretation of how those issues and values mesh with the Constitution (Gerston 2007).

Early Supreme Court decisions favor the federal government and protect it against bold claims of autonomy raised by the states, particularly in policy areas requiring a need for national uniformity. For example, in March 1819, the Supreme Court holds that the Supremacy Clause prevents the state of Maryland from taxing a federal enterprise; in this case the Bank of the United States, and that Congress has the authority to create a national bank under the Necessary and Proper Clause of Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution (Herman and Finkelman 2008). However, the divisive issue of slavery pits national authority against state autonomy, and the Supreme Court attempts to enforce an uneasy compromise, allowing the states to decide for themselves whether or not to permit slavery by limiting the choice of the free states with respect to fugitive slaves (*Prigg v. Pennsylvania* 1842). In addition, the Supreme Court holds that the Constitution prevents Congress from making Dred Scott a free man when he moves to a free territory on the

ground that Scott's owner has a federal constitutional right to the "property" another state has given him the legal right to own (*Dred Scott v. Sandford* 1857). Consequently, the disagreements over slavery rights and states' rights are not resolved which ultimately leads to war (Herman and Finkelman 2008).

Following the Civil War, the Amendments of the Reconstruction Era essentially rearranges the relationship between the federal and state governments empowering the federal government to take the lead in promoting a newly expanded national agenda. During the 20th century, the Supreme Court approves federal labor laws and other legislation reflecting a desire for uniform national policies under the Commerce Clause (*A.L.A Schechter Poultry Corp v. United States* 1935; *Carter v. Carter Coal Co.* 1936; *United States v. Darby* 1941; and *Wickard v. Filburn* 1942). However, in 1995, the Supreme Court begins enforcing limitations on federal power, setting out constitutional rules that circumscribe the relationship between the federal, state and local governments and limit Congress' power both under the Commerce Clause (*United States v. Lopez* 1995; *United States v. Morrison* 2000) and the Fourteenth Amendment (*United States v. Morrison* 2000; *City of Boerne v. Flores* 1997). As such, judicial decisions have institutionalized a range of discretion at each level of government, at times retarding national policy changes, as well as state policy changes that are venues for potential significant litigation.

The appropriate policymaking role for state and local governments in the American federal system also receives considerable attention during the past several decades (Bowman and Krause 2003). Centralization argues for the national government to assume more power and authority in relation to states and localities and

decentralization advocates a shift in power towards sub-national governments (Bowman and Krause 2003; O'Toole 2007). While some of the advantages to decentralized federalism include reduction of conflict by reflecting local differences in policy decisions and policy experimentation that allow for a more efficient or effective pursuit of preexisting national policy goals, there are disadvantages to decentralized federalism as well (Stephens and Wikstrom 2007). Some of those disadvantages include duplication and confusion by multiple political actors, difficulty with coordination because states operate as independent and sovereign units and potential inequality in services and policy across states (Stephens and Wikstrom 2007); however, the current American institutional arrangement is set-up to promote multiple smaller agencies rather than one large overarching agency. This is apparent in federal law enforcement due to its decentralized nature. Since the representative bureaucracy literature presumes that agencies with a high percent of sworn female officers and female administrative leadership will provide female officers with greater promotional opportunities (Martin 1980; Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006; O'Toole 1987; Schulz 2004) and help with retention of female officers (Kranda 1998), then those agencies without the 25-30 % threshold of female federal officers are presumed not to assist female officers with promotional opportunities. Conversely, even if many of the federal agencies do have the 25-30 % threshold of female officers, there is no guarantee that these agencies will even make policy decisions to support women and if they do, there will likely be different approaches for creating and implementing women-friendly policies that in the end will not necessarily help women in federal law enforcement.

Depending on the issue or policy area, three models of intergovernmental relations describe the interaction between federal and state governments. First, the coordinate-authority model of intergovernmental relations establishes distinct boundaries between federal jurisdiction and state jurisdiction; local units are part of and dependent on state governments. Following Dillon's Rule, the most classic expression of state-local relations, local entities are creatures of the state, subject to creation and abolition and exercise only those powers expressly granted. The coordinate-authority model implies that the two types of entities are independent and autonomous and linked only tangentially. Their boundaries are open to interpretation by the Supreme Court should the two entities clash (Wright 2007).

The second model of intergovernmental relations is the inclusive authority model. This model maintains a dependent relationship with authority exercise through hierarchy. The national government determines state actions, and state and local governments depend entirely on national decisions, resulting into a centralized hierarchical system. Finally, the third model of intergovernmental relations is the overlapping authority model which establishes a more cooperative and bargaining-exchange-type of relationship. Agreements are reached through negotiations and involve simultaneous competition and cooperation. The overlapping-authority model maintains an interdependent relationship, involving all three levels simultaneously. Though areas of autonomy remain, they are relatively small and changeable (Wright 2007).

These models over time reflect a new addition to the study of intergovernmental relationships. Emerging literature on the importance of networks has shown how nongovernmental organizations (for-profit and nonprofit) exchange information, manage

knowledge, and address problems of mutual concern with public officials at all levels of government (Agranoff 2007). Klijn (2003, 32) suggests that "networks facilitate interaction, decision-making, cooperation and learning, since they provide the resources to support these activities, such as recognizable interaction patterns, common rules, and organizational forms and sometimes even a common language." They also depict networks as bodies that connect "public policies with their strategic and institutionalized context: the network of public, semi-public, and private actors participating in certain policy fields" (Agranoff 2007; Kickert, Klijn and Koppenjan 1997, 1) to "solve problems that cannot be solved, or solved easily, by single organizations" (Agranoff and McGuire 2003, 4). Networks are by no means replacing hierarchies but rather form an overlay over the governmental agencies to bridge organizational information gaps and asymmetries (Agranoff 2007). O'Toole (1997) suggests nongovernmental organizations tackle the policy problems that cut across boundaries of agencies and programs, deal with ambitious policy goals in contexts of dispersed power, face political demands for inclusion and broader influence, and deal with second-order effects and layers of mandates from federal and state governments. Sometimes, the employment of networks has led to the minimization of the governmental actors (Agranoff 2007). Non-profit organizations and networks of non-profits spread policy information and can help government agencies build capacity for change (Hale 2011). This is particular true for women in federal law enforcement. Due to the decentralized nature of federal law enforcement, reputable non-profit organizations such as Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE) are leading the charge in promoting women-friendly policies throughout federal law enforcement and making policy recommendations on topics such

as pregnancy to all federal agency directors. Without WIFLE to advocate for these women, there is no guarantee the over 100 federal law enforcement agencies independently will provide extra support to their female federal officers. In addition, other non-profit organizations such as the International Association of Women Police (IAWP), the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE), and the National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP) provide information, guidance, and support to female law enforcement officers, as well as educate police administrators, politicians, the media, and the public about the benefits of increasing the number of women in law enforcement.

US Constitution and Federal Police Powers

In regards to the genesis of federal police powers, the Constitution does not grant the federal government general police powers. The Constitution reserves police powers to the states. In addition, the Tenth Amendment also seems to suggest that law enforcement is a function of the state government. However, other parts of the Constitution imply the existence of federal police powers to enforce some criminal laws. For example, in Article III, Section 3, it states that treason against the US is a crime and that Congress has the power to declare punishment for treason, suggesting that the criminal offense falls under the federal government for investigation and prosecution. In addition, the Necessary and Proper Clause in Article I, Section 8, states that Congress has the power to make all laws necessary and proper in executing the "foregoing powers," defined as those explicit powers to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among several states, to establish uniform laws on bankruptcy, to provide for the punishment of

counterfeiting, and to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, again implying a federal law enforcement function (Bumgarner 2006).

As such, federalism allows the criminal justice system to develop at both the state and federal level and according to Dillon's Rule, local governments fall under the authority of state governments. Most of these local governments employ full-time law enforcement officers whose responsibilities are to police the particular geographic boundaries of the employing government or jurisdiction—the authority to enforce particular laws in particular political and/or geographic boundaries. Though federal law enforcement agencies have broad geographic jurisdiction throughout the US and its territories, the federal laws they have the authority to enforce tend to be narrowly focused. On the other hand, local law enforcement can make an arrest for virtually any criminal law that is broken—federal, state, or local—however; they are generally limited geographically to their municipality (Bumgarner 2006).

Police powers are intentionally limiting in breadth and depth so that no single law enforcement agency or government jurisdiction has too much power. Another advantage to this decentralized nature of law enforcement is that law enforcement efforts are more manageable and efficient, at least locally. In addition, there is an opportunity to observe many different manners of policing and to identify best practices. However, there are also disadvantages to a decentralized law enforcement structure. For starters, the quality of police services varies from state to state and community to community. In addition, the federal government is unable to mandate a specific model of policing that is worth implementing. But above all, the lack of standardization poses challenges to coordination when joint efforts, such as homeland security or a response to public safety concerns with

overlapping jurisdictions, are required. In fact, competition between agencies can promote an intentional lack of cooperation. This suggests that new policies or progressive policies such as family-friendly policies might be less likely to spread into other jurisdictions (Bumgarner 2006).

In theory, law enforcement in the US falls under the coordinate-authority model of intergovernmental relations, which establishes distinct boundaries between federal and state jurisdiction (Wright 2007). On June 27, 1997, the Supreme Court rules in *Printz v. United States* that it is unconstitutional to require local law enforcement officials to assist in conducting background checks before issuance of a gun permit under the federal Brady Act. The Court argues that states as a sovereign government have the right to choose whether or not to participate in a federal enforcement program. However, on the other hand, state and local governments may not prohibit federal investigators from operating within their jurisdictions, even when the federal agents' actions will violate state law. On June 4, 1928, the Supreme Court rules in *Olmstead v. United States* that the federal government may preempt state or local laws that hinder national interests, in this case wiretapping, because of the Supremacy Clause. Thus, *Printz* prohibits commandeering local law enforcements but it does not prohibit circumventing or ignoring them (Herman and Finkelman 2008).

Following 9/11, the law enforcement paradigm changes dramatically. Federal resources move from traditional crime fighting to terrorism, while many state and local police agencies expand their roles to include the prevention of and response to terrorism. At the federal level, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is the lead agency for responding to acts of domestic terrorism. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

serves in a broad capacity, facilitating collaboration between local and federal law

enforcement to develop a national strategy to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against,

respond to and recover from terrorist attacks from the US (Hess 2009).

As a result, for matters such as combating terrorism and homeland security, law

enforcement in the US falls under the overlapping authority model of intergovernmental

relations, establishing a more cooperative and bargaining-exchange-type of relationship

(Wright 2007). For example, in September and October 2001, the FBI requests the

assistance of local law enforcement officials in questioning approximately 5,000 Arab

and Muslim men around the country (Herman and Finkelman 2008). Legally, local law

enforcement officials do not have to cooperate with the FBI per *Printz*; however, most

throughout the country cooperate with federal authorities due to homeland security

concerns. In addition, many state and local agencies have voluntarily agreed to enforce

federal immigration laws as part of a "narrow anti-terrorism mission" (Herman and

Finkelman 2008). Furthermore, local law enforcement joins over 100 Joint Terrorism

Task Forces (JTTFs) throughout the country with formal agreements spelling out the

nature of local cooperation with federal agents (Bumgarner 2006; Herman and Finkelman

2008).

Background on Federal Law Enforcement[2]

Introduction

The power of the federal government to engage in law enforcement activities

expands considerably in practice since the adoption of the US Constitution. The federal

criminal code covers many types of criminal beyond the scope of our Constitution's

---

[2] Unless otherwise cited, the information in this section is derived from Bumgarner, Jeffrey B. 2006. *Federal agents: The growth of federal law enforcement in America.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

framers. The federal criminal laws of the US are primarily (but not exclusively) in Title

18 of the US Code. Well over 100 chapters appear in Title 18 (see Appendix A), and

each chapter relates broadly to an area of criminal law, containing several sub-sections

that deal with a specific criminal offense that adjudicate as a federal offense, regardless

of whether comparable state laws exist that can address the same criminal conduct. For

most of these laws, the constitutional nexus for their passage and enforcement is the

Interstate Commerce Clause. Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution gives

Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign countries, among states, and with

Indian tribes. This power has become the primary basis for federal government's

involvement in criminal matters. However, the power to regulate interstate commerce is

not always sufficient to trigger proper federal authority. In *United States v. Lopez* (1995),

the Supreme Court rules that Congress exceeds its authority in passing the Gun Free

School Zones Act (1990) which makes it a federal felony-level crime to knowingly

possess a firearm while inside a school zone. The Supreme Court rules in a 5-4 decision

that the law is unconstitutional and determines there are limits to the federal government's

role in matters of criminal justice particularly when the rationale for the government's

involvement is based on interstate commerce.

Initial Growth of Federal Law Enforcement

In the late 18th century, federal law enforcement agencies have concerns with

essentially four missions: taxes and tariffs, the postal system, securing public facilities,

and the judicial system. Although law enforcement is generally a local responsibility,

Congress creates several federal law enforcement agencies under the jurisdiction of the

Departments of Justice and Treasury to meet the demands of the nation's changing

17

condition. Many federal law enforcement agencies trace their heritage back to the mission of enforcing tax and tariff laws. The Tariff Act of 1789, sign into law by President George Washington on July 4, 1789, authorizes the federal government to collect duties for goods coming into and from the US. Later that month, Congress creates the US Customs Service [now the US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)], the first and oldest federal law enforcement agency under the Department of Treasury, to enforce tariff and trade laws, and for preventing smuggling and piracy (Saba 2003). Another early federal law enforcement agency responsible for fighting pirates and intercepting contraband such as illegal drugs or weapons and illegally importing slaves is the Revenue Cutter Service which is the direct ancestor of the US Coast Guard (USCG) (US Coast Guard 2002).

The second mission of concern for federal law enforcement agencies in the late 18th century is the postal system. After the adoption of the Constitution, Congress creates the Office of Postmaster General. Though the position "surveyor" is created in 1772 by Postmaster General Benjamin Franklin during the colonial postal period, these surveyors pursue those engaged in embezzlement in the post offices and those who rob mail riders and mail stagecoaches, steamboats, and trains. Their title officially changes to "Special Agent"[3] in 1801, and they carry firearms and execute law enforcement powers (US Postal Service 2010).

The third mission of concern for federal law enforcement agencies in the late 18th and early 19th century is securing public facilities. Through the Residence Act of 1790, the US government locates to Philadelphia for 10 years while public buildings are

---

[3] Special agent is the common title for sworn officers who work in federal law enforcement.

undergoing construction in the District of Columbia (US Senate Historian 2010). During

the construction period, a single watchman at any given time guards the Capital Building

and its grounds. Several incidents in the 1820s, however, draw attention to the need for

more security personnel and on April 29, 1828, Congress creates a police force for the

Capital Building and the immediate area around it. For the remainder of the first half of

the 19th century, federal and local authorities work closely together to provide protection

to the public buildings, and federal police agencies such as the US Capital Police and

what later becomes the US Park Police under the Department of Interior begin to evolve

as legitimate police service providers.

Lastly, the fourth and broadest mission of concern for federal law enforcement

agencies in the late 18th century is supporting the judicial system. The US Marshals

Service (USMS) forms through the Judiciary Act of 1789 to serve writs and processes on

behalf of federal judicial districts (Turk 2005). Legislation gives US Marshals broad

powers to perform their duties, to include the power to carry firearms, make arrests, and

conduct searches and seizures pursuant to court-approved warrants. They are responsible

for executing orders of the judiciary but also have responsibilities to the other branches of

government as well. US Marshals and their deputies serve as general law enforcers for

the federal government and the criminal laws of the US. In particular, they enforce US

tax laws, the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, counterfeiting of federal coin and

currency, and slave trade violations.

During the late 1700s and 1800s, the USMS is the primary face of federal law

enforcement. They revisit their earlier role as guardians against espionage (from the War

of 1812) during the Civil War (1861-1865) and seize property and money to deposit into

federal coffers in breach of the First Confiscation Act of 1861 and Second Confiscation Act of 1862. Following the Civil War, they enforce the new provisions of the Constitution namely the 13th Amendment (1865) which outlaws slavery, the 14th Amendment (1868) which make slaves citizens and afford them due process of law, and the 15th Amendment (1870) which guarantee former slaves the right to vote. In addition, they enforce the Force Act of 1870, Civil Rights Act of 1871 and exercise broad law enforcement authority in the Indian Territory.

Modern Federal Law Enforcement

On June 22, 1870, President Ulysses S. Grant signs the "Act to Establish the Department of Justice" which creates the US Justice Department, and among other things, give them the overarching authority to control federal law enforcement. During this important and dramatic time in history, in addition to the USMS being place under the Department of Justice, an expansion of other federal law enforcement agencies emerge, most notably the US Secret Service (USSS). The USSS forms on July 5, 1865, and fall under the Department of Treasury. Their specific mission is to halt counterfeiting, releasing the USMS of that responsibility; however, the dignitary protection duties of which they are primarily known for today begin informally in 1894. In 1902, the USSS assumes full-time responsibility for protecting the President but it is not until 1906 when Congress passes the Sundry Civil Expense Act for 1907 which gives the USSS the responsibility for protecting the President and provides funds to the Department of Treasury for that purpose. Another federal agency that emerge during this time (July 1, 1862) is the Bureau of Internal Revenue [renamed the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in 1953]. For decades, the USMS and to a lesser degree the USSS enforce

tax laws; however, on July 1, 1919, the Commission for Internal Revenue creates their Intelligence Unit to investigate tax fraud (TRAC Syracuse University 2010).

Despite the increased role and numbers of federal law enforcement agencies during this period, nothing is more significant than the transfer of ten USSS agents to the Department of Justice in July 1908 to form a small investigative unit known as the Bureau of Investigation (BOI) [renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) in 1935]. The years 1910-1935 observe the passage of significant federal legislation that broadens the jurisdiction of BOI. First, in 1910, Congress passes the Mann Act which bars white slave trafficking and expands BOI's jurisdiction over interstate crime. In 1917, Congress passes the Espionage Act which empowers the BOI to confront subversives within the US, removing responsibility from the USMS. And in October 1919, Congress passes the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, which makes it a federal crime to bring stolen vehicles across state lines and give investigative responsibility to the BOI. However, the most infamous crime that will shape the image and jurisdiction of the BOI occurs on March 1, 1932, when the 20-month old son of aviation hero Charles Lindbergh is missing from his home in Hopewell, New Jersey. Though the BOI provides special agents to support the investigation of the New Jersey State Police, they are only there in an auxiliary capacity since no federal kidnapping law yet exists. In May 1932, officials find the toddler's body and in response to the public outcry of the crime, Congress passes the Federal Kidnapping Act in 1932, making kidnapping a federal crime when the act involves crossing state borders. In September 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt gives the BOI exclusive federal jurisdiction to work the case. Through

extensive investigative efforts, the BOI identifies and arrests the kidnappers, and convicts

Bruno Hauptmann for kidnapping and murder in February 1935.

The BOI also gains prestige in the 1930s by investigating renegade gangsters who

are pillaging from state to state throughout the Midwest. In 1934, Congress enacts

legislation that officially give BOI special agents the authority to carry firearms and make

arrests (Fox 2003) which enhances the authority of the BOI to actually arrest gangsters

and bank robbers who cross state lines to avoid capture. Also in 1934, Congress enacts

the Federal Bank Robbery Statute which makes it a federal offense to rob a financial

institution whose holdings are insured by the Federal government. Furthermore, on June

28, 1940, Congress enacts the Smith Act making it a federal crime to advocate the violent

overthrow of the US. As such, at the conclusion of World War II, the FBI has lead

responsibility for eliminating the threat and influence of Communism in the US and

utilizes the Smith Act to pursue vocal Communists. The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 also

gives the FBI the authority to root out non-violent Communists who hold sensitive

positions in government service. By the mid-1950s, the FBI assigns many of their agents

to the counterespionage mission.

One of the most interesting developments in federal law enforcement during the

20th century is the creation and rise of the Offices of Inspector General (OIGs). The

mission and structure of the federal OIG offices are in the Inspector General Act of 1978.

Every federal executive branch cabinet-level department, as well as dozens of smaller,

independent agencies, has an OIG. In fact, there are 58 OIGs in federal service today

(Ackerman 2006). Each OIG has within its own organization a criminal investigative

unit that addresses matters of fraud and abuse. These special agents are fraud

investigators specializing in a variety of white collar crimes and investigate issues where the US government serves as the victim.

Today, the FBI is clearly the face of federal law enforcement and has over 100 field offices and jurisdiction for more than 200 federal crimes (Ackerman 2006; Damp 2008; Hess 2009); but the strong reputation of federal law enforcement is not built by them alone. Other major federal law enforcement agencies worth mentioning include the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), the US Forest Service, the Bureau of Diplomatic Security, the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), and the Air Force Office of Special Investigations (AFOSI). In total, over 100 federal enforcement agencies exist across the entire federal domain (Ackerman 2006). See Appendix B for a listing of all federal agencies employing full-time personnel with authority to make arrests and carry firearms.

Finally, in the wake of 9/11, two major pieces of legislation change the way federal law enforcement conducts its business. One is the United and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act of 2001 which President George W. Bush signs into law on October 26, 2001 (Foerstel 2008). The 342-page USA PATRIOT Act is so massive and technical that both supporters and critics are free to interpret it loosely and in partisan fashion (Foerstel 2008). However, prior to 9/11, significant impediments do encumber federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies to thwart acts of terror, and it is the removal of those impediments that is the objective of the USA PATRIOT Act. As a result, the USA PATRIOT Act greatly enhances the federal government's ability to prevent terrorism by using more aggressive surveillance techniques such as delay

notification search warrants, roving wiretaps, and National Security Letters (Mayer 2009). In addition, the USA PATRIOT Act includes anti-money laundering provisions, more resources for border security, and new intelligence activities (Mayer 2009).

The other significant legislation is the Homeland Security Act of 2002 which President George W. Bush signs into law on November 25, 2002 (Ackerman 2006). This law creates the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and 22 federal agencies transfer to DHS (Mayer 2009). DHS is the third largest cabinet department in the federal government after the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (Hess 2009) and employs more federal law enforcement officers than any other federal department through seven federal law enforcement agencies: the USSS, the USCG, the ICE, the US Border Patrol, the Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the Federal Air Marshal Service, and the Federal Protective Service. Oddly (or not), the primary agency responsible for defending the homeland—the FBI—is absent from DHS as they remain under the Department of Justice.

Background on Women in Federal Law Enforcement

Women's Entry into Federal Law Enforcement

No women working as law enforcement officers today have endure greater barriers to equality than the women who work in federal law enforcement (Schulz 2009). Although municipal police departments began employing women in the early 1900s (Horne 2006), women's entry into federal law enforcement does not occur until the mid-twentieth century and is complicated by a number of laws—not merely tradition—that limit their full participation.

President Richard M. Nixon paves the modern entry of women into federal law enforcement on August 8, 1969, when he signs Executive Order (EO) 11478, "Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government," which provides equal opportunity in federal employment for all persons; prohibits discrimination in federal employment because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, handicap, or age; and promotes equal employment opportunity through a continuing affirmative program in each executive department and agency (WIFLE 1991). Although the wording of EO 11478 appears to prohibit discrimination against women in special agent positions, a "firearms" exception stemming from an earlier law in 1870 and several legal interpretations hence forth continue to bar women from these positions (Schulz 2009). Civil service regulations specify that all appointments are without regard to sex unless the Civil Service Commission grants an exception. One of those exceptions is "law enforcement jobs requiring the bearing of firearms" (Schulz 2009, 676). Although Congress finally repeals the 1870 law in 1965, the Civil Service Commission does not cancel the "firearms" exception until 1971 (Hellriegel and Short, 1972; Markoff, 1972). Only then do women become eligible for positions in the GS-1811[4] and other job series that require carrying a firearm. As with many of the laws that open up traditionally male employment areas to women, neither EO 11478 nor the action of the Civil Service Commission appear in a vacuum. The 1963 Equal Pay Act outlaws salary discrimination on the basis of sex and in October 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson issues EO 11375, which adds sex to the existing prohibited forms of discrimination (Martin and Jurik 2006). In addition, in November 1971, the Supreme Court rules in *Reed v. Reed* that the equal protection clause

---

[4] A federal occupational group that classifies law enforcement positions with the title Criminal Investigator or Special Agent.

in the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex (Wells and Alt

2005). While these legislative and executive actions have an immediate impact on

women's presence in non-law enforcement jobs, the firearms exception has the effect of

continuing past discrimination until the firearms exception is eliminated in 1971. That

year, the USSS and the US Postal Inspection Service (USPIS) became the first agencies

to swear in women special agents (Bumgarner 2006). Other agencies such as the

Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) (now known as ICE) and the ATF

implement the change after the amendment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in March

1972 (Hess 2009; Wells and Alt 2005). The FBI, however, does not hire women until

after the death of J. Edgar Hoover when on May 2, 1972, acting director L. Patrick Gray

III orders that women will be agents (Schulz 2005). By late 1972 and throughout 1973,

the initial groups of women begin to emerge from training as special agents.

First Women Directors

Women have now been working almost 40 years as special agents and since the

1990s, in a variety of supervisory and management positions. But it isn't until 2003 that

Karen P. Tandy, who is the new Director of the DEA, becomes the first woman to head a

major federal law enforcement agency. Tandy, who has experience as a federal drug

prosecutor, is an associate deputy attorney general and director of the Organized Crime

Drug Enforcement Task Force at the time of her appointment. The nomination by

President George W. Bush of Michele M. Leonhart as Tandy's deputy is also an

important first since Leonhart, a career DEA special agent who is in charge of its Los

Angeles field office, is the first woman in her agency to come from the agent's rank to fill

a top management position (Schulz 2004). Leonhart later becomes the Director of the

DEA on December 22, 2010 when the Senate unanimously confirms her nomination by President Barack H. Obama.

In addition, after 30 years of service in January 2004, Barbara Riggs becomes the first woman deputy director of the USSS. She is the tenth woman agent the USSS ever hires, the first woman field office supervisor, and the first woman to supervise a presidential protective division. Furthermore, in January 2004, the IRS names Nancy J. Jardini chief of the Criminal Investigation Division, the agency's law enforcement sector. She becomes the first woman to lead the organization, directing a staff of about 4,500 employees, including almost 3,000 special agents in which more than a quarter are women. Like Tandy, she does not come from the agents' ranks but moves to the IRS from the Justice Department in 2000 and has previous experience as a federal prosecutor and a defense lawyer (Schulz 2005).

Finally, on December 31, 2010, after 30 years of law enforcement and management experience, President Barack H. Obama appoints Stacia A. Hylton as the 10th Director of the USMS. Like Leonhart, she too comes up through the ranks starting her career in 1980 as a Deputy US Marshal and later holds several key positions with the USMS, including Acting Deputy Director. As the Director, Hylton is responsible for federal judicial security, fugitive apprehension, witness security, asset forfeiture, and prisoner transportation, custody, and safety.

On February 14, 2002, Teresa Chambers swears in as the chief of the US Park Police, becoming the first woman to head a minor federal law enforcement agency (Schulz 2002). Chambers, who is the former chief of police in Durham, NC, takes the helm of the US Park Police at a time when national landmarks are at greater risk due to

the terrorist threat. Park Police officers guard Washington, DC memorials, protect New York's Statue of Liberty, and watch over San Francisco's Golden Gate National Park (Schulz 2002). Another first is Connie Patrick who in July 2002 becomes the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC). After serving as a sheriff's deputy in Brevard County, she spends 20 years with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE), a statewide investigative agency that functions much like a federal agency (Schulz 2005).

Gender Difference Between Federal and State and Local Law Enforcement

Though women have only been in federal law enforcement since 1971, the federal government's overdue appointments of the first women to head a major or minor federal law enforcement agency in 2003 and 2002 respectively is remarkable considering the percentage of women in federal law enforcement has always been greater than in local or state law enforcement. There are four factors that may explain why the percentage of women is higher in federal law enforcement. First, federal law enforcement agencies offer a wide range of job opportunities, as well as specialty occupations beyond those of traditional policing that are particularly attractive to women, to include investigations, inspections, court operations, and security and protection (Reaves 2006). In fact, the federal government employs law enforcement personnel in more than 40 job series[5] (Damp 2008). See Appendix C for a partial listing of law enforcement employment occupations.

Second, nearly all federal law enforcement positions have a minimum entry requirement of a 4-year college degree. According to the latest statistics by USDOJ BJS,

---

[5] Federal occupational classifications created by the Office of Personnel and Management.

28

in state and local law enforcement, a high school diploma is the educational requirement for 68 % of all new recruit positions in state law enforcement agencies, 81 % of all new recruit positions in local police departments and 89 % for all new recruit positions in sheriffs' offices (Hickman and Reaves 2006a, 2006b; Reaves and Hickman 2004). Since women hold 58 % of all undergraduate degrees, outnumbering men since 1996, and 59 % of all graduate degrees in the US (Wittenberg-Cox and Maitland 2008), women who have interest in law enforcement will likely apply to federal law enforcement agencies who recruit women with college degrees. There is well-documented research that shows a positive correlation between higher-educated people and their level of success at all three levels of law enforcement positions that use such areas as critical thinking, problem solving, and better-developed interpersonal and communication skills (Mayo 2006). Plus, federal law enforcement agencies offer higher starting salaries, as well as higher annual median earnings. In May 2004, the median annual earnings are $75,700 in federal government, $46,670 in state government, and $49,650 in local government (Damp 2008). In addition, federal law provides special salary rates to federal employees who serve in law enforcement. Federal special agents and inspectors receive law enforcement availability pay (LEAP)—equal to 25 % of the agent's basic pay—because of the large amount of overtime that these agents work and the expectation to carry their firearm and exercise their arrest authority whenever necessary (Damp 2008). In addition, shift work is common and for junior officers, they frequently work weekends, holidays, and nights (Damp 2008).

Third, since the FLETC serves as the inter-agency law enforcement training organization for 89 federal law enforcement agencies, federal officers who graduate from

FLETC can easily apply to other federal law enforcement agencies throughout their careers without fear of losing any time towards their retirement in federal service. Many federal law enforcement agencies offer a pension after 20 to 30 years of service, allowing federal officers to pursue a second career while still in their forties (Damp 2008).

And fourth, most federal law enforcement agencies use a health-based screening test that uses age and gender norms to assess general fitness rather than entry-level physical agility test requirements common in state and local law enforcement (Lonsway 2003). Research shows that entry-level physical agility tests are often out-of-date and test for requirements that are irrelevant to perform the job of a modern law enforcement officer (Lonsway 2003). These tests often put unnecessary emphasis on upper body strength and rely on methods of testing that eliminate large numbers of women who are, in fact, well-qualify for the job (Lonsway 2003). In 2000, 77 % of all local law enforcement agencies and 90 % of all state law enforcement agencies use a physical agility test to screen for new officer recruits (Reaves and Hickman 2004).

As such, health-based screening tests tend to screen in rather screen out women applicants because appropriate norms are likely more favorable to women applicants. The purpose of the health-based screening is to prevent on-the-job injuries rather than predict successful job performance. Because these tests do not purport to simulate job tasks, gender and/or age norms affect the passing criteria. The US Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines for their incumbents currently use this approach and it represents the current position of the Department of Justice (Lonsway 2003). The courts repeatedly upholds these gender norming of health-based standards, both for entry-level selection and testing of police incumbents (*Alspaugh v. Michigan Law Enforcement Officers*

Training Council 2001; *Franz v. City of O'Fallon* 1995; *Lanning v. Southeastern*

Pennsylvania Transportation Authority 1999; *Peanick v. US Marshals Service* 1994;

Powell v. Reno 1997; *United States v. City of Wichita Falls* 1988). It is important to note

that the decision for all but one of these cases occurs after the Civil Rights Act of 1991,

which prohibits altering or adjusting cutoff scores on selection tests. The courts upholds

the use of norm standards for a number reasons: 1) the tests assess general fitness rather

than minimum standards for job performance, 2) the norm standards expand the

competitive pool of qualify applicants but not exclude anyone at hiring, and 3) because

norm standards that appear different actually represent identical levels of underlying

physical fitness (Lonsway 2003).

Many experts find physical agility tests inappropriate (Riccucci 1990; Sass and

Troyer 1999). The occupation of police officers is largely sedentary, requiring a very

small amount of anaerobic and aerobic fitness, and the "lack of quantitative data on the

physical requirements for policing allows qualitative judgments to exist by male police

officer's preoccupation with dangerous aspects of policing" (Charles 1982, 196; Sass and

Troyer 1999). Furthermore, physical agility testing is primarily for recruits and entry

selection, potentially serving as a mechanism for controlling female entry (Lonsway

2003; Sass and Troyer 1999). Why else do only 22 % of agencies have recurring

physical testing (Sass and Troyer 1999)?

There are several aspects of federal law enforcement that make it less attractive to

women in comparison to local or state law enforcement. Federal law enforcement

officers frequently relocate and transfer throughout their careers, especially if they want

to move up the career ladder. Additionally, agents that work for agencies such as the

USSS or the DEA require extensive travel, often on very short notice. Agencies such as

the US Border Patrol, which is the fastest-growing federal law enforcement agency today,

assign virtually all new personnel to the Southwestern border, which makes the agency

unattractive to those who are not from these areas (Schulz 2009) or to those who do not

want to move there. In addition, these agents undergo very rigorous physical training

standards and work outdoors in rugged terrain for long periods of time in all kinds of

adverse weather (Damp 2008). Federal officers must also be US citizens, at least 21

years of age and under the age of 37 at the time of appointment (Damp 2008), and face a

mandatory retirement age of 57 per 5 U.S.C. § 3307; however, as a result of the 2009

Defense Authorization Act, the age limit rise from 37 to 47 for those applicants who

retire from military service. This factor is significant because women who start careers

later in life will not be eligible for appointments in federal law enforcement.

<div align="center">

Problem Statement

</div>

To this point, the majority of research on women in law enforcement is on female

police officers in state and local law enforcement (Brown and Sargent 1995; Burlingame

and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005; Garcia 2003; Horne 2006; Hunt 1990; Lunneborg 1989;

Martin 1980; Martin and Jurik 2006; Paoline 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Seklecki and

Paynich 2007; Waddington 1999; Wood et al. 2004). Federal law enforcement has been

all but ignored by the policing research community and even more by those who study

nontraditional occupations (Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009). Federal law enforcement is a

particularly gender segregated field and continues to be a nontraditional occupation for

women (Keverline 2003). According to the USDOJ BJS, women's participation in

federal law enforcement hovers around 16.1 % (Reaves 2006), still far from breaking out

of its nontraditional occupational status. But while an increasing number of women enter federal law enforcement and challenge the traditional male dominance of the occupation, federal law enforcement agencies have not done enough to recruit and particularly retain women. Court-ordered rulings, recruitment programs that target women and corrective hiring practices are likely not the only steps necessary to achieve gender representation in federal law enforcement (Keverline 2003).

There are several problems to understanding women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement. First, while law enforcement agencies redesign recruitment strategies to attract women candidates, they neglect to include long-term plans to retain these women (Hochstedler 1994; Kaminski 1993). In addition, discussions on police culture fail to recognize that the overall culture of federal law enforcement may differ from local and state law enforcement, and more importantly may differ considerably from agency to agency (Schulz 2009), further representing the decentralized nature of federal law enforcement. Without consideration of the individual characteristics of each federal agency, it's difficult to determine why women may be successful in some agencies and not in others. Furthermore, very little research exists on federal law enforcement careers. Available information is often anecdotal, pertains to a specific agency or small groups of agencies that are better known than others and perceived to have more prestige, or is learned in passing from newspaper accounts (Schulz 2009). Finally, even less is known about women in federal law enforcement or their experiences. To date, only five studies exist that study female federal law enforcement officers or both male and female federal law enforcement officers (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Blasdel 2010; Doll 2010; Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009).

In order to address these problems, this study examines some of the factors that may potentially influence women's decision to stay or depart federal law enforcement. Research suggests that women do not remain in law enforcement for an extended period of time. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) suggests that women leave law enforcement after an average of five years of service (IACP 1998). Though men and women enter law enforcement for similar reasons (e.g. helping people, job security, fighting crime, and the excitement of the job) (Meagher and Yentes 1986; Schulz 2004), they depart for very different ones (Fry 1983; Keverline 2003; Martin 1980; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Timmons and Hainsworth 1989; Wexler and Logan 1983). However, it appears women are not making quick exits from the profession but rather after several years (IACP 1998). This pattern seems to reflect problems not with recruiting or screening but with aspects of the job itself. What accounts for this turnover is not clear, however, eight factors in particular appear to be salient: 1) perceived male colleagues' negative attitudes, 2) perceived negative law enforcement work culture, 3) perceived lack of promotional opportunities, 4) perceived sexual harassment, 5) perceived sexual discrimination, 6) perceived lack of female role models, 7) perceived gender specific obstacles with pregnancy and 8) perceived gender specific obstacles with family care (Fry 1983; Keverline 2003; Martin 1980; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Timmons and Hainsworth 1989; Wexler and Logan 1983). Research suggests that the single most significant factor for high turnover is the negative attitudes of male colleagues (Keverline 2003; Timmons and Hainsworth 1989; Wexler and Logan 1983). In addition, heavy drinking, crude jokes, racism, homophobia and demands that women who enter it "subsume male characteristics to achieve social acceptability" characterize the law

enforcement work culture (Young 1991, 193). A lack of promotional opportunities also strongly affects women's rates of turnover (Fry 1983). Men and women report the same desire for promotion, yet these opportunities are perceived by women to be less available to women than to men (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Horne 1980). In addition, sexual harassment and discrimination is widespread throughout law enforcement (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Haarr 1997; Hunt 1990; Keverline 2003; Martin 1980; Martin and Jurik 2006; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Seklecki and Paynish 2007). Furthermore, women report a lack of female role models (Poole and Pogrebin 1988; Schulz 2004) and believe their agencies do not provide adequate support during pregnancy (Keverline 2003) or to fulfill family obligations (Golden 1982; Keverline 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008). Any one of these factors can prevent women from continuing a career in law enforcement; however, given the range of issues, it may be more likely that a combination of factors, as well as the interrelationship between factors, influences turnover decisions.

On the other hand, some women have careers in law enforcement and stay for many of the same reasons that men do, including salary and benefits, challenging and exciting work, and the opportunity to help others (Poole and Pogrebin 1988). These women likely face the same challenges as women who decide to leave law enforcement; however, may perceive the challenges differently than those who leave. Poole and Pogrebin (1988) speculate that the challenges themselves may be the very reason why these women stay in law enforcement, and Doerner (1995) suggests they may feel a need to prove they are just as good as men. Moreover, a recent survey by Seklecki and Paynich (2007) indicate that female officers do feel equal to their male counterparts, and

35

another recent study by Rabe-Hemp (2008, 256-257) found that "despite experiences of sexual harassment, discrimination, and disrespect, almost all believe they have achieved acceptance in their current agencies."

The problem of employee turnover is an extremely costly one for law enforcement agencies (Fry 1983). High rates of turnover can cost an agency directly in terms of recruitment, selection, and training costs, and indirectly by loss of productivity, reduced efficiency, transferring employees to fill vacancies, and disruptions in employee social networks that build morale (Lambert, Hogan, and Barton 2001). As public agencies such as federal law enforcement increasingly have to compete for quality candidates in order to reflect the diversity of the communities they serve, they must improve their focus on retention. Furthermore, as a result of the terrorist events of 9/11, it has become increasingly important for federal law enforcement agencies to work effectively, especially since the FBI, the common face of federal law enforcement, is responsible for fighting terrorism in the US and has over 100 Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTFs), augment by local, state, and other federal law enforcement officers throughout the country. High turnover rates will only undermine federal law enforcement's ability to focus on homeland security and other similar tasks. Understanding the factors why women stay or depart federal law enforcement will enable agencies to implement courses of actions to minimize the costs of turnover and focus instead on their mission.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate eight factors that influence women's decision to stay or depart federal law enforcement. In addition, it describes women in federal law enforcement and identifies the challenges they face in federal law

enforcement, as well as the strategies they utilize to best overcome these challenges. Furthermore, it explains why women stay in federal law enforcement and why they are underrepresented in this field. Moreover, it provides recommendations on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement. Finally, this study contributes to the existing base of knowledge about bureaucratic representation.

Organization of the Study

Six chapters present this study. Chapter 1 presents an overview of the key issues regarding the study, context of policing under the intergovernmental/federalism framework, background on federal law enforcement and women in federal law enforcement, a statement of the problem, and the purpose of the study. Chapter 2 consists of a synthesis and analysis of relevant literature and the research questions in the study. A description of the methodology and instrumentation from the study details Chapter 3. Chapters 4 and 5 report the results from an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data in the study. Finally, Chapter 6 provides a discussion of the findings, future research, and conclusion.

The following chapter will provide an overview of the literature review, to include an introduction of the limited existing research on women in federal law enforcement, a theoretical framework of eight factors that appear to influence women's decisions to stay or depart federal law enforcement, and to summarize the contributions women make in law enforcement. In addition, eight research questions launch the focus of this study using the eight factors that appear to influence women retention in federal law enforcement.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Limited Existing Research

Most of the research on women in law enforcement has been on women police officers in state and local law enforcement (Brown and Sargent 1995; Burlingame and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005; Garcia 2003; Horne 2006; Hunt 1990; Lunneborg 1989; Martin 1980; Martin and Jurik 2006; Paoline 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Seklecki and Paynich 2007; Waddington 1999; Wood et al. 2004). Federal law enforcement has been all but ignored by the law enforcement research community (Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009) and to date, only five studies exist whose population consists of female federal law enforcement officers or both male and female federal law enforcement officers (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Blasdel 2010; Doll 2010; Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009). In addition, federal law enforcement agencies have not been forthcoming with providing the names of the women who do depart their agencies for reasons such as the Privacy Act. The research community must rely on "word of mouth" in order to identify those women. Furthermore, though the FLETC serves as the inter-agency law enforcement training organization for 89 federal law enforcement agencies, for reasons unknown, they do not allow the research community access to their female trainees who do not complete the training program. As such, these sole five studies consist of female federal law enforcement officers who are active in federal law enforcement.

The first study is by Susan Keverline (2003), whose research on entry-level special agents' persistence in federal law enforcement is the inspiration for this particular study. Her study of 280 sworn female federal law enforcement agents find that three particular factors influence women's decision to stay in federal law enforcement: 1) background factors, 2) self-efficacy, and 3) environmental factors. Environmental factors prove to exert the strongest influence, specifically in the areas of strong levels of social support, job satisfaction, tenure, commitment to their federal law enforcement agency, and few occupational barriers. Nearly 70 % of the women in her study indicate a high probability that they will remain in federal law enforcement despite personal, organizational, and male colleague challenges (Keverline 2003).

The second study is by Dorothy Schulz (2009), whose first-ever study on women Special Agents in Charge[6] (SACs) is based on career employees who move-up through the special agent ranks. Its purpose is to explore demographic and career path information about women middle managers in federal law enforcement agencies to establish a collective portrait of the first generation of federal law enforcement leaders. The 41 women in her study are overwhelmingly white, well-educated, new to middle management despite having spent an average of 20 years in law enforcement, and are on average between 48 and 49 years old. Due to hiring and retirement patterns in federal law enforcement, many of the women are at or close to retirement age when they obtain their SAC positions. Interestingly, though overall hiring in federal law enforcement increases as a result of the terrorist acts of 9/11, the overall percentage of women in federal law enforcement remains relatively static; however, the numbers of women in

---

[6] The Special Agent in Charge is the director of a field office.

middle-management increase (Schulz 2009), suggesting these women in middle-management are not doing enough to increase female representation in federal law enforcement.

The third study is by Earl Blasdel (2010), whose research on the glass ceiling effect on the advancement of women into positions of leadership in federal law enforcement centers on the actual experiences of both male and female first-line supervisors and middle-level managers in federal law enforcement. Its purpose is to identify factors creating the glass ceiling impeding women from progressing into middle management positions. His interview of 20 male and female federal officers reveal that the following barriers contribute to a low number of female middle level managers in federal law enforcement: 1) refusal of males to accept females, 2) gender stereotyping, 3) gender bias, and 4) the "good old boy" network (Blasdel 2010).

The fourth study is by Jason Doll (2010), whose research on stress levels is base on the actual experiences of female federal law enforcement officers. Its purpose is to determine whether women in federal law enforcement experience high levels of stress and if so, whether stress is organizational, operational, external, or personal. His survey research reveals that the respondents do not report high (or even moderate) levels of stress (Doll 2010).

Finally, the fifth study is by Clare L. Barratt, Rebecca J. Thompson, and Mindy E. Bergman (2011), whose research on the factors that influence women to pursue a supervisory position centers on the actual experiences of current supervisory female federal law enforcement officers. Their study of 74 female supervisors find that nine factors influence women's decision to pursue supervisory positions: values,

understanding, career, personal enhancement, organizational concern, impression management, family, women in federal law enforcement, and economic and personal reasons not associated with the job.[7] Supervisors report that on average their current job satisfies them; however, their job is frequently more stressful and their work leads to moderate amounts of conflict in their family/home. In addition, the researchers also survey 135 non-supervisors to assess their desire to seek promotion into the supervisory ranks. Nearly 75 % of the non-supervisors have interest in seeking a supervisory position and of those numbers, 89 % are willing to work longer hours and 83 % are willing to relocate to get it. In addition, 78 % feel they have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to do the job and 59 % want to take on more responsibility. However, despite their interest in supervisory positions, they are unsure about the opportunities for promotion within their organization (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011).

These five studies join some articles that chronicle women who work as informants (Friedman 2007; Kelso and McDonald 1989; Samuelson 1998; Schulz 2009; Vines 1981) and as Prohibition agents in the early twentieth century. Due to the political nature of the jobs and the exceedingly high turnover rates, no women are positively confirmed as federal agents (Schulz 2009). In addition, a former FBI special agent who achieves supervisory rank but not SAC status presents a discouraging picture of her and other women's acceptance into the agency (Dew and Paper 2004; Schulz 2009).

---

[7] An example of values is the desire to help others. An example of understanding is the desire to learn new skills. An example of career is to enhance a resume. An example of personal enhancement is to enhance my self-confidence. An example of organizational concern is the desire to help the agency or organization. An example of impression management is to look good to others in the agency or organization. An example of family is to better able to provide for my family. An example of women in federal law enforcement is to show that women can succeed in law enforcement. An example of economic and personal reasons not associated with the job is a supervisory position became open in an area where I want to live permanently after I retire.

Similarly, the third women to be hired by the US Fish and Wildlife Service, who completes special agent training in 1975, observes that at the time of her retirement in 1991 the agency has only nine women among its 210 agents and despite her having worked a major undercover investigation into illegal hunting in Alaska, many of her colleagues continue to question her abilities and suitability for the job (Schroeder 2006; Schulz 2009). These few studies highlight the limited research on female federal law enforcement officers and their negative experiences.

Employment Figures of Women in Federal Law Enforcement

Data from DOJ is similarly limited. Most available data on women in federal law enforcement are little more than employment figures published by the USDOJ BJS with limited analysis. The first DOJ report to include data on the gender of federal officers occurs in June 1996. Federal agencies employ about 74,500 full-time personnel authorized to make arrest and carry firearms and women account for 14 %. Of the major agencies employing at least 500 officers, the IRS has the highest percentage of women at 23.4 %. About sixth of the officers (17.3 %) employ by the US Customs Service (now ICE) are women and among major Department of Justice agencies, about one in seven FBI agents are women (14.5 %), compared to one in eight in INS (12.7 %) or the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) (12.3 %) (Reaves 1997).

In June 1998, federal agencies increase employment by 11 % and employ about 83,000 full-time federal officers; women increase slightly to 14.2 %. The IRS continues to have the highest percentage of women at 25.3 %. Among major Department of Treasury agencies, the ATF (12.2 %) and the USSS (8.6 %) are lower than the overall average and among the major Department of Justice agencies women continue to

comprise the highest percentage of officers at the FBI (15.9 %) and the lowest at the DEA (7.9 %) (Hart and Reaves 2000).

As with later figures, not all 83,000 federal officers are special agents. Some federal agencies employ uniformed police personnel and non-criminal investigators as well as corrections and court officers. In addition to these agencies, 26 of the (then) 61 OIG agencies employ a total of over 2,000 sworn officers. Women in federal law enforcement make their greatest progress in the OIG. Congress create the OIGs in 1978 to root out fraud, waste and abuse, and many have grown in size and prestige as they change primarily from an auditing agency to that of an arresting one, though some continue to play more of an auditing and investigatory role. The percentage of women in the OIGs has been higher than in other areas of federal law enforcement. In 1998, 28 % of OIG investigators are women (Hart and Reaves 2000).

A review of more recent years indicates that the trends from 1998 have changed little in the past decade. By 2000, the number of federal law enforcement officers increases to 88,000 and the percentage of women slightly increase to 14.4 %. The trend of higher percentages of women in the OIGs increases, as it has throughout the decade. In 2000, the largest OIG, the Department of Treasury Tax Administration, employ 352 criminal investigators, almost 23.6 % of whom are women. Furthermore, women make up more than 30 % of three smaller OIGs; 32.7 % in the Environmental Protection Agency, 31.7 % in the Department of Education, and 31.3 % in the Department of Agriculture. This contrasts sharply with non-OIG agencies, where only the IRS, with 2,742 federal officers, has over a quarter (27.3 %) of their federal officers that are

women, while the DEA, with 4,201 officers, continue to have the lowest percentage

(8.4 %) closely follow by the USSS (9.1 % of 4,039 agents) (Reaves and Hart 2001).

The period between 2000 and 2002 has a substantial 6 % increase in the total

number of federal agents, totaling more than 93,000 full-time personnel authorized to

make arrests and carry firearms (Reaves and Bauer 2003). Although women now

account for 14.8 % of these agents, their increase over two years is a mere 0.4 % (Reaves

and Bauer 2003). The figures for 2004 point out the strength of familiar patterns but

reinforce the importance of looking beyond numbers and percentages. Women now

make up 16.1 % of federal officers, but the numbers of full-time personnel authorized to

make arrests and carry firearms has grown to almost 105,000, a staggering increase of

13 %, undoubtedly due to the Homeland Security Act of 2002; however, women only

account for 10 % of the overall increase (Reaves 2006). With the exception of the

Administrative Office of the US Courts in which 44.2 % of all federal probation officers

are women, the IRS again has the highest percentage of women agents at 30 %; however,

no other major federal law enforcement agencies—those with at least 500 full-time

officers—even surpass the 20 % threshold (see Table 2.1) (Reaves 2006). This is

important considering the larger agencies have a higher proportion of women and the

ability to make the most difference for women in federal law enforcement. The medium-

size agencies—those with at least 100 but fewer than 500 full-time officers—continue to

increase in female representation and have three agencies that surpass the 25 % threshold

(see Table 2.2) (Reaves 2006). In addition, the medium-size OIGs also continue to

increase in female representation and have five OIGs that surpass the 25 % threshold with

two over 30 % (see Table 2.3) (Reaves 2006). With the decentralized nature of federal

law enforcement, what is it about the Administrative Office of the US Courts, the IRS, and the eight medium-size agencies and medium-size OIGs that attract women to these agencies and what have these agencies done to retain more women?

The period between 2004 and 2008 allegedly witness the largest increase in the number of women officers. According to USDOJ BJS, women are now 20.2 % of all full-time federal officers authorized to make arrests and carry a firearm. However, these numbers and percentages in 2008 are misleading. Five major federal law enforcement agencies do not report statistics for the 2008 study, thereby distorting the numbers upward. Four of the five agencies report an estimate 11,000 sworn officers—of whom approximately 1,500 are women—in 2004. In addition, due to the reorganization of several large federal law enforcement agencies after the events of 9/11 and inconsistencies among some agencies in the reporting of data on the gender of their officers, only 53 agencies are consistently organize and have data available from 1998 to 2008. Among these 53 agencies, the percentage of officers who are women increases only slightly from 14 % in 1998 to 15.2 % in 2008 (Langton 2010).

This recent data by the USDOJ BJS on federal agencies with full-time sworn law enforcement officers are from the 2008 Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers (FLEO) (Langton 2010). The 2008 FLEO Census contains data from only 62 of more than 100 federal law enforcement agencies and do not include officers working in US Territories (Puerto Rico, US Virgin Islands, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa) or station in foreign countries (Langton 2010). Of particular significance is the absence of reporting by one of the larger federal law enforcement agency—the Federal Air Marshal Service (FAMS). FAMS do not disclose their overall

45

numbers; women allegedly comprise just 5 % of all Air Marshals. Nonetheless, of all the federal law enforcement agencies with sworn officers, the OIGs still have the largest percentage of female officers at 25 % (Langton 2010). Thus, with the exception of the OIGs, the percentage of women in federal law enforcement remains relatively static at a time when there is a vast increase in the overall number of federal law enforcement personnel (Langton 2010).

Theoretical Framework

Introduction

Thus, the purpose of this study is to identify those factors that may explain why the percentage of women in federal law enforcement remains static leading to their underrepresentation. As previously mention, the majority of research on women in law enforcement is on women police officers in state and local law enforcement (Brown and Sargent 1995; Burlingame and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005; Garcia 2003; Horne 2006; Hunt 1990; Lunneborg 1989; Martin 1980; Martin and Jurik 2006; Paoline 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Seklecki and Paynich 2007; Waddington 1999; Wood et al. 2004). A review of this research is necessary to uncover potential explanations and theories to explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement. In addition, as the original pioneers of women in policing, those early and current experiences by women in local and state law enforcement may draw parallels with those accounts by women in federal law enforcement.

Since the creation of US police departments in the mid-19th century, most people view law enforcement as a traditionally male occupation because of its association with crime and danger (Heidensohn 1992; Horne 2006). Although women have been active in

46

police work since the 1840s as police matrons[8] (Lunneborg 1989; Wells and Alt 2005),

women do not obtain arrest authority until some many years later. There is difficulty in

determining the exact identity of the nation's first female cop. Los Angeles claims they

hire the first woman in September 1910, by a decree of the Los Angeles City Council to

provide for employment "one police officer who shall be a woman" (Appier 1998, 10).

As such, the Los Angeles Police Department appoints Alice Stebbins Wells to the

Juvenile Bureau (Horne 2006; Wells and Alt 2005). Her appointment as a policewoman

attracts nationwide attention because she has education and is a social worker that

deliberately secures the opportunity to work in a police department (Horne 1980).

Conversely, Portland claims they hire the first female officer on April 1, 1908,

when Lola Baldwin is sworn in as a detective to perform police service for the city of

Portland, Oregon (Horne 2006; Myers 1995; Wells and Alt 2005). Her duties, however,

emphasize crime prevention and social work rather than law enforcement. She never

wears a uniform or carries a firearm and seldom makes arrests; in fact, her office is not

even in the police station until two years later (Horne 2006; Myers 1995). But more

recently, a retired DEA agent and amateur historian uncovers records that indicates

Chicago hires the first female officer in 1891 (Mastony 2010). Marie Owens transfers to

the police department in 1891 from the city health department when pressure mounts on

public officials to step up enforcement of child-labor laws (Mastony 2010). Previously,

she is one of five female factory inspectors who enforce child-labor and compulsory-

education laws but the inspectors' powers have limits; they cannot enter buildings without

---

[8] Police matrons are women hired by police departments to handle female and juvenile offenders when they are held in correctional facilities and institutions for the insane. They are not police officers and do not have arrest authority but they pave the way for female police officers.

a warrant (Mastony 2010). After her transfer to the police department, she has powers of arrest, the title of detective sergeant and a police star (Mastony 2010). Regardless of who is first, Owens, Baldwin and Wells make important and original contributions to policing and pave the way for many women who follow them into policing. By 1916, there are policewomen in 21 states and Emma S. Banister becomes the first female Sheriff in 1918 when the Coleman County (Texas) commission appoints her Sheriff after the death of her Sheriff husband (Wells and Alt 2005).

In the 1920s, progressive police reformers look to free policing from corrupting politics and to professionalize police work by adopting new organizational models (Martin and Jurik 2006). One of these models of reform is the crime control model. This model, fostered by J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI at the national level, centralizes control and adopts a military-style command structure to address police corruption (Martin and Jurik 2006). Unfortunately, the crime control model also firmly reinforces male, working-class culture and values in police departments and reaffirms the superiority of the masculine virtues of the fearless crime fighter who is able to overcome resistance (Walker and Katz 2005). For the next 40 years, only a few policewomen gain assignments to detective, vice, or crime lab units, while the vast majority are assigned to juvenile work or secretarial duties (Martin and Jurik 2006). In 1960, there are only 5,617 women in policing and security work in the US (Heidensohn 1992).

During the 1960s and 1970s, legislation extends civil rights and equal employment opportunities to women. In the 1960s, several important advances arise for women in policing. In 1961, Felicia Shpritzer sues the New York City Civil Commission in order to compete in a promotional process that is previously closed to women (Horne

1980). Three years later she wins the case and passes the exam for sergeant becoming

the city's first woman sergeant (Bell 1982; Wells and Alt 2005). In 1968, the

Indianapolis Police Department assigns two women, Betty Blankenship and Elizabeth

Coffal, to patrol duties and proves they can handle the job (Horne 1980). This

encroachment on the stereotypically male task of patrol spurs a debate of the proper role

of women in policing (Rabe-Hemp 2008; Seklecki and Paynich 2007). Concern over

female officers' abilities to maintain the authority and strength necessary to the police

role provides a backdrop for the continuing resistance to women in the policing culture,

including daily harassment and sexism (Burlingame and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005;

Garcia 2003; Hunt 1990; Martin 1980). Finally, on August 8, 1969, President Nixon

signs Executive Order 11478, "Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal

Government," which prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, color,

religion, sex, national origin, handicap, or age (WIFLE 1991).

The 1970s mark further advances for women in policing. The Equal Employment

Opportunity Act of 1972 has the strongest influence on changing the face of policing. It

expands the coverage of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to include public, as

well as private employers. As a result, state and local government agencies, including

police departments, cannot discriminate on the basis of race, religion, creed, color,

national origin, or gender with regard to hiring, compensation, terms, conditions, and

privileges of employment (Martin and Jurik 2006). Employers cannot refuse to hire,

segregate, or classify employees so as to deprive them of employment opportunities

because of gender. An exception exists only if it can be proven that gender is "a bona

fide occupational qualification (BFOQ) reasonably necessary for the normal operation of

that particular business or enterprise" (Martin and Jurik 2006, 6). This interpretation warrants only "where it is necessary for the purpose of authenticity or genuineness" (Martin and Jurik 2006, 6). The law prohibits an employer from refusing to hire a woman because of assumptions about the comparative employment characteristics of women in general (e.g., they are not as strong as men), because of gender stereotypes (e.g., that women are less capable of aggressive "salesmanship"), or because of the preferences of coworkers, employers, clients, or customers (Martin and Jurik 2006).

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 also expands the powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As a direct result, the Metropolitan Police Department of Washington, DC, becomes the first municipal agency to assign a significant number of women to patrol, and the Pennsylvania State Police becomes the first state police agency to hire women for police duties in 1972 (Horne 1980; Wells and Alt 2005).

Other advances for women in policing include the Crime Control Act of 1973 which requires police departments with 50 or more employees that receive $25,000 or more in federal grants to implement equal opportunity programs for women or face withdrawal of funds (Bell 1982). Consequently, many police agencies are taken to court for discrimination on the basis of race, gender, or both throughout the 1970s. In *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.* (1971), the Supreme Court makes it easier to win discrimination cases by ruling that the plaintiffs do not have to prove that the employer intends to discriminate. Once a plaintiff shows that job qualifications disproportionately exclude a group or class, the burden falls on the employer to prove that the requirements are BFOQs and that no other selection mechanisms exist. Application of this standard

invalidates minimum height and weight standards that exclude women from police and corrections work; however, the courts do not always rule in women's favor and some courts permit exceptions to the prohibitions on BFOQs. In *Dothard v. Rawlinson* (1977), the Court agrees that height and weight requirements for corrections officers in Alabama's maximum security prisons violate Title VII but still rule that the ban on women working in jobs that require close proximity to male inmates in an all male maximum security prison is justifiable given that female prison guards are more vulnerable to male sexual attacks than male prison guards.

The court decisions that follow *Dothard* are less likely to accept BFOQs. In *United States v. City of Los Angeles* (1979) and *Blake v. City of Los Angeles* (1979), the Courts agree that the City of Los Angeles and the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) do engage in a pattern and practice of employment discrimination on the basis of sex, race, and national origin. The resulting Blake Consent Decree set precedent-making conditions that alter the criteria for employment as a police officer in Los Angeles by including within its requirements that all Blacks and Hispanics of either sex, as well as Caucasian females who are past, present, or future police officer applicants for entry-level police officer classifications, are primary candidates for potential police officers (Felkenes and Unsinger 1992). The Blake Consent Decree causes reverberations throughout the country, often affecting police agencies through changes in recruitment, selection, training, and employment of officers (Felkenes and Unsinger 1992). Incidentally, in 2002 after 20 years under the Blake Consent Decree, the LAPD still has not met their goal to recruit more women (Wells and Alt 2005).

Other lawsuits in the 1970s deal with entrance requirements such as age and education, selection criteria such as written examinations and agility tests, discriminatory assignment and promotion procedures (Potts 1983). As a result, the court-ordered consent decrees establish affirmative action programs and quotas for hiring and promoting women, as well as adjusting the rosters of law enforcement agencies to more accurately reflect the racial/gender composition of the local community (Doerner 1995).

Some police departments respond by changing recruitment practices, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria (Felkenes, Peretz and Schroedel 1993; Hochstedler 1984; Kaminski 1993). They eliminate height and weight requirements and agility tests that emphasize upper body strength and replace them with tests of fitness and health, which measure cardiovascular function, body composition, and flexibility (Martin and Jurik 2006). In addition, they adjust written entrance exams, which traditionally exclude women and minorities, and standardize oral screening and promotion procedures to include a single set of questions administered by trained interviewers. Some agencies institute perks to attract women to policing such as take-home cars, permanent shift assignments, bonuses for college degrees, and salary incentives for officers enrolling in college courses during off-duty hours (Doerner 1995).

Amidst the rise of community policing, consent decrees, and affirmative action suits (Martin 1991), women's struggle to integrate into police agencies exemplifies 35 years of past research underscoring continued resistance to women in law enforcement; however, eight factors in particular appear to be salient that might explain why women are underrepresented in federal law enforcement: 1) perceived male colleagues' negative attitudes, 2) perceived negative law enforcement work culture, 3) perceived lack of

promotional opportunities, 4) perceived sexual harassment, 5) perceived sexual discrimination, 6) perceived lack of female role models, 7) perceived gender specific obstacles with pregnancy and 8) perceived gender specific obstacles with family care (Belknap and Shelley 1992; Brown and Sargent 1995; Burlingame and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005; Fry 1983; Garcia 2003; Haarr 1997; Heidensohn 1992; Horne 2006; Hunt 1990; Keverline 2003; Lunneborg 1989; Martin 1980; Martin and Jurik 2006; Miller 1999; Paoline 2003; Pike 1985; Price 1985; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Remmington 1983; Seklecki and Paynish 2007; Timmons and Hainsworth 1989; Waddington 1999; Wexler and Logan 1983; Wood et al. 2004).

Pervasive Negative Attitudes

The first factor that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement is the perception of pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues. Male police officers' resistance to female officers has much documentation. The first women on patrol duty experienced blatant, malicious and sometimes life threatening resistance from their male colleagues (Bloch and Anderson 1974; Hunt 1984; Martin 1980). Initially, many men refuse to teach their female counterparts basic skills to do the job or fail to respond quickly to assist women seeking backup (Martin and Jurik 2006). Often, supervisors assign women to dangerous foot beats alone (while men work in pairs), overzealously enforce rules, depress women's performance evaluations, sexually harass them, and ignore women's mistreatment by fellow officers (Martin and Jurik 2006). There are a few men who favor the integration of women into patrol and who assist women; however, they do so at the risk of being ostracized by fellow street cops, and

53

their actions on behalf of women tend to be viewed by other men as directed towards particular individuals rather than efforts to benefit women as a group (Martin 1980).

Despite changes in both the nature of policing and the status of women, many male officers continue to believe that women cannot handle the job physically or emotionally and therefore, shall not be allowed to exercise the moral authority of the state or be integrated into policing (Martin and Jurik 2006). This hostile attitude has been characterized as "a huge if shadowy presence which hangs like a 'miasma' over women officers" (Heidensohn 1992, 65).

Keverline (2003), who conducts only one of five empirical research studies specifically targeting women in federal law enforcement, finds that the most salient challenge women face is male colleagues' negative attitudes; these negative attitudes are pervasive, infect all aspects of work, and make it difficult for women to concentrate on performing the job at hand frequently leading to more harmful situations such as discrimination and harassment. In addition, Seklecki and Paynish (2007) study female police officers' motivations, experiences, and attitudes and reveal 39 % of respondents indicate they are made to feel less welcome than males. More recently, Barratt, Thompson and Bergman (2011) study the factors that influence women's interest in seeking supervisory positions and find that female supervisor's relationships with their peers and teammates are neither positive nor negative. This suggests that women are not as accepting in supervisory roles or feel welcome as part of the team as they will like from their male colleagues. In addition, 25 % of the females in their study report they are not part of the social activities at their organization and believe it is due to their gender (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011).

Work Culture and Resistance to Female Officers

The second factor that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement is the perception of a negative law enforcement work culture. Existing literature on police culture defends and explains the theories that drive resistance to female officers (Brown and Sargent 1995; Paoline 2003; Waddington 1999). There is wide speculation on the nature and purpose of the police subculture. Some theorists posit the solitary, masculine police subculture is a dated vestige of the past, and modern police organizations have many different subcultures, each vying for resources (Wood et al. 2004). Despite the fact that women represent 46.7 % of the nation's workforce (US Department of Labor 2011), no police organization in the US has female employment equal to that percent, suggesting if women do possess a unique subculture, it is subordinate in strength and power to the male subculture (National Center for Women and Policing 2001; Rabe-Hemp 2008).

The police subculture describes itself as a manifestation of the nature of police work (i.e. stress, shift work, danger), as well as a social structure which exists purposely and specifically to oppress female officers (Brown and Sargent 1995; Franklin 2005; Hughes 2010). There is consensus that the sovereign police culture is a distinctive occupational subculture that celebrates masculine values which engender particular views of women, the nature of policing, and the roles for which men and women officers are believe to be most suitable (Dick and Jankowicz 2001). The intrusion of women into the police culture has the potential to change these norms, values, and customs and hence is met with great resistance (Hughes 2010; Rabe-Hemp 2008). Beyond the sexist attitudes of individual men, the work culture is characterized by heavy drinking, crude jokes,

racism, and homophobia and demands that women who enter it "subsume 'male

characteristics' to achieve even a limited social acceptability" (Young 1991, 193).

Therefore, the resultant resistance to women integrating into the male culture comes as

little surprise (Brown and Sargent 1995; Burlingame and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005;

Garcia 2003; Hughes 2010; Hunt 1990; Martin 1980; Paoline 2003; Waddington 1999).

Tokenism

The framework of tokenism clearly demonstrates the impact of a negative work

environment. Kanter (1977) contends that an employment organization having a very

low percentage of minority workers places multiple pressures on those persons.

Foremost, tokens are more visible within the organization which places them under a

spotlight. These officers feel as though everything they do undergoes excessive scrutiny.

Tokens experience strong feelings of isolation and stress because they are given little

margin for error. Female officers in such situations can become "mistake avoidance

sensitive" and develop a fear of failure in important tasks and key events (Wertsch 1998).

Organizations apply stereotypes and the error of one woman becomes embellished and

applied to all others (Martin and Jurik 2006). Kanter (1977) also asserts that female

police tokens are "role encapsulate." She finds that female officers typically confine to

one of four roles. The first role is the "mother" who is sympathetic and comforting to the

men. The second role is the "sex object." Within this role, the female officer acts as a

seductress who provokes the men to compete for her favor. The third role is the "kid

sister" who acts as the cheerleader to the male ideas and adds humor without being

threatening. The last role is the "women's liberationist." If a female officer does not fit

into one of the preceding first three roles, her male colleagues view her with suspicion

and possible hostility and ultimately cast her into this remaining role as an outcast. The indirect significance of tokenism is the pressure for the female officers to conform. As such, female officers are expected to perform as well as a man without crossing the line of not behaving within the established female stereotype. Such role and identity ambiguity can create personal difficulties, including a retreat from the work environment (Wertsch 1998).

Though female officers are still tokens or numerical oddities in many police agencies, recent research suggests the theory of tokenism alone cannot fully describe the experiences of female officers (Franklin 2005; Greene and del Carmen 2002). The occupation of policing is masculine by its nature, as law enforcement typically associates itself with aggressive behavior, physical strength, and camaraderie. Martin (1999) argues that female police officers have the choice of either maintaining their gender identity as police women or the police identity as police women. Women who attempt to meet the crime-fighting image of police may be negatively label as "butch or dyke" (Pike 1985, 264), but female officers who do not attempt to meet this perceive ideal may risk being define as weak or "pansy police" (Miller 1999, 70). Neither solution allows them to fully integrate into police work, as bona fide or "real" police officers (Martin 1990; Remmington 1983). The token status of women in police organizations may exacerbate the expectations and stereotypes already common with female officers (Rabe-Hemp 2008). When a group makes up less than 15 % of an organization, as women do in local and state law enforcement and close enough in federal law enforcement, they perceive themselves to be highly visible, attracting disproportionate attention to themselves, being perceived as "in but not of" the organization (Belknap and Shelley 1992; Kanter 1977).

Men maintain women's status as "outsiders" by sexualizing the workplace (Cockburn 1991; Swerdlow 1989). Women experience sexual propositions and threats as well as sexual harassment as a condition of work, including unwanted touching, comments that call attention to their sexuality or express anti-women sentiment, and a variety of pranks and jokes (Hunt 1984; Martin 1980; Sugden 2005; Young 1991). Women still find sex magazines, dildos, and vibrators in their lockers and mailboxes, and encounter betting pools on who will be the first to have sex with a new woman officer (Martin and Jurik 2006). Sugden (2005, 17) argues "women are desexualized, hyper-sexualized and effeminized by male police officers as a means to confirm and stabilize the masculinity and heterosexism of policing."

Glass Ceiling to Promotions

The third factor that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement is the perception of a glass ceiling to promotions. In addition to resistance from male colleagues, women appear to face a glass ceiling in regards to promotion, and the progress up the career ladder is slow. In 1997, the Federal Glass Ceiling Commission defined the glass ceiling as an invisible or artificial barrier preventing women from advancing past a certain level in the workplace (Blasdel 2010). More than half the local and state agencies that participate in the Status of Women in Policing (2001) survey report no women in top command or supervisory positions. However, 2003 is a strong year for women in the top echelons of both state and federal law enforcement; more receive appointments or win elections for sheriff than in any other single year (Schulz 2004) and President George W. Bush appoints the first female director to lead a major federal law enforcement agency (Schulz 2009). But of the approximately 200 women

chiefs of police and 30 women sheriffs in the US in 2004, they make up only 1 % of the law enforcement chief executives in the nation (Schulz 2004). Interestingly, the similarities between men and women chiefs of police and sheriffs are striking except in education; the women chiefs and sheriffs are exceptional in their educational levels, each having a master's degree or a juris doctorate (Schulz 2004). At first glance, this appears solely positive, however, at a second glance, it may suggest that women experience a double standard and are expected to have more credentials for the same position.

Blasdel (2010), who conducts one of only five empirical research studies targeting women in federal law enforcement, reveals that barriers do impede the career progression of females into middle management positions in federal law enforcement. His research into the examination of the glass ceiling effect reveals the following barriers contribute to a low number of female middle level managers in federal law enforcement: 1) refusal of male officers to accept female supervisors, 2) gender stereotyping, 3) gender bias, and 4) the "good old boy" network (Blasdel 2010).

Sexual Harassment and Sexual Discrimination

The fourth and fifth factors that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement are the perception of sexual harassment and sexual discrimination. Martin (1980) finds most women officers experience both sexual discrimination and sexual harassment. Hunt (1990, 26) examines the underlying logic of police sexism among police when she researches the hesitation of male police to accept women into their ranks and concludes "sexism is a deep structure which articulates in every aspect of the police world." Her study finds that 63 % of 72 women officers from five large urban departments recount instances of sexual harassment on the job, including

25 % who experience *quid pro quo* harassment (Hunt 1990). Haarr (1997) finds women

to remain outside the informal police structure and continue to face sexual harassment,

sexism, and discrimination. In addition, Keverline (2003) finds that 49 % of the women

in her study report experiencing sexual harassment in the course of their work in federal

law enforcement; however, 31.8 % do not report the incident to their supervisors because

of fear of retaliation, fear that peers and supervisors will ostracize them, and because they

believe nothing will be done. Furthermore, 38.2 % of the women report experiencing

sexual discrimination in regards to work assignments, promotions, and training

opportunities (Keverline 2003). In spite of this, 51.8 % do not file a complaint for sexual

discrimination because of fear of retaliation, fear of being ostracized by peers and

supervisors, and because they believe nothing will be done (Keverline 2003).

More recently, Seklecki and Paynish (2007) study female police officers'

motivations, experiences, and attitudes and find 27.2 % experience sexually harassment.

Furthermore, Rabe-Hemp (2008) examines the resistance and obstacles women continue

to face in policing and finds that all female officers in her study identify personal

instances of sexual harassment, sexual discrimination, or disrespect that impede their

successes and acceptance in police work. Finally, Barratt, Thompson and Bergman

(2011) study the factors that influence women's interest in seeking supervisory positions

and find that 29 % experience sexual harassment. Regardless of how women react, such

harassment is problematic for them. It is a significant source of stress (Brown and

Grover 1997; Haarr and Morash 2005; Texeira 2002; Wells and Alt 2005; Wexler and

Logan 1983) and isolates women from men colleagues and divides women. Although

60

many women officers experience sexual harassment, they do not appear to unite or take

action to press for change (Martin and Jurik 2006).

<div align="center">Peer Support</div>

The importance and value of peer support and acceptance is important in federal

law enforcement. To be a member in good standing within the organization is necessary

for the maintenance of the officer's perception of their self-worth and ultimately has a

considerable impact on officer retention and longevity (Brown 1981; Doerner 1995). The

inability to establish workplace networks prevents women from satisfying their needs for

affiliation and relationship (Keverline 2003). Consequently, how female officers

perceive their acceptance and gauge their capabilities has a significant impact on job

satisfaction and coping strategies (Brown and Heidensohn 2000). Job satisfaction

directly impacts officer retention and longevity. Due to the low proportion of female

officers in most agencies, it is crucial for those agencies attempting to achieve gender

parity to retain female officers. A number of state, regional, national, and international

associations exist to give support to female officers and give an organize voice to the

interests of policewomen (Horne 2006). The oldest association is the International

Association of Women Police (IAWP) found in 1915 by Alice Wells (Horne 2006).

Their mission is to strengthen, unite and raise the profile of women in criminal justice

internationally (IAWP 2011). Another international association, the International

Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), creates an ad hoc committee on women in

policing in 1998 to examine the role of women in policing (Horne 2006). Female law

enforcement executives throughout the US compose of the committee (Horne 2006).

Three other organizations promoting women in law enforcement also arise in the 1990s:

the National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE), the National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP), and the Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE).

Established in March 1996, NAWLEE is the first organization to address the unique needs of women holding senior management positions in law enforcement (NAWLEE 2011). Their mission is to serve and further the interests of women executives and those who aspire to be executives in law enforcement (NAWLEE 2011). Another organization that promotes women in law enforcement is NCWP. Found in 1995 by the Feminist Majority Foundation, NCWP works to build a nationwide movement for dramatically increasing the numbers of women in all areas and levels of law enforcement as an effective strategy for reducing police brutality and improving police response to domestic violence, which is the single largest cause of injury to women in the US (NCWP 2011). Finally, the organization that solely promotes the population in this study is WIFLE. Incorporated in June 1999, WIFLE is an outgrowth of an interagency committee from the Departments of Justice and Treasury (WIFLE 2009a). Their mission is to promote gender equity through its leadership education center that provides training, research, scholarships, awards, and networking opportunities in partnership with law enforcement agencies, their members and supportive sponsors (WIFLE 2009b).

All these organizations are non-profit organizations that provide information, guidance, and support to female law enforcement officers, as well as educate police administrators, politicians, the media, and the public about the benefits of increasing the number of women in law enforcement. Due to the decentralized nature of law

62

enforcement and of federal law enforcement in particular, these non-profit organizations serve as avenues for policy research in the underrepresentation of women in law enforcement, as well as making policy recommendations to law enforcement administrators to promote women-friendly policies to retain more women in law enforcement.

Lack of Female Role Models

The sixth factor that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement is the perception of few high-ranking female role models. Martin (1980) argues that a lack of variety of female role models in higher ranks is a major obstacle to younger female officers. Without the guidance of veterans to teach rookies the ropes, female officers are not part of the informal networks that are essential to the police culture (Martin 1980; Wells and Alt 2005; Wexler and Logan 1983). Agencies with higher percentages of sworn female officers and female administrative leadership also provide female officers with greater promotional opportunities (Martin 1980; O'Toole 1987; Schulz 2004) and help with retention of female officers (Kranda 1998). The lack of female role models may also foster feelings of isolation in law enforcement organizations. Rabe-Hemp (2008) provides an explanation as to why there are not that many women in supervisory positions. She argues family and child-care issues play a larger role in women's decisions to forego early promotional opportunities than they do for men; this reflects a preference by women to stay in their current assignment and job shift (Rabe-Hemp 2008; Schulz 2004; Whetstone and Wilson 1999). Skipping the first promotional opportunity may put a female candidate as much as a decade behind in

making rank, possibly precluding any chance to be considered for executive-level positions later in her career (Schulz 2004).

Pregnancy Friendly Policies

The seventh factor that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement is the perception of the lack of pregnancy-friendly policies. The Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978 (PDA) prevents a law enforcement agency from discriminating against its employees base on pregnancy, childbirth, or related conditions unique to females (Kruger 2006). The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) provides pregnant women the right to take up to twelve weeks of leave without losing one's job (Kruger 2006). However, neither law encourages employers to accommodate pregnant workers in ways that allow them to make realistic and productive choices about their work lives during pregnancy, because neither requires an employer to make accommodations for a woman whose work abilities may change because of pregnancy (Kruger 2006). Specifically, the PDA does not require law enforcement employers to offer maternity benefits to make it easier for pregnant women to continue to work during pregnancy and to return to work after delivery. Further, the FMLA does not require law enforcement employers to accommodate pregnant employees, except to provide them time to attend medical appointments, or be absent from work with or without pay for limited time periods. The National Center for Women and Policing (2001) suggests police agencies adopt more pregnancy-friendly policies that include light duty assignments and safety measures during range qualifications without jeopardizing the female officer's career (NCWP 2001). In addition, research by Keverline (2003) finds

that 21.4 % of the women in her study will leave law enforcement because their agencies do not provide adequate support during pregnancy.

Family-Friendly Policies

Finally, the eighth factor that may explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement is the perception of the lack of family-friendly policies. Much attention is given to the role of child rearing in the careers of professional women (Chambers 2003; Hewlett 2002; Valian 1998). In American society, the primary caregivers for children and the home are women, making employment with shift work especially difficult (Rabe-Hemp 2008). Police agencies have not kept pace with the private sector in implementing more family-friendly policies such as maternity/paternity leave, flex time to accommodate general family needs, and in-house day care options (Rabe-Hemp 2008), as well as the ability to stay in one location for a longer period of time without jeopardizing one's career and providing accommodations for breast-feeding and other nursing care. Due to the decentralized nature of federal law enforcement, a presumption exists that some federal agencies do have family-friendly policies; however, as a whole, there is no data that suggests federal law enforcement agencies promote family-friendly policies. Police agencies are also behind the rest of the public sector. For comparison purposes, the Pentagon which is headquarter for the Department of Defense has an on-site day-care facility for their employees and provides 6-weeks of paid maternity leave and 10 days of paid paternity leave for all active duty military personnel without charging them earned vacation days or sick days.

Research by Keverline (2003) concludes 44.2 % of the women in her study will leave law enforcement because their agencies do not provide adequate support in raising

a family. In addition, 25.7 % will leave law enforcement because their agencies do not provide adequate support in caring for aging parents (Keverline 2003).

<p style="text-align:center;">*Contributions to Law Enforcement*</p>

Though society views law enforcement as a very physical, aggressive profession that only men can perform, the world changes and so have the physical and mental competencies to perform law enforcement (Hughes 2011). Ortmeier and Meese (2010, 31) state that in the "contemporary policing environment, brute strength and aggressiveness give way to a new breed of officers who are better educated, self managed, creative, guided by values and purposes." As law enforcement evolves, competencies such as communication, problem solving, analytical thinking, and ethical decision-making become more important (Hughes 2011).

Though barriers exist, women have made significant contributions to law enforcement. Research in the US and internationally clearly demonstrates the advantages to hiring and retaining female law enforcement officers. A long line of research finds female officers to be equally capable and competent as their male counterparts (Balkin 1988; Fry and Greenfeld 1980; Grennan 1987; Martin 2001; Martin and Jurik 2006; NCWP 2003a; Tuomey and Jolly 2009). Also, female officers rely on a style of policing that uses less physical force, are better at defusing and de-escalating potentially violent confrontations with citizens, and are less likely to become involve in problems with use of excessive force (Grennan 1987; Horne 2006; Horvath 1987; NCWP 2002b; Tuomey and Jolly 2009). For example, the 1991 Christopher Commission report on the LAPD in the wake of the Rodney King videotape recommends hiring more women in order to reduce police brutality, based on its findings that of the 183 officers who each have more

than four allegations of excessive force or improper tactics from 1986 to 1990, none are women (Schulz 2004). In its own study of the years 1990 to 1999, the National Center for Women and Policing finds that the LAPD pays out $63.4 million in lawsuits that result from accusations that male officers use excessive force or are involve in sexual assaults or domestic violence incidents, while for the same years only $2.8 million are paid out for excessive force lawsuits involving female officers and no female officers are named in either sexual assault or domestic violence cases (Schulz 2004).

Additionally, female officers often possess better communication skills than their male counterparts and are better able to facilitate the cooperation and trust require to implement a community policing model (Horne 2006; Mayo 2006; NCWP 2002b; Pike 1985; Tuomey and Jolly 2009). Furthermore, female officers often respond more effectively to incidents of violence against women, a crime that represents approximately half of all violent crime calls to police (Cassidy, Nicholl and Ross 2001; Horne 2006; NCWP 2002b; Tuomey and Jolly 2009). Finally, increasing the presence of female officers reduces problems of sexual harassment and discrimination within an agency and brings about beneficial changes in policy for all law enforcement officers such as family-friendly policies that support both parents (Tuomey and Jolly 2009).

The mass media has put a positive spin on the portrayal of female officers in the last 15 years or so. *NYPD Blue*, *Third Watch*, *Law and Order: SVU*, *X-Files*, *NCIS*, *In Plain Sight*, *The Closer*, *Bones*, and the various *CSI* shows, as well as a myriad of blockbuster movies, portray female officers as competent and valuable members of law enforcement (Horne 2006). The media contributes to the changing attitudes of society concerning policewoman. There is a growing acceptance by the public of females in the

67

law enforcement role and more importantly, most people are no longer skeptical of women's ability to handle violent situations (Dempsey and Forst 2005). However, these positive accolades do not result in a significant increase of female representation.

Research Questions

Research shows there are eight factors that account for women's turnover in law enforcement. In order to identify which of these factors may or may not explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement, the following eight research questions (Q) serve as the focus of this study:

Q_1: Does perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_2: Does a perceived traditional law enforcement work culture explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_3: Does a perceived glass ceiling to promotions explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_4: Does perceived sexual harassment from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_5: Does perceived sexual discrimination from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_6: Does a perceived lack of high-ranking female role models in federal law enforcement explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_7: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly pregnancy policies explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_8: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly family care policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

The following chapter will explain the methodology for both the quantitative and qualitative research designs, to include sample selection, data collection procedures, and data analysis. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the weaknesses and limitations of the quantitative portion of the study.

Table 2.1 *Top Employers of Female Officers in Federal Law Enforcement Agencies with 500 or More Full-Time Officers with Authority to Make Arrests and Carry Firearms 2004* [9]

Federal Law Enforcement Agency	% Women	Total Officers
Administrative Office of the US Courts	44.2	4,166
Internal Revenue Service Criminal Investigation	30.0	2,791
US Postal Inspection Service	19.6	2,999
US Capitol Police	18.8	1,535
Federal Bureau of Investigations	18.5	12,414
National Park Service - Ranger Division	18.2	612
USDA Forest Service	17.5	1,547
US Customs and Border Protection	15.3	28,200
US Immigration and Customs Enforcement	13.7	10,691
Federal Bureau of Prisons	13.3	15,361
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives	13.3	2,398
Bureau of Diplomatic Security Service	11.8	825
National Park Service - US Park Police	11.4	612
US Secret Service	10.5	4,780
US Marshals Service	10.2	3,233
Drug Enforcement Agency	8.9	4,500
US Fish and Wildlife Service	8.7	713
Veterans Health Administration	6.9	2,474

[9] Source: US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Federal law enforcement officers, 2004*, NCJ 212750 (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, 2006), pg 6, Table 4. Table is modified by author.

Table 2.2 *Top Employers of Female Officers in Federal Law Enforcement Agencies (non-OIGs) with at Least 100 but Fewer Than 500 Full-Time Officers with Authority to Make Arrests and Carry Firearms 2004* [10]

Federal Law Enforcement Agency	% Women	Total Officers
US Mint	27.8	376
National Marine Fisheries Service	27.1	146
Library of Congress	25.6	116
Environmental Protection Agency	18.7	209
Food and Drug Administration	14.8	182
Tennessee Valley Authority	14.3	168
US Supreme Court	13.1	125
Bureau of Engraving and Printing	12.0	234
Bureau of Land Management	10.8	249
Pentagon Force Protection Agency	10.8	482
Amtrak	9.1	317
Bureau of Indian Affairs	5.9	320
Department of Energy, Office of Secure	0.3	292

[10] Source: US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Federal law enforcement officers, 2004*, NCJ 212750 (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, 2006), pg 7, Table 6. Table is modified by author.

Table 2.3 *Top Employers of Female Officers in Federal Law Enforcement Agencies (OIGs) with at Least 100 but Fewer Than 500 Full-Time Officers with Authority to Make Arrests and Carry Firearms 2004* [11]

Offices of Inspector General	% Women	Total Officers
Health and Human Services	31.5	378
Agriculture	30.6	170
Housing and Urban Development	29.4	218
Labor	26.8	142
Treasury, Tax Administration	25.3	332
Education	24.0	100
Social Security Administration	23.5	281
Transportation	23.1	108
Justice	19.5	128
Defense	18.4	326
Veteran Affairs	16.4	116
Homeland Security	14.5	138

[11] Source: US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Federal law enforcement officers, 2004*, NCJ 212750 (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, 2006), pg 7, Table 5. Table is modified by author.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

The majority of research on women in law enforcement has been on female police officers in state and local law enforcement (Brown and Sargent 1995; Burlingame and Baro 2005; Franklin 2005; Garcia 2003; Horne 2006; Hunt 1990; Lunneborg 1989; Martin 1980; Martin and Jurik 2006; Paoline 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Seklecki and Paynich 2007; Waddington 1999; Wood et al. 2004). Very little research exists on women in federal law enforcement. To date, only five studies exist whose target population consist of either all female federal law enforcement officers or both male and female federal law enforcement officers (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Blasdel 2010; Doll 2010; Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009). Since women make up only 16.1 % of all federal officers (Reaves 2006), this study examines some of the factors that may or may not influence women's decision to stay or depart federal law enforcement.

The following chapter explains the mixed methodology for this study. The quantitative portion uses surveys and has two purposes: to collect descriptive data (descriptive) and to examine eight factors that may explain the under-representation of women in federal law enforcement (explanatory). The qualitative portion uses semi-structured, open-ended interviews to collect supplemental data to enrich the findings from the survey data (explanatory) and to identify the following: 1) the biggest barrier women experience in federal law enforcement, 2) other challenges women face in federal law enforcement, 3) how they perceive and cope with these challenges, 4) reasons why

women stay in federal law enforcement, 5) new theories for the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement, and 6) obtain ideas on how to retain more women in federal law enforcement (exploratory). There is much value in using a mixed methodology. First, mixed methods provide strengths that offset the weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell and Plano-Clark 2007). Second, they provide more comprehensive evidence for studying a research problem because all the tools of data collection are available (Creswell and Plano-Clark 2007). And third, it helps answer questions that one method or another cannot answer (Creswell and Plano-Clark 2007).

This chapter also provides a discussion of the keys terms present in the research design, the research designs themselves, sample selection, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Finally, it addresses internal and external validity within the limitations of this study.

Definitions and Key Terms

Existing literature on female police officers in state and local law enforcement and female special agents in federal law enforcement identify eight occupational barriers as potential factors that may influence a woman's decision to depart federal law enforcement and possibly explain its underrepresentation. First, pervasive negative attitudes by male colleagues' represent the most salient challenge women face in federal law enforcement (Keverline 2003). Despite changes to both the nature of policing and the status of women, many male officers continue to believe that women cannot handle the job physically or emotionally and therefore, do not have the ability to exercise the moral authority of the state (Martin and Jurik 2006).

Second, a social structure which exists purposely and specifically to oppress female officers describes the law enforcement work culture (Brown and Sargent 1995; Franklin 2005). Beyond the sexist attitudes of individual men, the work culture portrays heavy drinking, crude jokes, racism, and homophobia and demands that women who enter it "subsume 'male characteristics' to achieve even a limited social acceptability" (Young 1991, 193).

Third, research reveal that women make up only 1 % of all law enforcement chief executives in the nation (Schulz 2004), suggesting that women face a glass ceiling to promotion. The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission (1997) defines glass ceiling as an invisible or artificial barrier preventing women from advancing past a certain level in the workplace. Recent research into the examination of the glass ceiling effect reveals that barriers such as males' refusal to accept females, gender stereotyping and bias, and the "good old boy" network impede the career progression of females into middle management positions in federal law enforcement (Blasdel 2010).

Fourth, Hunt (1990) finds that 63 % of the women in his study recount instances of sexual harassment on the job, including 25 % who have experience with "quid pro quo" harassment. In addition, Keverline (2003) finds that 49 % of the women in her study experience sexual harassment in the course of their work in federal law enforcement. The courts identify two general types of sexual harassment: "quid pro quo" and "the hostile work environment" (Martin and Jurik 2006, 9). Quid pro quo harassment involves a sexual advance or proposition with which the women must comply or forfeit an employment benefit (Martin and Jurik 2006). A hostile environment sexual harassment occurs "when an employer encourages or tolerates the existence in its

workplace of an environment fraught with sexual innuendo and intimidation or other forms of harassing conduct sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the terms and conditions of a woman's employment " (Gregory 2003, 125) and includes a variety of unwelcoming sexual behaviors such as touching, teasing, and making comments about a woman's appearance or sexuality, establishing a pattern that makes her work environment unpleasant or hostile (Martin and Jurik 2006).

Fifth, Keverline (2003) finds that the women in her study also experience sexual discrimination in terms of work assignments (38.2 %), promotions (26.7 %), and training opportunities (21.8 %). According to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, sexual discrimination or gender discrimination is the practice of letting a person's sex unfairly become a factor when deciding who receives an initial job, promotion, training opportunity, job assignment, compensation, or other employment benefit (Martin and Jurik 2006).

Sixth, Martin (1980) argues that the lack of female role models in the higher ranks is a major obstacle to younger female officers because it fosters feelings of isolation since they have no one to serve as examples in an organization and whose behavior is a model for others. Additionally, agencies with a higher percentage of female administrative leadership provide female officers with greater promotional opportunities (Martin 1980; O'Toole 1987; Schulz 2004) and helps with retention of female officers (Kranda 1998).

Seventh, Rabe-Hamp (2008) finds that police agencies are not at pace with the private sector in implementing more family-friendly policies such as maternity/paternity leave, flex-time to accommodate general family needs, and in-house day care options. In addition, other family-friendly policies include accommodations for breastfeeding and

other nursing care and the ability to stay in one location for an extended period of time without jeopardizing one's career. Research by Keverline (2003) concludes that 44.2 % of women in federal law enforcement will leave law enforcement because their agency does not provide adequate support in raising a family. In addition, 25.7 % will leave law enforcement because their agency does not provide adequate support in caring for aging parents (Keverline 2003).

Finally, law enforcement employers are under no obligation to adopt more pregnancy-friendly policies such as maternity benefits to make it easier for pregnant women to continue to work during pregnancy, such as light duty assignments and safety measures during range qualifications, and returning to work after delivery without jeopardizing one's career, nor accommodate pregnant employees, except to provide them time to attend to medical appointments (National Center for Women and Policing 2001). Research by Keverline (2003) concludes 21.4 % will leave law enforcement because their agency does not provide adequate support during pregnancy.

Quantitative Research Design

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The quantitative portion of this addresses the following research questions (Q) and hypotheses (H):

Q_1: Does perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H_1: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive pervasive negative attitudes from their male colleagues, then expected female retention will decrease.

Q_2: Does a perceived traditional law enforcement work culture explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H_2: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive a negative work culture, then expected female retention will decrease.

Q_3: Does a perceived glass ceiling to promotions explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H_3: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive a glass ceiling to promotions, then expected female retention will decrease.

Q_4: Does perceived sexual harassment from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H_4: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive sexual harassment from their male colleagues, then expected female retention will decrease.

Q_5: Does perceived sexual discrimination from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H_5: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive sexual discrimination from their male colleagues, then expected female retention will decrease.

Q_6: Does a perceived lack of high-ranking female role models in federal law enforcement explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H$_6$: The perceived lack of high-ranking female federal law enforcement role models will

decrease expected female retention.

Q$_7$: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly pregnancy policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H$_7$: If federal law enforcement agencies are perceived to have non-friendly pregnancy

policies, then expected female retention will decrease.

Q$_8$: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly family care policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

H$_8$: If federal law enforcement agencies are perceived to have non-friendly family care

policies, then expected female retention will decrease.

Design

According to Schutt (2006), a quantitative study involves testing a theory in a

control environment through statistical analysis to determine if predictive generalizations

hold true. The quantitative portion of this study utilizes a cross-sectional survey to

investigate eight factors (independent variables) that may explain the underrepresentation

of women in federal law enforcement. The unit of analysis is the individual, specifically

female federal law enforcement officers, and the units of observation are the responses

(data) collected from these women via surveys. The dependent variable is female officer

retention in federal law enforcement. It is operationalized by responders' perceived

intent to stay in federal law enforcement utilizing three items. The first item asks,

"Assuming things in your personal life and work remain the same, how many more years

do you plan on staying in federal law enforcement?" Using a numeric scale, respondents

indicate the number of years they will likely remain in federal law enforcement. The

second item asks, "Assuming things in my personal life and work remain the same, I will

remain in federal law enforcement in the near future." Using a 5-point scale, respondents

indicate the degree to which they will likely remain in federal law enforcement measured

at the ordinal level (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). The third item asks the

likelihood they will depart federal law enforcement specifically for any one of the eight

independent variables (factors) that are the focus of this study. Using a 5-point scale,

respondents indicate the degree to which they will depart federal law enforcement for

these reasons measured at the ordinal level (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

The eight independent variables are: 1) perception of negative attitudes from male

colleagues, 2) perception of a negative work culture, 3) perception to a glass ceiling to

promotions, 4) perception of sexual harassment from male colleagues, 5) perception of

sexual discrimination from male colleagues, 6) perception of a lack of female role models

in federal law enforcement, 7) perception of non-friendly pregnancy policies in federal

law enforcement, and 8) perception of non-friendly family care policies in federal law

enforcement. These are operationalized by responders' perception with these issues

(factors). Definitions of the key terms to measure the independent variables are in the

footnotes of the survey at the first mention of the key term to mitigate any

misinterpretation. In addition, no manipulation of the variables occurs and the

participants solely determine their responses.

There are 19 other variables in this study. First, the study captures respondent's

year of birth for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question to determine the

respondent's age in order to provide the mean and range of the overall sample. Coding is the actual year of birth and measurement is at the interval level. Second, the study captures respondent's *gender* using a fixed-choice question to distinguish the sample between men and women. This is a dummy variable and coding is 0 (males) and 1 (females). Male responders will not be in the final sample or analysis. Third, the study captures respondent's *sexual orientation* for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding includes the numbers 1 (heterosexual), 2 (bisexual), and 3 (homosexual). Fourth, the study captures respondent's *level of education* for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding includes the numbers 1 (high school), 2 (some college), 3 (bachelors degree), 4 (masters degree), and 5 (doctoral degree).

Fifth, the study captures respondent's *ethnicity* for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding uses the numbers 1 (African American), 2 (Asian/Pacific Islander), 3 (Caucasian), 4 (Latina), 5 (Native American), 6 (Other), and 7 (Multiracial). Respondents have the option of choosing as many ethnic groups as possible to describe themselves. Sixth, the study captures respondent's *current relationship status* for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding includes the numbers 1 (single), 2 (married), 3 (domestic partner), 4 (separated/divorced), and 5 (widowed).

Seventh, the study captures the *number of children* respondent has for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of children ranging between 0 - 6. Eighth, the study captures the *number of minor children living at home* for descriptive purposes using an

open-ended question. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of children ranging between 0 - 6.

Ninth, the study asks if the respondent is a *sworn federal officer with arrest and firearm authority* using a fixed-choice question to distinguish the sample between those that are sworn federal officers and those that are not. This is a dummy variable and coding is 0 (not sworn federal officers) and 1 (sworn federal officers). Only those that are sworn federal officers are in final sample and analysis. Tenth, the study captures respondent's *current federal law enforcement agency* (employer) for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding is the actual acronym of the agency. For example, if the respondent works for the FBI, the coding is FBI and so forth. Eleventh, the study captures the *number of years* respondent has with her current employer (federal law enforcement agency) for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of years ranging between 0 - 30. Twelfth, the study captures the *total number of years* respondent has in federal law enforcement agency for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question to provide a mean and range of the sample's experience level. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of years ranging between 0 - 30.

Thirteenth, the study captures respondent's *GS-level or military rank* for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question to provide a mean, median, and range of the overall sample. Measurement is at the ordinal level and coding is numeric identifying their actual rank or GS-level from the most junior to the most senior: 5 (GS-5 or E-5), 6 (GS-6 or E-6), 7 (GS-7 or E-7), 8 (GS-8 or E-8), 9 (GS-9 or E-9), 10 (GS-10 or

O-1), 11 (GS-11 or O-2), 12 (GS-12 or O-3), 13 (GS-13 or O-4), 14 (GS-14 or O-5), 15 (GS-15 or O-6), and 16 (SES or O-7 and higher). For those few agencies that do not utilize the GS pay scale, a missing code is in place for "Non-GS pay scale." Fourteenth, the study captures if the respondent has any *law enforcement supervisory experience* for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding includes the numbers 1 (yes) and 2 (no).

Fifteenth, the study captures the number of *permanent relocations* respondent has in her federal law enforcement employment for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of relocations ranging between 0 - 10. Sixteenth, the study captures the number of *business trips or temporary duties (TDYs)* lasting 3 months or longer respondent has in her federal law enforcement employment for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of business trips or TDYs ranging between 0 - 10.

Seventeenth, the study captures whether respondent has experience in *either state or local law enforcement* prior to working in federal law enforcement for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding includes the numbers 1 (yes) and 2 (no). Eighteenth, if respondent does have experience in either state or local law enforcement prior to working in federal law enforcement, the study captures the *number of years in state or local law enforcement* for descriptive purposes using an open-ended question. Measurement is at the interval level and coding is numeric with the actual number of years ranging between 0 - 30. Finally, the study captures whether the *events of 9/11* affects respondent's decision to pursue or stay in

federal law enforcement for descriptive purposes using a fixed-choice question. Measurement is at the nominal level and coding includes the numbers 1 (yes) and 2 (no).

In summary, the first part of the survey collects responses to the 19 demographic/descriptive questions primarily to describe the current status of women in federal law enforcement. The remainder of the survey examines the actual experiences and opinions of the respondents and use various questions/statements to test the eight hypotheses using measurements at the ordinal level and coding with the numbers 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (unsure), 4 (agree), and 5 (strongly agree). Table 3.1 identifies the survey questions that correspond with the measurable variables. In addition, the study includes other questions/statements that examine other items of interest using measurement at the nominal level and coding with the numbers 1 (yes) and 2 (no). See Appendix E for the quantitative codebook for the survey.

Sample

This portion of the study draws its sample from sworn female federal law enforcement officers attending the 12th Annual Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE) Leadership Training Conference on June 20-23, 2011, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Long Beach, California. This sample is chosen from this population for several reasons. First, the women who attend the WIFLE Leadership Training Conference represent all the professions in federal law enforcement and the majority of all the federal law enforcement agencies in the US. Sworn federal officers perform duties in the following areas: 1) criminal investigation, 2) police response and patrol, 3) corrections, 4) non-criminal investigation, 5) court operations, and 6) security and protection (Reaves and Hart 2000). See Appendix B for a listing of the over 100 federal agencies employing

84

full-time personnel with authority to make arrests and carry firearms. Second, it ensures

a large sample size is achievable in order to provide generalizable results. Third, no

specific federal law enforcement agency provides permission to study the women at their

agency. And fourth, this sampling strategy follows Keverline's (2003) previous research

on women's persistence in federal law enforcement and extends that line of research.

Six hundred twenty three women (N = 623) attend the 12th Annual WIFLE

Leadership Training Conference. One hundred ninety six attendees respond to the

survey. This represents a 31.5 % rate of return. Of that number, 168 are by women who

are sworn federal officers with arrest and firearm authority. Twenty eight surveys are by

women who work in federal law enforcement but not in the capacity of a sworn federal

officer. These surveys are not in the final sample (n = 168) for analysis.

Data Collection Procedures

Women in Federal Law Enforcement, Inc. (WIFLE), a non-profit professional

organization incorporated in June 1999, grants access to their 12th Annual WIFLE

Leadership Training Conference to administer the research instruments. The quantitative

design collects data on a sample of women presently working as sworn federal law

enforcement officers who attend the conference.

WIFLE provides each conference attendee a welcome packet which contains a

paper copy of the survey packet that elicits information on a variety of issues concerning

women in federal law enforcement, upon check-in for the conference. The survey packet

contains: 1) an information letter describing the study, the importance of her

involvement, solicitation for her participation in the survey, assurances of confidentiality

and anonymity, and another solicitation for her participation in an interview to discuss

further issues and 2) copy of the 6-page survey. Instructions for survey return are in the information letter informing them that a locked box with the label "Survey Returns" is at the conference registration table. Respondents voluntarily participate in the study by completing the survey which contains forced choice and open-ended items that elicit information about their experience in federal law enforcement. The survey takes approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. The survey is completely anonymous and contains no identifying information or a means to connect an individual to her participation in this study or her specific responses. The information letter and survey appear in Appendix F.

Data Analysis

Data analysis includes computations of the descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, as well as frequencies and percentages, for the demographic information and each of the measures in the survey portion of the study. Analysis also includes calculations for cross tabulations and bivariate correlations for the observed variables to determine if there is a statistical correlation between the independent variables and dependent variables. In addition, multivariate analysis to include ordinary least squares and logistic regression identifies statistical relationships between the independent variables.

Weaknesses and Limitations

According to Schutt (2009), in order for a survey to be valid, it must minimize four types of error. They include: 1) coverage error: every person in the target population has an equal opportunity for selection; 2) sampling error: enough people in the target population are randomly chosen in order to achieve generalizability; 3) measurement

86

error: questions in the survey are clear and choices are without bias; and 4) non-response error: non-respondents differ from those who take the time to participate. In addition, a survey must be reliable: have the ability to provide the same results each time.

Though the design of the survey in this study minimizes survey error and maximizes internal and external validity, there are, however, several known limitations to this study that can affect the validity and generalizability of the results. First, the population from which the sample is drawn is limited to those women in federal law enforcement who attend the WIFLE Leadership Training Conference. This limits the sample frame of possible women in federal law enforcement that might have been part of the study and may therefore not be representative of all sworn female federal law enforcement officers; however, there is no reason to believe a particular group or subgroup is excluded from attending the conference. Second, the single wave of data collection at the WIFLE Leadership Training Conference may also limit the representation of all sworn female federal officers. Third, other factors (variables) may exist that explain why women stay or depart federal law enforcement; however, there is no feasible way to control for all of these possibilities. Fourth, response relies on the self-reporting of the participants. Since all subjects have unique characteristics, different orientations, and different perceptions, there may be some reporting bias. However, since the researcher has knowledge and technical understanding of federal law enforcement, the survey uses appropriate technical language. In addition, the researcher pre-tests the survey with two individuals who are familiar with federal law enforcement and with one individual who has no knowledge of federal law enforcement to minimize bias or misinterpretation. And fifth, because the women chose to attend the WIFLE Leadership

Training Conference or their respective agencies selects them to represent their agency, they are likely already committed to improving the status of women in federal law enforcement and/or are relatively committed to their careers regardless of the perceived barriers. As a result, some questions may lead respondents to provide a perceived "correct answer." The limitations may influence the overall findings of the study by skewing the data in the opposite direction or not representative of all women in federal law enforcement.

Qualitative Research Design

Guided Questions

The qualitative portion of this study addresses the following guided questions to provide supplemental data to enrich the findings from the survey data:

1. What is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement?

2. What other challenges do women face in federal law enforcement?

3. What strategies do women employ to deal with these challenges?

4. Why do women stay in federal law enforcement?

5. Why are women underrepresented in federal law enforcement?

6. What can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement?

Design

According to Schutt (2006), a qualitative study involves a process or study in its natural setting that seeks to better understand a social or human problem. The qualitative portion of this study utilizes a cross-sectional, semi-structured open-ended interview to collect supplemental data regarding the relationship between the eight factors that may or may not explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement to enrich the

findings from the survey data. This portion also attempts to identify the biggest barrier

for women in federal law enforcement, other challenges that women face in federal law

enforcement, how they perceive and cope with these challenges, identify reasons why

women stay in federal law enforcement, discover new theories why women are

underrepresented in federal law enforcement, and obtain opinions on what can or should

be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement. In addition, the qualitative

portion repeats the same demographic/ descriptive questions from the quantitative portion

in order to describe this new sample.

The researcher serves as the sole interviewer. In order to reduce bias, data

collection uses a standardized approach. Interview questions are written in advance,

exactly the way they are asked in the interview. Using a standardized approach to

capture the participants' response minimizes the interviewer effect because every

participant is asked the same question. In addition, the interviewer follows a

predetermine sequence of questions, reducing the need for interviewer judgment and

utilizing time limits effectively. Finally, the standardized interviews facilitate data

analysis, making it easier to locate participants' answers to specific questions. Though

the predetermined questions limit probing, the interviewer exercises flexibility when

responses are unclear. See Appendix G for the qualitative codebook for the interviews.

Sample

This portion of the study draws its sample from sworn female federal law

enforcement officers attending the 12th Annual Women in Federal Law Enforcement

(WIFLE) Leadership Training Conference on June 20-23, 2011, at the Hyatt Regency

Hotel in Long Beach, California, that responds to the solicitation for interview in the

survey information letter to further discuss their experiences in federal law enforcement

to collect supplemental data to enrich the findings from the survey data. Twenty sworn

female federal law enforcement officers (n = 20) responds to the solicitation for

interview.

<center>*Data Collection Procedures*</center>

The information letter in the survey packet provides a solicitation for interview to

further discuss women's experiences in federal law enforcement. For those who show

interest in the interview, instructions in the letter advise respondents to write their name

and phone number on the tear-off portion of the information letter and return the slip to a

locked box with the label "Interview Requests" at the conference registration table. The

researcher contacts all respondents to schedule an interview. Eleven respondents have in-

person interviews and nine have telephonic interviews. Separate informed consent forms

are collected from the interview participants at the time of the in-person interview. All

eleven respondents provide consent for the interviews to be audio-taped. These

interviews are conducted in a private room away from the main activities of the

conference and last between 15-45 minutes, depending on the breadth and depth of the

interviewees' response. Audio recordings have no identifying information on the audio

file. Additionally, the interviewer records notes if a concept is unclear for follow-up or

further probing. For the telephonic interviews, all nine respondents provide verbal

consent for the interview; however, there are no recordings. The telephonic interviewer

takes place in a private room and last between 20-50 minutes. The interviewer takes

notes throughout the entire interview. In both types of interviews, many women share

stories and provide specific examples of gender barriers. Copies of the informed consent forms and interview questions appear in Appendix H.

Data Analysis

At the conclusion of the conference, the audio recordings are transcribed and analyzed utilizing a pattern matching method of data analysis to identify phrases, sentences, or paragraphs that represent one idea. The focus of the analysis is on common themes, recurring ideas, language, and patterns in order to identify key issues, events, and people.

The following chapter provides the results of the quantitative research to include descriptive statistics of the demographic variables and the eight factors that may or may not explain why women depart federal law enforcement; bivariate statistics of the demographic variables and the observed variables; and multivariate statistics of the independent variables using ordinary least squares and logistic regression.

Table 3.1 *Measurable Variables*

Dependent Variables	Survey Questions
Pervasive negative attitudes: H_1: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive pervasive negative attitudes from their male colleagues, then expected female retention will decrease.	C2: Pervasive negative attitudes from my male colleagues will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Law enforcement work culture: H_2: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive a negative work culture, then expected female retention will decrease.	C4: A negative law enforcement work culture will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Glass ceiling to promotions: H_3: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive a glass ceiling to promotions, then expected female retention will decrease.	D6: A perceived glass ceiling to promotions will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Sexual harassment: H_4: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive sexual harassment from their male colleagues, then expected female retention will decrease.	C6: Sexual harassment will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Sexual discrimination: H_5: If female federal law enforcement officers perceive sexual discrimination from their male colleagues, then expected female retention will decrease.	C8: Sexual discrimination will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Lack of high-ranking female role model: H_6: The perceived lack of high-ranking female federal law enforcement role models will decrease expected female retention.	C12: The lack of high-ranking female role models will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Non-pregnancy friendly policies: H_7: If federal law enforcement agencies are perceived to have non-pregnancy friendly policies, then expected female retention will decrease.	C13: The lack of pregnancy-friendly policies in my agency will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Non-friendly family-care policies: H_8: If federal law enforcement agencies are perceived to have non-friendly family care policies, then expected female retention will decrease.	C14: The lack of family-friendly policies in my agency will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
Further years respondent plans on staying federal law enforcement.	D1: Assuming things in my personal life remain the same, I will remain in federal law enforcement in the near future.
Respondent's likelihood to remain in federal law enforcement	B8: Assuming things in your personal life remain the same, how many more years do you plan on staying in federal law enforcement?

Table 3.1 *Measurable Variables (cont)*

Independent Variables	Survey Questions
If respondent experience pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues	C1: I experience pervasive negative attitudes from my male colleagues.
If respondent experience a negative law enforcement work culture	C3: I experience a negative law enforcement work culture at my agency.
If a perceived glass ceiling to promotions exist at respondent's agency	D5: A perceived glass ceiling to promotion exists in my agency.
If respondent experience sexual harassment	C5: I experience sexual harassment in my federal law enforcement employment.
If respondent experience sexual discrimination	C7. I experience sexual discrimination in my federal law enforcement employment.
If respondent has many female role models at agency	C10: There are many high-ranking female role models at my agency.
If respondent's agency has family-friendly policies	C13: My agency has adopted a family-friendly policy in the workplace.
If respondent's agency has pregnancy-friendly policies	C15. My agency has adopted a pregnancy-friendly policy in the workplace.

Chapter 4: Quantitative Results

Introduction

The results of the analysis for the quantitative data collected in this study are presented in this chapter. Written surveys were completed by 168 sworn female federal officers with arrest and firearm authority attending the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference. The first three sections focus on descriptive statistics to describe the current status of women in federal law enforcement and to better understand the participants in this study, as well as examine other items of interest that may or may not hold any significance to the status of women in federal law enforcement. The remaining sections focus on bivariate and multivariate statistics to address the following eight research questions (Q) and attempts to explain if the perceived eight factors affect the likelihood of women's retention in federal law enforcement:

Q_1: Does perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_2: Does a perceived traditional law enforcement work culture explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_3: Does a perceived glass ceiling to promotions explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_4: Does perceived sexual harassment from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q5: Does perceived sexual discrimination from male colleagues explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q6: Does a perceived lack of high-ranking female role models in federal law

enforcement explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law

enforcement?

Q7: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly pregnancy policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q8: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly family care policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Descriptive Statistics of the Demographic Variables

This section describes the current status of women in federal law enforcement to

better understand the participants in this study. Descriptive statistics, including means

and standard deviations, for the demographic information and each of the measures in the

survey portion of the study are computed. Frequencies and percentages are compiled for

sample description purposes.

Age

The age range of this sample is consistent with average working women aged

16 – 64 in the US labor force. The survey respondents are 23 - 60 years old. They have a

mean age of 39, a median age of 38, and a mode age of 31 (see Table 4.1).

Sexual Orientation

The sexual orientation makeup of this sample is consistent with the US

population; 91.6 % (n = 153) report being heterosexual, 1.2 % (n = 2) report being

bisexual, and 7.2 % (n = 12) report being homosexual (see Table 4.2). Though the exact

size of the lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) population in the US is unknown, base on data from the National Survey of Family Growth and the General Social Survey, it is estimated that 8.2 % of Americans engage in same-sex sexual behavior (Gates 2011).

Education

The women in this sample are significantly more educated than the overall general population of women aged 25 – 64. As for education, 0.6 % (n = 1) of the sample has a high school diploma, 14.9 % (n = 25) has some college, 57.7 % (n = 97) has a bachelor's degree, 24.4 % (n = 41) has a master's degree, and 2.4 % (n = 4) has a doctoral degree (see Table 4.3). In comparison with the educational attainment statistics compiled by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), only 36 % of the overall general population of women aged 25 – 64 has a bachelor's degree or higher in the US.

Ethnicity

In comparison with race/ethnicity statistics provided by the latest Census Data (2010), the women in this sample are more diverse than the US population. As for ethnicity, 54.5 % (n = 91) of the sample describe themselves as Caucasian, 19.2 % (n = 32) describe themselves as Latina, 14.4 % (n = 24) describe themselves as African American, 6 % (n = 10) describe themselves as Asian/Pacific Islander, 4.2 % (n = 7) describe themselves as Multiracial, 1.2 % (n = 2) describe themselves as Native American, and 0.6 % (n = 1) describe themselves as Other (see Table 4.4). The only exception is the Other category; 6.2 % report Other during the last census call.

Relationship Status

Assuming women with domestic partners are inclusive in the single category, the makeup of this sample is far more single (unmarried) than the women in the US labor

force. As for relationship status, 50 % (n = 84) of the women in this sample report being married, 29.2 % report being single, 14.9 % report being separated or divorced, and 6 % report having a domestic partner (see Table 4.5). According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), 53.2% of the women in the US labor force aged 16 and older are married, 26.9% are single, and 16.9% are either separated or divorced.

Children

The majority of the women in this sample have no children or have very few children. Over half the women (52.4%, n = 88) report having no children and even more (61.9 %, n = 104) have no minor children living at home (see Tables 4.6 and 4.7). Of the women who do have children, 85.9 % (n = 55) have only one or two minor children at home. The mean response for minor children at home is 0.63 (SD = .958).

Law Enforcement Grade and Supervisory Experience

The majority of the women in this sample are slightly higher than mid-level federal law enforcement officers. Their General Schedule (GS) level ranges from GS-7 to Senior Executive Service (SES) (see Table 4.8). Over half the women (58.7 %) in this sample are working at GS-13 or higher. The mean GS-level is 12.75 (SD = 2.186) and the median and mode is GS-13. This is consistent with the 54.8 % (n = 91) who also report having supervisory experience (see Table 4.9) since GS-13 is normally the grade individuals become supervisors.

According to Ackerman (2006), the majority of federal law enforcement utilizes a GS system to classify occupations that are considered white-collar positions. In general, GS-level is determined by a combination of education and employment experience and is placed on a scale from GS-01 to GS-15; SES positions are above GS-15. Professional

positions increase in 2-grade intervals such as GS-5 to GS-7 to GS-9 to GS-11.

Subsequently, positions increase in 1-grade intervals to GS-12 to GS-13 to GS-14 to

GS-15. To qualify for appointment at the GS-5 level, applicants must have a bachelor's

degree or three years of general experience that was equivalent to at least GS-4. For

GS-7, applicants must have completed one full year of graduate level education, or have

attained superior academic achievement during undergraduate studies (i.e. 3.0 GPA or

higher), or have one year of specialized experience that was equivalent to at least GS-5.

For GS-9, applicants must have a master's degree, or two years of graduate education, or

have one year of specialized experience that was equivalent to at least GS-7. For GS-11,

applicants must have a PhD or equivalent doctoral degree, or three years of graduate

education, or have one year of specialized experience equivalent to at least a GS-9.

Agency Representation

Agency representation in this sample is grossly underrepresented. Only 34

agencies are represented in this study (see Table 4.10). According to the USDOJ BJS, no

more than 67 federal law enforcement agencies at any given time have responded to the

Census of Federal Law Enforcement Officers (Reaves and Bauer 2003). Some agencies

such as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Federal Air Marshal Service are

automatically excluded because their numbers are classified (Reaves and Bauer 2003);

however, according to Ackerman (2006) and Bumgarner (2006), over 100 federal law

enforcement agencies exist that employ full-time personnel who are sworn officers

authorized to make arrests and carry firearms,

Based on the latest census provided by the USDOJ BJS, federal agencies employ

approximately 105,000 sworn full-time officers in the US. Federal agencies with 500 or

more federal officers' employ about 98,500 or 94 % of the federal officers covered in the census. Of these 18 large federal agencies, the largest agency (US Customs and Border Protection to include US Border Patrol) employ approximately 26.4 % of all federal officers; however, they are only half represented in this study (13.1 %). The next two largest agencies (Federal Bureau of Prisons and Federal Bureau of Investigations) combined employ approximately 26.2 % of all federal officers; however, they are negligible in this study (0.6 %). The fourth largest agency (US Immigrations and Customs Enforcement to include Federal Protective Service) employ approximately 9.9 % of all federal officers; however, they are grossly overrepresented in this study (25 %).[12] The next three largest agencies (US Secret Service, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Administrative Office of the US Courts) combined employ approximately 12.6 % of all federal officers; however, they are only half represented in this study (6 %). The next largest agency (US Marshals Service) employs approximately 3 % of all federal officers and is equally represented in this study (3 %). The remaining nine large agencies (US Postal Inspection Service; Internal Revenue Service Criminal Division; Veterans Health Administration; Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; National Park Service to include US Park Police; US Capitol Police, Diplomatic Security Service; US Fish and Wildlife Service; and the USDA Forest Service) combined employ approximately 15.6 % of all federal officers; however, they are only a quarter represented in this study (4.2 %) (Reaves 2006).

---

[12] Note: The Director of US Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is a keynote speaker during the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference and his attendance may explain the over-representation of respondents from ICE in the study, as well as overrepresentation at the conference itself.

Of the agencies that represent 6 % of the remaining federal officers covered by

the USDOJ BJS census (Reaves 2006), they are grossly overrepresented in this study

(22.8 %). These numbers suggest that with the exception of the US Immigration and

Customs Enforcement and the US Marshals Service, many of the potential participants

from the large federal agencies are either non-respondent to the study or are not

appropriately represented at the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference.

Tenure in Federal Law Enforcement

The women in this sample are experienced federal law enforcement officers. The

tenure of survey respondents in both current federal agency and total federal law

enforcement respectively range between 1 to 33 years (see Tables 4.11 and 4.12). The

mean response for years worked at their current federal agency is 10.01 (SD = 7.285).

When examining tenure in federal law enforcement regardless of agency, the mean

response for total years worked in federal law enforcement is 12.23 (SD = 7.64). The

increase in total years worked in federal law enforcement may suggest that women have

no problem leaving one agency for another should an issue arise. In addition, the

increase in total years may also be explained by the re-shuffling and re-naming of several

agencies transferred to the Department of Homeland Security in 2002.

Previous Experience in State or Local Law Enforcement

The overwhelming majority of the women in this sample have no prior experience

in state or local law enforcement (see Table 4.13). Of the 18.5 % (n = 31) who do have

prior experience in state or local law enforcement, the mean response for years at state or

local law enforcement is 4.76 (SD = 2.96) (see Table 4.14). This may be one area

recruiters of federal law enforcement find a pool of qualified applicants.

Relocations and Extended Business Trips

The women in this sample have relocated more for their federal law enforcement careers than the average working American. No other profession, other than the military, requires relocations for career advancement. They have a range of 0 to 10 permanent relocations (see Table 4.15), and the mean response for relocations is 1.61 (SD = 1.831). Similarly, the women in this sample have also traveled for their federal law enforcement careers and have a range of 0 to 15 business trips lasting longer than 3 months (see Table 4.16). The mean response for trips lasting longer than 3 months is 1.31 (SD = 1.824).

9/11 Influence

Finally, the majority of the women in this sample did not report any influence by the events of 9/11 for pursuing or staying in federal law enforcement. Though the overall number of federal law enforcement personnel in the past 10 years has increased with the passage of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 as a result of the events of 9/11 (Langton 2010), only 27.5 % (n = 44) of the respondents report any influence by the events of 9/11 for pursuing or staying in federal law enforcement (see Table 4.17). To determine if age makes a difference in their response, the year of birth was collapsed to capture respondents born before 1980 and after 1980. Of those respondents born after 1980, the percentage was higher; 34.4 % report pursuing or remaining in federal law enforcement as a result of the events of 9/11. Of those respondents born before 1980, the percentage was lower; 25.4 % of the respondents report pursuing or remaining in federal law enforcement as a result of the events of 9/11.

Descriptive Statistics of Eight Factors and Perceived Expected Retention

This section describes respondents' experience with eight factors that may or may not explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement. Using a five point scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Unsure, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree), the respondents indicate the degree to which they agree or disagree with these eight series of statements.

Pervasive Negative Attitudes

The first set of statements describe whether respondents experience pervasive negative attitudes from their male colleagues; 27.7 % (n = 46) strongly disagree, 34.3 % (n = 57) disagree, 13.9 % (n = 23) are unsure, 19.3 % (n = 23) agree, and 4.8 % (n = 8) strongly agree (see Table 4.18). The mean response is 2.39 (SD = 1.215), an indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement is not affected by negative attitudes from male colleagues. In addition, whether respondents will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues, 71.3 % (n = 119) strongly disagree, 19.2 % (n = 32) disagree, 4.8 % (n = 8) are unsure, 3 % (n = 5) agree, and 1.8 % (n = 3) strongly agree. The mean response is 1.45 (SD = .862), a strong indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law enforcement as a result of pervasive negative attitudes from males.

Negative Law Enforcement Work Culture

The second set of statements describe whether respondents experience a negative law enforcement work culture at their agency; 38.6 % (n = 64) strongly disagree, 34.3 % (n = -57) disagree, 10.2 % (n = 17) are unsure, 13.3 % (n = 22) agree, and 3.6 % (n = 6) strongly agree (see Table 4.19). The mean response is 2.09 (SD = 1.159), an indication

that this sample of women in federal law enforcement is not affected by a negative law enforcement work culture. In addition, whether respondents will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of a negative law enforcement work culture, 63.6 % (n = 105) strongly disagree, 18.2 % (n = - 30) disagree, 8.5 % (n = 14) are unsure, 6.1 % (n = 10) agree, and 3.6 % (n = 6) strongly agree. The mean response is 1.68 (SD = 1.093), a strong indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law enforcement as a result of a negative law enforcement work culture.

Glass Ceiling to Promotions

The third set of statements describe whether respondents perceive a glass ceiling for women to promotions; 8.5 % (n = 14) strongly disagree, 24.2 % (n = 40) disagree, 47.9 % (n = 79) are unsure, 15.8 % (n = 26) agree, and 3.6 % (n = 6) strongly agree (see Table 4.20). The mean response is 2.82 (SD = .926), a strong indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement is unsure of the promotional possibilities in federal law enforcement. In addition, whether respondents will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of a perceived glass ceiling to promotions, 40.4 % (n = 67) strongly disagree, 30.1 % (n = 50) disagree, 24.1 % (n = 40) are unsure, 4.8 % (n = 8) agree, and 0.6 % (n = 1) strongly agree. The mean response is 1.95 (SD - .946), a strong indication that though this sample is unsure of the promotional possibilities in federal law enforcement, they will likely not depart federal law enforcement as a result of a perceived glass ceiling to promotions.

Sexual Harassment

The fourth set of statements describe whether respondents experience sexual harassment at their current agency; 52.7 % (n = 87) strongly disagree, 24.8 % (n = 41)

disagree, 3.6 % (n = 6) are unsure, 14.5 % (n = 24) agree, and 4.2 % (n = 7) strongly

agree (see Table 4.21). The mean response is 1.93 (SD = 1.237), a strong indication that

this sample of women in federal law enforcement has not experienced sexual harassment

at their current agency. For those women who did experience sexual harassment during

their careers (n = 71), 19.7 % (n = 14) made a formal report and 80.3 % (n = 57) did not,

a strong indication that women are either still afraid of reporting sexual harassment or do

not bother for one reason or another. Of interest is the larger sample size of those

respondents who experience sexual harassment during in their career (n = 71) in

comparison to the sample size (n = 31) that experience sexual harassment at their current

agency. This disparity suggests that women experience sexual harassment at their

previous employment prior to their current agency and may even be the reason why they

left their agency. In addition, whether respondents will likely depart federal law

enforcement as a result of sexual harassment, 73.6 % (n = 120) strongly disagree, 15.3 %

(n = 25) disagree, 7.4 % (n = 12) are unsure, 1.8 % (n = 3) agree, and 1.8 % (n = 3)

strongly agree. The mean response is 1.43 (SD = .853), a strong indication that this

sample of women in federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law

enforcement as a result of sexual harassment.

Sexual Discrimination

The fifth set of statements describe whether respondents experience sexual

discrimination at their current agency; 42.4 % (n = 70) strongly disagree, 26.1 % (n = 43)

disagree, 10.3 % (n = 17) are unsure, 15.8 % (n = 26) agree, and 5.5 % (n = 9) strongly

agree (see Table 4.22). The mean response is 2.16 (SD = 1.278), an indication that this

sample of women in federal law enforcement has not experienced sexual discrimination

at their current agency. For those women who did experience sexual discrimination

during their careers (n = 66), 21.2 % (n = 14) made a formal report and 78.8 % (n = 52)

did not, a strong indication that like sexual harassment, women are either still afraid of

reporting sexual discrimination or do not bother for one reason or another. Of note is the

larger sample size of those respondents who experience sexual discrimination during

their career (n = 66) in comparison to the sample size (n = 35) that experience sexual

discrimination at their current agency. This disparity suggests that women experience

sexual discrimination at their previous employment prior to their current agency and may

even be the reason why they left. In addition, whether respondents will likely depart

federal law enforcement as a result of sexual discrimination, 63.9 % (n = 106) strongly

disagree, 18.7 % (n = 31) disagree, 11.4 % (n = 19) are unsure, 4.8 % (n = 8) agree, and

1.2 % (n = 2) strongly agree. The mean response is 1.61 (SD = .952), a strong indication

that this sample of women in federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law

enforcement as a result of sexual discrimination.

<div align="center">High-Ranking Female Role Models</div>

The sixth set of statements describe whether respondents have many high-ranking

female role models at their agency; 25 % (n = 41) strongly disagree, 34.1% (n = 56)

disagree, 11 % (n = 18) are unsure, 25 % (n = 41) agree, and 4.9 % (n = 8) strongly agree

(see Table 4.23). The mean response is 2.51 (SD = 1.246), an indication that this sample

of women in federal law enforcement perceive there are not enough high-ranking female

role models at their agency. Specifically, the women in this sample report having 0 to 27

female role models at their agencies (see Table 4.24). The mean response is 2.81

(SD = 4.071), indicating that this sample of women in federal law enforcement does

indeed have few high-ranking female role models at their agency. In addition, only

33.5 % (n = 56) of the women in this sample has a mentor at their agency and of that

number, only 40 % are female mentors (see Tables 4.25 and 4.26). Regardless, whether

respondents will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of high-

ranking female role models, 62.2 % (n = 102) strongly disagree, 25.6% (n = 42) disagree,

11 % (n = 18) are unsure, 0.6 % (n = 1) agree, and 0.6 % (n = 1) strongly agree. The

mean response is 1.52 (SD = .763), a strong indication that this sample of women in

federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law enforcement as a result of the

lack of high-ranking female role models.

Pregnancy-Friendly Policies

The seventh set of statements describe whether respondents' agencies have

pregnancy-friendly policies at the workplace; 17.3 % (n = 28) strongly disagree, 9.9 %

(n = 16) disagree, 37.7 % (n = 61) are unsure, 24.1 % (n = 39) agree, and 11.1 % (n = 18)

strongly agree (see Table 4.27). The mean response is 3.02 (SD = 1.218), a strong

indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement is unsure whether their

agencies have these pregnancy-friendly policies in place. For those women who were

pregnant while employed as a federal officer (n = 64), 18.8 % (n = 12) report suffering

adverse employment consequences from their pregnancy while 81.3 % (n = 54) did not.

In addition, whether respondents will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of

the lack of pregnancy-friendly policies, 50.9 % (n = 83) strongly disagree, 18.4 %

(n = 30) disagree, 22.1 % (n = 36) are unsure, 4.9 % (n = 8) agree, and 3.7 % (n = 6)

strongly agree. The mean response is 1.92 (SD = 1.122), an indication that this sample of

women in federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of pregnancy-friendly policies.

Family-Friendly Policies

Finally, the eighth set of statements describe whether respondents' agencies have family-friendly policies at the workplace; 17 % (n = 28) strongly disagree, 17 % (n = 28) disagree, 23.6 % (n = 39) are unsure, 32.1 % (n = 53) agree, and 10.3 % (n = 17) strongly agree (see Table 4.28). The mean response is 3.02 (SD = 1.261), a strong indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement is unsure whether their agencies have these types of policies. Of those respondents aware of these family-friendly policies (n = 92), 30.4 % (n = 28) indicate that their agencies do provide accommodations for breastfeeding and other nursing care whereas 69.6 % (n = 64) do not. In addition, whether respondents will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of family-friendly policies, 51.2 % (n = 84) strongly disagree, 17.1 % (n = 28) disagree, 21.2 % (n = 35) are unsure, 6.1 % (n = 10) agree, and 4.3 % (n = 7) strongly agree. The mean response is 1.95 (SD = 1.166), an indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement will likely not depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of family-friendly policies.

Retention

Assuming things in their personal life and work remain the same, the women in this sample report remaining in federal law enforcement. As for the actual number of year's respondents plan on remaining in federal law enforcement, the years range from 0 to 30 years (see Table 4.29). The mean response is 12.89 (SD = 7.162). After combining the mean response for total years in federal law enforcement (see Table 4.11), the mean

response for respondents total expected service is 24.58 (SD = 6.324), a very strong

indication that this sample of women in federal law enforcement will likely stay in

federal law enforcement until retirement. In addition, whether respondents plan on

staying in federal law enforcement, assuming things in their personal life and work

remain the same, 3.2 % (n = 5) strongly disagree, 2.5 % (n = 4) disagree, 3.2 % (n = 5)

are unsure, 26.6 % (n = 42) agree, and 64.6 % (n = 102) strongly agree (see Table 4.30).

The mean response is 4.47 (SD = .992), another strong indication that this sample of

women in federal law enforcement will likely stay in federal law enforcement.

Descriptive Statistics of the Other Items of Interest

This section covers other items of interest that may or may not have particular

significance to women in federal law enforcement but may serve as a baseline for future

research.

Increase of Fire Power to Duty Weapon

A potential topic of interest is whether the increase of fire power to duty weapons

has created difficulties in respondents' jobs. As a result of the terrorist attacks of 9/11,

many of the federal law enforcement agencies shifted from a 9 mm duty weapon to a .40

caliber weapon for greater fire power, resulting in a larger weapon with stronger recoil;

however, 93.3 % (n = 125) of the women in this sample report being unaffected by the

increase of fire power (see Table 4.31).

Physical Agility Testing

Another potential topic of interest is physical agility testing in federal law

enforcement. Approximately 2/3 (62.9 %) of the respondents (n = 105) report taking a

physical agility test prior to federal entry-level selection (see Table 4.32). In addition,

60.4 % (n = 90) report having different physical standards than the men and 39.6 %

(n = 59) report having identical physical standards (see Table 4.33). For those with

identical physical standards, this begs the question, "What exactly does the physical

agility test cover and what are the gender neutral standards?" After selection into federal

law enforcement, only 43.3 % (n = 72) continue to take an annual physical agility test as

a condition of their employment (see Table 4.34). This further begs the question, "Why

do 62.9 % of the women in this sample take a physical agility test prior to entry selection

but a far lower percentage has requirements to maintain physical testing?" Regardless,

90.5 % (n = 124) of the women in this sample report that they do consider the physical

agility test fair (see Table 4.35).

<center>*Work Satisfaction and Overcoming Barriers*</center>

The overwhelming majority of the women in this sample find their work

satisfying; however, a quarter reports there are many barriers that make it difficult to

achieve career goals. Though 87.6 % (n = 143) of the women agree or strongly agree that

their work is satisfying (see Table 4.36), 25.9 % (n = 43) do believe there are many

barriers that make it difficult to achieve career goals (see Table 4.37); however, the mean

response is 2.49 (SD = 1.292), indicating that this sample of women in federal law

enforcement slightly disagree that there are many barriers. In addition, 75.4 % (n = 126)

of the respondents believe they can overcome any barrier that is in their way of achieving

their career goals (see Table 4.38). Finally, the women in this sample report what they

believe is the biggest barrier to women in federal law enforcement. Of the 18 categories

given (see Table 4.39), two stand out: male co-workers/supervisors pre-conceive notions

of women being weak and therefore not equal with men (24.2 %) and work/family

<center>109</center>

balance issues (24.8 %). This is consistent with previous research conducted on women in law enforcement.

Bivariate Statistics of the Demographic Variables

This section will determine if there is a relationship between any of the demographic variables and between the demographic variables and retention. An analysis of the correlations between the demographic variables and retention both in years and intent are computed (see Table 4.40). There are 26 statistically significant relationships and each of these correlations is significant at the .01 level using a Pearson correlation two-tailed test.

Age

Seven statistically significant relationships involve year of birth and the following variables: number of children (Pearson correlation = -.432, $p < .01$), years at current agency (Pearson correlation = -.650, $p < .01$), total years in federal law enforcement (Pearson correlation = -.819, $p < .01$), grade (Pearson correlation = -.278, $p < .01$), supervisory experience (Pearson correlation = .412, $p < .01$), number of permanent relocations (Pearson correlation = -.221, $p < .01$), and intent (by years) on staying in federal law enforcement (Pearson correlation = .636, $p < .01$). The women in this sample are a mature group of federal officers with a mean age of 39. Though these women are older, the statistically significant relationship with number of children suggests these women have few children. This is further evident by over half the women (52.4%) in this study having no children and of the women who do have children, 85.9 % having only one or two minor children at home. These numbers also suggest that perhaps women who pursue a career in federal law enforcement are not necessarily the "mothering" type

and that childbearing is closely related to women's career pursuits (Yim 2009). This lends support to research conducted by Baber and Monahan (1988) who found that women pursuing innovative careers were less child oriented than those planning moderately innovative or traditional careers (Yim 2009).

As for years at current agency and total years in federal law enforcement, their mean response is 10.01 and 12.23 respectively. These numbers suggest as women get older, they will likely stay with their agency or with federal law enforcement in general. Since most federal officers are eligible for retirement after only 20 to 25 years in law enforcement, once a person hits the half way mark, they are more likely to continue their career path.

As for grade and supervisory experience, these women have a median response of 12.75 (~GS-12/GS-13) for grade and 54.8 % have supervisory experience. As such, there is no surprise that these two variables are statistically significant with year of birth. Assuming most women enter their career path shortly after college, a grade of either GS-12 or GS-13 is commensurate with women in their late 30s in the public sector. In addition, once an individual attains the grade of GS-13, they are eligible for supervisory positions. Since 58.7 % are at least a GS-13, this is consistent with the 54.8 % of those women who have supervisory experience. As such, supervisory experience is consistent with the mean response for year of birth.

Finally, the last two variables having a statistically significant relationship with year of birth is number of permanent relocations and intent (by years) of staying in federal law enforcement. The mean response for permanent relocations is 1.61 with a range of 0 to 10 moves. These numbers suggest that women with a mean age of 39 do

not relocate often. As for retention, the mean response is 12.89 for years they will likely remain in federal law enforcement. These numbers suggest that women in their late 30s, who are already half-way through their careers, will remain in federal law enforcement through retirement.

Education

Two statistically significant relationships exist between education and the number of children (Pearson correlation = -.230, p < .01) and education and the number of permanent relocations (Pearson correlation = .216, p < .01). The women in this sample are educated with over half (57.7 %) having a bachelor's degree and 24.4 % having a master's degree. These numbers suggest as women gain more education while in federal law enforcement, they are unlikely to have children or have very few children. This may also be driven by the fact that as one gains education, promotion opportunities increase further pursuing women's desire for a career. As for number of permanent relocations, these numbers suggest as women become more educated, they will likely relocate more in their careers.

Relationship Status

There is a statistically significant relationship between marital status and number of children (Pearson correlation = .207, p < .01). Though over half (64.9 %) the women in this sample are married or have been married at one time, the numbers suggest that these women do not have children or either have few children. This is further evident by over half the women (52.4%) in this study having no children and of the women who do have children, 85.9 % having only one or two minor children at home.

Number of Children

Two more statistically significant relationships exist between number of children and the following: years at current agency (Pearson correlation = .326, p < .01) and total years in federal law enforcement (Pearson correlation = .322, p < .01). The numbers suggest the less children women have, the longer they are at their agency and in federal law enforcement respectively. If women do not have children or only have one child, they are more incline to pursue careers and work until retirement.

Tenure at Current Federal Law Enforcement Agency

There are five statistically significant relationships with years at current agency and the following variables: total years in federal law enforcement (Pearson correlation = .760, p < .01), grade (Pearson correlation = .267, p < .01), supervisory experience (Pearson correlation = -.410, p < .01), number of permanent relocations (Pearson correlation = .271, p < .01), and intent (by years) on staying in federal law enforcement (Pearson correlation = -.560, p < .01). As with years at current agency, the mean response is 10.01. The mean response for total years in federal law enforcement is 12.23. There is a strong correlation between these two variables, and the numbers suggest women have experience with more than one federal law enforcement agency. In addition, the mean response for years at current agency is commensurate with mean response for grade (12.75), whether they have supervisory experience (54.8 %), and the number of relocations they've made thus far with their agency (1.61). Finally, since these women are half-way to retirement, their intent on staying in federal law enforcement is high.

Tenure in Federal Law Enforcement

There are four statistically significant relationships with total years in federal law enforcement and the following variables: grade (Pearson correlation = .297, p < .01), supervisory experience (Pearson correlation = -.514, p < .01), number of permanent relocations (Pearson correlation = .375, p < .01), and intent (by years) on staying in federal law enforcement (Pearson correlation = -.615, p < .01). These relationships are similar to those explanations with years at current agency. The mean response for total years in federal law enforcement (12.23) is commensurate with the mean response for grade (12.75), whether they have supervisory experience (54.8 %), and the number of relocations they've made thus far in their federal law enforcement careers (1.61). Finally, since the mean response of total years in federal law enforcement is more than half-way to retirement, their remaining years in federal law enforcement is also high.

Law Enforcement Grade

There is a statistically significant relationship between grade and supervisory experience (Pearson correlation = .228, p < .01). As mention previously, the mean response for grade is 12.75. This equates to a high GS-12. Once an individual attains the grade of GS-13, they are eligible for supervisory positions. Since 58.7 % are at least a GS-13, this is consistent with the 54.8 % of those women who have supervisory experience.

Supervisory Experience

There are two more statistically significant relationships between supervisory experience and the following: number of permanent relocations (Pearson correlation = -.336, p < .01) and intent (in years) on staying in federal law enforcement (Pearson

114

correlation = .400, p < .01). Since 54.8 % of the women in this sample have supervisory

experience and the mean response for permanent relocations is 1.61, the numbers suggest

those with supervisory experience do not relocate as often. In addition, those with

supervisory experience are likely to remain in federal law enforcement until retirement.

Permanent Relocations

There are two more statistically significant relationships between number of

permanent relocations and the following: number of business trips lasting longer than 3

months (Pearson correlation = .256, p < .01) and intent (in years) on staying in federal

law enforcement (Pearson correlation = -.392, p < .01). The mean response for

permanent relocation is 1.61, and the mean response for business trips lasting longer than

3 months is 1.31. These numbers suggest that women who relocate for their agency also

take lengthy business trips but not as many. In addition, those who relocate more do not

likely remain in federal law enforcement longer.

Bivariate Statistics of the Observed Variables

This section will determine if there is a relationship between the eight observed

variables and retention. An analysis of the correlations between retention both in years

and intent, length of total service in federal law enforcement, length of total expected

service in federal law enforcement, determinants of retention intended on the specific

factor, and the eight factors that may or may not influence women's decision to stay in

federal law enforcement are computed (see Table 4.41). The strongest correlations

appear between the following variables: pervasive negative attitudes and retention based

on pervasive negative attitudes (Spearman's rho = .227, p < .01); pervasive negative

attitudes and length of total expected service (Spearman's rho = .306, p < .01); negative

law enforcement work culture and retention based on negative law enforcement work culture (Spearman's rho = .271, p < .01); negative law enforcement work culture and expected retention in the near future (Spearman's rho = -.169, p < .05); negative law enforcement work culture and length of total expected of service (Spearman's rho = .171, p < .05); perceived glass ceiling to promotions and retention based on perceived glass ceiling to promotions (Spearman's rho = .263, p < .01); perceived glass ceiling to promotions and length of total service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = .183, p < .05); perceived glass ceiling to promotions and length of total expected service (Spearman's rho = .175, p < .01); sexual discrimination and retention based on sexual discrimination (Spearman's rho = .268, p < .01); high-ranking female role models and length of total service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = -.235, p < .01); high-ranking female role models and expected retention in years (Spearman's rho = .287, p < .01); and family-friendly policies and length of total expected service (Spearman's rho = -.172, p < .05). Each of these correlations is significant at the .01 or .05 level using a Spearman's rho two-tailed test.

Pervasive Negative Attitudes

Research question number one asks, "Does perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?" There are two statistically significant relationships involving this factor. First, there is a statistically significant relationship between pervasive negative attitudes and retention base on this factor (Spearman's rho = .227, p < .01). The hypothesis suggests that perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues will result in a decrease of female retention. The data supports the hypothesis and for those women who

experience pervasive negatives from their male colleagues, they will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of this specific factor.

Second, there is a statistically significant relationship between pervasive negative attitudes and length of total expected service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = .306, p < .01). In this case, the data does not support the hypothesis and actually has the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to stay in federal law enforcement. For those women who experience pervasive negative attitudes from their male colleagues, their length of total expected service in federal law enforcement appears to increase.

There are no statistically significant relationships between pervasive negative attitudes and retention in either years or intent or total length of service in federal law enforcement.

Negative Law Enforcement Work Culture

Research question number two asks, "Does a perceived traditional law enforcement work culture explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?" There is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived negative law enforcement work culture and retention base on this factor (Spearman's rho = .271, p < .01). The hypothesis suggests that a perceived negative law enforcement work culture will result in a decrease of female retention. The data supports the hypothesis and for those women who experience a negative law enforcement work culture, they will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of this specific factor.

Second, there is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived negative law enforcement work culture and expected retention in the near future

(Spearman's rho = -.169, p < .05). The data supports the hypothesis and for those women who experience a negative law enforcement work culture, their expected retention in the near future decreases.

Third, there is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived negative law enforcement work culture and length of total expected of service (Spearman's rho = .171, p < .05). In this case, the data does not support the hypothesis and actually has the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to stay in federal law enforcement. For those women who perceive a negative law enforcement work culture, their length of total expected service in federal law enforcement appears to increase.

There are no statistically significant relationships between law enforcement work culture and retention in either years or length of total service in federal law enforcement.

Glass Ceiling to Promotions

Research question number three asks, "Does a perceived glass ceiling to promotion explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? There is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived glass ceiling to promotions and retention based on this factor (Spearman's rho = .263, p < .01). The hypothesis suggests that a perceived glass ceiling to promotions will result in a decrease of female retention. The data supports the hypothesis and for those women who perceive this glass ceiling, they will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of this specific factor.

Second, there is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived glass ceiling to promotions and length of total service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = .183, p < .05). For those women who perceive a glass ceiling to promotions, their length of total service in federal law enforcement appears to be higher.

Third, there is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived glass ceiling to promotions and length of total expected service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = .175, p < .05). In this case, the data does not support the hypothesis and actually has the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to stay in federal law enforcement. For those women who perceive a glass ceiling to promotions, their length of total expected service in federal law enforcement appears to increase.

There are no statistically significant relationships between a perceived glass ceiling to promotions and retention in either years or intent to stay in the near future.

Sexual Harassment

Research question number fours asks, "Does perceived sexual harassment from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? There are no statistically significant relationships between sexual harassment and retention, either specifically as a result of sexual harassment or retention in years and intent. In addition, there are no statistically significant relationships between sexual harassment and length of total service in federal law enforcement and length of total expected service in federal law enforcement.

Sexual Discrimination

Research question number five asks, "Does perceived sexual discrimination from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? There is a statistically significant relationship between sexual discrimination and retention based on this factor (Spearman's rho = .268, p < .01). The hypothesis suggests that perceived sexual discrimination will result in a decrease of female retention. The

data supports the hypothesis and for those women who experience sexual discrimination, they will likely depart federal law enforcement as a result of this specific factor.

There are no statistically significant relationships between sexual discrimination and retention in either years or intent or length of total service in federal law enforcement and length of total expected service in federal law enforcement.

Lack of High-Ranking Female Role Models

Research question number six asks, "Does a perceived lack of high-ranking female role models in federal law enforcement explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? There are two statistically significant relationships involving this factor. First, there is a statistically significant relationship between high-ranking female role models and length of total service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = -.235, p < .01). The hypothesis suggests that a perceived lack of high-ranking female role models will result in a decrease of female retention. While the null hypothesis is rejected, the data actually acts opposite of the expected direction and does not support the hypothesis, suggesting the lack of high-ranking female role models will actually increase length of total service in federal law enforcement.

Second, there is a statistically significant relationship between high-ranking female role models and expected retention in years (Spearman's rho = .279, p < .01). The data does not support the hypothesis and for those women who perceive there are many high-ranking female role models, they will remain in federal law enforcement.

There are no statistically significant relationships between the number of high-ranking female role models and retention base on this factor or intent or length of total expected service in federal law enforcement.

Non-Friendly Pregnancy Policies

Research question number seven asks, "Do agencies perceived with non-friendly pregnancy policies explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? There are no statistically significant relationships between lack of pregnancy-friendly policies and retention, either specifically as a result of this factor or retention in years and intent. In addition, there are no statistically significant relationships between lack of pregnancy-friendly policies and length of total service in federal law enforcement and length of total expected service in federal law enforcement.

Non-Friendly Family Policies

Finally, research question number eight asks, "Do agencies perceived with non-friendly family care policies explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? There is a statistically significant relationship between family-friendly policies and length of total expected service in federal law enforcement (Spearman's rho = -.172, p < .05). The data supports the hypothesis and for those women who perceive non-family friendly care policies at their agency, their length of total expected service in federal law enforcement appears to decrease.

There are no statistically significant relationships between lack of family-friendly policies and retention, either specifically as a result of this factor or retention in years and future intent. In addition, there is no statistically significant relationship between lack of family-friendly policies and length of total service in federal law enforcement.

Multivariate Statistics of the Independent Variables

This section will determine if there is indeed a relationship between the observed variables and retention by estimating the effect of each observed variable while holding

all the other independent variables, to include demographic variables, constant. Based on

the bivariate analysis of the eight observed variables, five appear to have a statistically

significant relationship with retention—pervasive negative attitudes by male colleagues, a

negative law enforcement work culture, a perceived glass ceiling to promotions, sexual

discrimination, and the lack of high-ranking female role models. In addition, four of the

demographic variables also have a statistically significant relationship with retention—

number of children, grade, supervisory experience, and the number of permanent

relocations. To analyze multivariate regression, ordinary least squares is the best method.

An analysis of pairwise correlation and auxiliary regression with the five

observed variables show four to be highly correlated, displaying multicollinearity. As

such, four regression models are formulated between retention (length of total expected

service in federal law enforcement) and these four measures (see Table 4.42), resulting in

two statistically significant relationships between pervasive negative attitudes by male

colleagues and retention (Coefficient = 1.418, p < .01) and between a perceived glass

ceiling to promotions and retention (Coefficient = 1.517, p < .05).

Model 1: Pervasive Negative Attitudes

Research question number one asks, "Does perceived pervasive negative attitudes

from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law

enforcement?" While keeping the number of high-ranking female role models, number

of children, grade, supervisory experience, and the number of permanent relocations

constant, there is a statistically significant relationship between pervasive negative

attitudes from male colleagues and its effect on retention (Coefficient = 1.418, p < .01).

The hypothesis suggests that perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues

will result in a decrease of female retention; however, the data does not support the hypothesis. Pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues appear to have the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Perhaps the women are not intimidated by their male colleagues and want to prove them wrong or that the other benefits of remaining in federal law enforcement outweigh the costs. Nevertheless, the more women experience pervasive negative attitudes, the longer they remain in federal law enforcement. The multivariate model is as follows:

Retention = 20.021 (Constant) + 1.418 * Negative Attitudes + .733 * Number of   High-Ranking Female Role Models + .521 * Number of Children + .170 * Grade - 2.058 * Supervisory Experience - .109 * Number of Permanent Relocations

Model 2: Negative Law Enforcement Work Culture

Research question number two asks, "Does a perceived traditional law enforcement work culture explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?" While keeping the number of high-ranking female role models, number of children, grade, supervisory experience, and number of permanent relocations constant, there is no statistically significant relationship between negative law enforcement work culture and its effect on retention. This suggests that a negative law enforcement work culture is not an important factor in predicting retention. The multivariate model is as follows:

Retention = 22.441 (Constant) + .636 * Negative Work Culture + .591 * Number of High-Ranking Female Role Models + .523 * Number of Children + .163 * Grade - 1.920 * Supervisory Experience - .126 * Number of Permanent Relocations

Model 3: Glass Ceiling to Promotions

Research question number three asks, "Does a perceived glass ceiling to promotion explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? While keeping the number of high-ranking female role models, number of children, grade, supervisory experience, and the number of permanent relocations constant, there is a statistically significant relationship between a perceived glass ceiling to promotions and its effect on retention (Coefficient = 1.517, p < .05). The hypothesis suggests that a perceived glass ceiling to promotions will result in a decrease of female retention; however, the data does not support the hypothesis. A perceived glass ceiling to promotions appear to have the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Again, perhaps the challenge of breaking the glass ceiling or being a female role model encourages women to remain in federal law enforcement. Or perhaps the other benefits of remaining in federal law enforcement outweigh the costs. Nevertheless, the more women perceive a glass ceiling to promotions, the longer they remain in federal law enforcement. The multivariate model is as follows:

Retention = 18.584 (Constant) + 1.517 * Glass Ceiling to Promotions + .564 * Number of High Ranking Female Role Models + .325 * Number of Children + .193 * Grade - 1.571 * Supervisory Experience - .055 * Number of Permanent Relocations

Model 4: Sexual Discrimination

Research question number five ask, "Does perceived sexual discrimination from male colleagues explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement? While keeping the number of high-ranking female role models, number of children, grade, supervisory experience, and number of permanent relocations constant, there is no

statistically significant relationship between sexual discrimination and its effect on retention. This suggests that sexual discrimination is not an important factor in predicting retention. The multivariate model is as follows:

Retention = 22.629 (Constant) + .305 * Sexual Discrimination + .426 * Number of High-Ranking Female Role Models + .505 * Number of Children + .226 * Grade - 1.835 * Supervisory Experience - .143 * Number of Permanent Relocations

Logistic Regression

Using the same four multivariate models to determine which factors are statistically significant with length of total expected service in federal law enforcement, logistic regression is also analyzed using a dummy variable to measure expected retention in the near future. All four models have similar results with the number of high-ranking female role models and the number of permanent relocations being statistically significant in determining retention in the near future (see Table 4.43). To determine the probability of retention in the near future based on these two statistically significant factors, the probability percentages are computed using Model 1 (see Table 4.44).

To form the baseline case for retention in the near future, the medians are computed for the following variables: pervasive negative attitudes (2), role models (2), number of children (1), law enforcement grade (12.75), supervisory experience (1=Yes), and number of permanent relocations (1.6). The baseline probability for retention in the near future is 98.6 %; however, if women perceive there are not many high-ranking female role models, the probability for retention in the near future decreases to 95.7 %. Conversely, if women perceive there are many high-ranking female role models, the probability for retention in the near future increases to 99.9 %. As for the second factor, if women do not or are not required to permanently relocate for their federal law

125

enforcement employment, the probability for retention in the near future increases to 99.4 %. Conversely, if women do or are required to permanently relocate multiple times, the probability for retention in the near future drastically decreases to 43.8 %. These results clearly show that the number of high-ranking female role models and the number of permanent relocations do affect retention in the near future.

The following chapter provides the results of the qualitative research to include a demographic profile of the sample, possible explanations for the eight factors that may or may not explain why women depart federal law enforcement, and responses to the following six guided questions:

1. What is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement?

2. What other challenges do women face in federal law enforcement?

3. What strategies do women employ to deal with these challenges?

4. Why do women stay in federal law enforcement?

5. Why are women underrepresented in federal law enforcement?

6. What can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement?

Table 4.1 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Year of Birth*

Mean	Median	Mode	Min	Max	n=166
1972	1973	1980	1951	1988	

Table 4.2 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Sexual Orientation*

Response	n	%	n=167
Heterosexual	153	91.6	
Bisexual	2	1.2	
Homosexual	12	7.2	

Table 4.3 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Educational Level*

Response	n	%	n=168
High School	1	0.6	
Some college	25	14.9	
Bachelors	97	57.7	
Masters	41	24.4	
Doctoral	4	2.4	

Table 4.4 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Ethnicity*

Response	n	%	n=167
African American	24	14.4	
Asian/Pacific Islanders	10	6.0	
Caucasian	91	54.5	
Latina	32	19.2	
Native American	2	1.2	
Other	1	0.6	
Multiracial	7	4.2	

Table 4.5 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Current Relationship Status*

Response	*n*	%	n=168
Single	49	29.2	
Married	84	50.0	
Domestic partner	10	6.0	
Separated/Divorced	25	14.9	

Table 4.6 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Children*

Response	*n*	%	n=168
0	88	52.4	
1	28	16.7	
2	28	16.7	
3	19	11.3	
4	1	0.6	
5	3	1.8	
6	1	0.6	

Mean = 0.99
Standard Deviation = 1.281

Table 4.7 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Minor Children Living at Home*

Response	*n*	%	n=168
0	104	61.9	
1	34	20.2	
2	21	12.5	
3	6	3.5	
4	3	1.8	

Mean = 0.63
Standard Deviation = .958

Table 4.8 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' GS-Level*

Response	*n*	%	n=167
GS-7 or E-6/E-7	6	3.6	
GS-9 or E-8/E-9	15	9.0	
GS-11 or O-2	8	4.8	
GS-12 or O-3	26	15.6	
GS-13 or O-4	69	41.3	
GS-14 or O-5	20	12.0	
GS-15 or O-6	7	4.2	
SES or O-7+	2	1.2	
Non-GSA pay scale	14	8.4	

Mean = 12.75
Median = 13
Mode = 13
Standard Deviation = 2.186

Table 4.9 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Supervisory Experience in Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n=166
Yes	91	54.8	
No	75	45.2	

Table 4.10 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Employers*

Response	n	%	n=168
AFOSI	14	8.3	
ATF	2	1.2	
CBP	9	5.4	
CGIS	2	1.2	
DEA	6	3.6	
DHS	4	2.4	
DLA	1	0.6	
DOE OIG	1	0.6	
DOJ OIG	2	1.2	
EDUC OIG	5	3.0	
FAMS	8	4.8	
FBI	1	0.6	
FDIC OIG	2	1.2	
FPS	1	0.6	
HHS OIG	1	0.6	
HUD OIG	5	3.0	
ICE	41	24.4	
IRS CI	2	1.2	
NCIS	6	3.6	
NOAA	1	0.6	
NRC OIG	1	0.6	
OIG	1	0.6	
PFPA	4	2.4	
SSA OIG	4	2.4	
USDA OIG	2	1.2	
USMP	2	1.2	
USMS	5	3.0	
USPIS	1	0.6	
USPO	2	1.2	
USPP	2	1.2	
USPS OIG	5	3.0	
USSS	2	1.2	
VA OIG	2	1.2	

Table 4.11 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Tenure in Current Federal Agency*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Min	Max
10.01	7.285	8	3	1	33

n = 168

Table 4.12 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Tenure in Federal Law Enforcement*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Min	Max
12.23	7.64	10.5	11	1	33

n = 168

Table 4.13 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Have Experience in State or Local Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n=168
Yes	31	18.5	
No	137	81.5	

Table 4.14 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Years Employed in State or Local Law Enforcement*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n=29
4.76	2.96	5	1	15	

Table 4.15 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Relocations for Federal Law Enforcement Employment*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n=167
1.61	1.831	1	0	10	

Table 4.16 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Business Trips Lasting Longer Than 3 Months*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n=156
1.31	1.824	1	0	15	

Table 4.17 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Decision to Stay or Pursue Federal Law Enforcement as a Result of 9/11*

Response	*n*	%	n=160
Yes	44	27.5	
No	116	72.5	

Table 4.18 *Frequency Distribution of Pervasive Negative Attitudes Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%
Have respondents experienced pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues at their current agency?		
Strongly Disagree	46	27.7
Disagree	57	34.3
Unsure	23	13.9
Agree	32	19.3
Strongly Agree	8	4.8

n = 166
Mean = 2.39
Standard Deviation = 1.215

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues.		
Strongly Disagree	119	71.3
Disagree	32	19.2
Unsure	8	4.8
Agree	5	3.0
Strongly Agree	3	1.8

n = 167
Mean = 1.45
Standard Deviation = .862

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.19 *Frequency Distribution of Negative Law Enforcement Work Culture Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%
Have respondents experienced a negative law enforcement work culture at their current agency?		
Strongly Disagree	64	38.6
Disagree	57	34.3
Unsure	17	10.2
Agree	22	13.3
Strongly Agree	6	3.6

n = 166
Mean = 2.09
Standard Deviation = 1.159

Response	*n*	%
Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of a negative law enforcement work culture.		
Strongly Disagree	105	63.6
Disagree	30	18.2
Unsure	14	8.5
Agree	10	6.1
Strongly Agree	6	3.6

n = 165
Mean = 1.68
Standard Deviation = 1.093

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.20 *Frequency Distribution of Glass Ceiling Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%
Are promotions based on ability at respondents' current agencies?		N = 167
Strongly Disagree	18	10.8
Disagree	48	28.7
Neither Agree/Disagree	42	25.1
Agree	46	27.5
Strongly Agree	13	7.8

n = 167
Mean = 2.93
Standard Deviation = 1.144

Do respondents' agencies have good opportunities for advancement?		
Strongly Disagree	11	6.6
Disagree	21	12.6
Neither Agree/Disagree	41	24.6
Agree	62	37.1
Strongly Agree	32	19.2

n = 167
Mean = 3.50
Standard Deviation = 1.155

Do respondents perceive a glass ceiling to promotions at their current agencies?		
Strongly Disagree	14	8.5
Disagree	40	24.2
Neither Agree/Disagree	79	47.9
Agree	26	15.8
Strongly Agree	6	3.6

n = 165
Mean = 2.82
Standard Deviation = .926

Table 4.20 (cont) *Frequency Distribution of Glass Ceiling Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of a perceived glass ceiling to promotions.

Strongly Disagree	67	40.4
Disagree	50	30.1
Neither Agree/Disagree	40	24.1
Agree	8	4.8
Strongly Agree	1	0.6

n = 166
Mean = 1.95
Standard Deviation = .946

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.21 *Frequency Distribution of Sexual Harassment Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%
Have respondents experienced sexual harassment at their current agency?		
Strongly Disagree	87	52.7
Disagree	41	24.8
Unsure	6	3.6
Agree	24	14.5
Strongly Agree	7	4.2

n = 165
Mean = 1.93
Standard Deviation = 1.237

If respondents have ever experienced sexual harassment, did they report it?		
Yes	14	19.7
No	57	80.3

n = 71

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of sexual harassment.		
Strongly Disagree	120	73.6
Disagree	25	15.3
Unsure	12	7.4
Agree	3	1.8
Strongly Agree	3	1.8

n = 163
Mean = 1.43
Standard Deviation = .853

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.22 *Frequency Distribution of Sexual Discrimination Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%
Have respondents experienced sexual discrimination at their current agency?		
Strongly Disagree	70	42.4
Disagree	43	26.1
Unsure	17	10.3
Agree	26	15.8
Strongly Agree	9	5.5

n = 165
Mean = 2.16
Standard Deviation = 1.278

If respondents have ever experienced sexual discrimination, did she report it?		
Yes	14	21.2
No	57	78.8

n = 66

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of sexual discrimination.		
Strongly Disagree	106	63.9
Disagree	31	18.7
Unsure	19	11.4
Agree	8	4.8
Strongly Agree	2	1.2

n = 166
Mean = 1.61
Standard Deviation = .952

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.23 *Frequency Distribution of High-Ranking Female Role Models Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%
Do respondents have many female role models at their current agency?		
Strongly Disagree	41	25.0
Disagree	56	34.1
Unsure	18	11.0
Agree	41	25.0
Strongly Agree	8	4.9

n = 164
Mean = 2.51
Standard Deviation = 1.246

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of high-ranking female role models.		
Strongly Disagree	102	62.2
Disagree	42	25.6
Unsure	18	11.0
Agree	1	0.6
Strongly Agree	1	0.6

n = 164
Mean = 1.52
Standard Deviation = .763

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.24 *Frequency Distribution of the Number of Female Role Models at Respondents Current Federal Agency*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Mode	Min	Max
2.81	4.071	2	0	0	27

n = 160

Table 4.25 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Have a Mentor at Their Federal Agency*

Response	*n*	%	n=167
Yes	56	33.5	
No	111	66.5	

Table 4.26 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents' Mentor is a Female*

Response	*n*	%	n=55
Yes	22	40.0	
No	33	60.0	

Table 4.27 *Frequency Distribution of Pregnancy-Friendly Policies Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%
Do respondents' current agencies have pregnancy-friendly policies?		
Strongly Disagree	28	17.3
Disagree	16	9.9
Unsure	61	37.7
Agree	39	24.1
Strongly Agree	18	11.1

n = 162
Mean = 3.02
Standard Deviation = 1.218

If respondents were pregnant during their federal employment, did they suffer any adverse consequence from their pregnancy?		
Yes	18	18.8
No	54	81.3

n = 64

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of pregnancy-friendly policies.		
Strongly Disagree	83	50.9
Disagree	30	18.4
Unsure	36	22.1
Agree	8	4.9
Strongly Agree	6	3.7

n = 163
Mean = 1.92
Standard Deviation = 1.122

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.28 *Frequency Distribution of Family-Friendly Policies Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%
Do respondents' current agencies have family-friendly policies?		
Strongly Disagree	28	17.0
Disagree	28	17.0
Unsure	39	23.6
Agree	53	32.1
Strongly Agree	17	10.3

n = 165
Mean = 3.02
Standard Deviation = 1.261

Response	n	%
Specifically, do respondents' current agencies provide accommodations for breastfeeding and other nursing care?		
Yes	28	30.4
No	64	69.6

n = 92

Response	n	%
Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of family-friendly policies.		
Strongly Disagree	84	51.2
Disagree	28	17.1
Unsure	35	21.2
Agree	10	6.1
Strongly Agree	7	4.3

n = 164
Mean = 1.95
Standard Deviation = 1.166

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.29 *Frequency Distribution of Expected Retention and Total Service by Years*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n=137
Further years respondents plan on staying in federal law enforcement.					
12.89	7.162	12	0	30	
Respondents' expected total service in federal law enforcement.					
24.58	6.324	25	3	37	

Table 4.30 *Frequency Distribution of Expected Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%
Respondents' likelihood to remain in federal law enforcement, assuming things in their personal life and work remained the same.		
Strongly Disagree	5	3.2
Disagree	4	2.5
Neither Agree/Disagree	5	3.2
Agree	42	26.6
Strongly Agree	102	64.6

n = 158
Mean = 4.47
Standard Deviation = .992

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.31 *Frequency Distribution of Whether the Increase of Fire Power to Duty Weapons Have Created Difficulties in Respondents' Jobs*

Response	n	%	n=134
Yes	9	6.7	
No	125	93.3	

Table 4.32 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Took a Physical Agility Test Prior to Federal Entry-Level Selection*

Response	*n*	%	n=167
Yes	105	62.9	
No	62	37.1	

Table 4.33 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Standards for Respondents' Physical Agility Test is Separate for Men and Women*

Response	*n*	%	n=149
Yes	90	60.4	
No	59	39.6	

Table 4.34 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Were Required to Take an Annual Physical Agility Test*

Response	*n*	%	n=166
Yes	72	43.3	
No	94	56.7	

Table 4.35 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Consider the Physical Agility Test Fair*

Response	*n*	%	n=137
Yes	124	90.5	
No	13	9.5	

Table 4.36 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Work Was Satisfying*

Response	n	%	n=167
Disagree	12	7.2	
Nether Agree/Disagree	16	7.2	
Agree	87	52.1	
Strongly Agree	56	35.5	

Mean = 4.12
Standard Deviation = .827

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.37 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Believe They Have Many Barriers That Make it Difficult to Achieve Career Goals*

Response	n	%	n=166
Strongly Disagree	46	27.7	
Disagree	50	30.1	
Unsure	27	16.3	
Agree	29	17.5	
Strongly Agree	14	8.4	

Mean = 2.49
Standard Deviation = 1.292

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.38 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Believe They Can Overcome Any Barrier That Stand in Their Way of Achieving Their Goals*

Response	*n*	%	n=167
Disagree	16	9.6	
Neither Agree/Disagree	25	15.0	
Agree	77	46.1	
Strongly Agree	49	29.3	

Mean = 3.95
Standard Deviation = .911

Note: A scale of 1 – 5 was used to compute responses.

Table 4.39 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions as to What the Biggest Barrier for Women is in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 149
Good old boy network	13	8.7	
Male co-workers/male supervisors pre-conceived notions			
of women being weak and not equal w/men	36	24.2	
Lack of women supervisors	3	2.0	
Lack of promotions	13	8.7	
Work/family balance	37	24.8	
Pregnancy	1	0.7	
Women feeling entitled	4	2.7	
Themselves; lack of confidence	5	3.4	
Equipment/gear/clothing unsuitable for women	3	2.0	
Physical agility standards	2	2.0	
Double standard; doing more than men	2	1.3	
Lack of training opportunities	2	1.3	
Firearms training	1	0.7	
Relocate for promotions	2	1.3	
Un-acceptance of women in male culture	11	7.4	
Lack of communication by management	3	2.0	
Lack of women	4	2.7	
Job stability	1	0.7	
None	5	3.4	

Table 4.40 *Summary of Correlation Analysis for Demographic/Descriptive Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Year	1.00																	
2. Orient	-.082	1.00																
3. Educ	.103	.058	1.00															
4. Eth	.059	.041	-.142	1.00														
5. Rel	-.121	.076	-.117	-.003	1.00													
6. Child	-.432**	-.159*	-.230**	.063	.207**	1.00												
7. Num	-.650**	-.042	-.117	-.046	.111	.326**	1.00											
8. TotNum	-.819**	.001	-.092	-.142	.091	.322**	.760**	1.00										
9. Rank	-.278**	.109	.118	-.093	-.035	.026	.267**	.297**	1.00									
10. Sup	.412**	-.134	.129	.128	-.155*	-.104	-.410**	-.514**	-.228**	1.00								
11. Perm	-.221**	-.036	.216**	-.074	.038	.075	.271**	.375**	.116	-.336**	1.00							
12. Trip	-.079	-.019	-.020	-.104	-.060	.095	.186*	.156	.007	-.181*	.256**	1.00						
13. State	.056	-.034	-.064	.069	-.110	-.089	-.001	.024	.009	.031	-.084	.111	1.00					
14. StNum	-.327	.417*	.101	-.015	.286	.145	-.034	.029	.137	-.044	-.242	-.112	a	1.00				
15. Sept	-.182*	-.091	-.033	-.027	.184*	.130	.169*	.115	-.006	.066	-.110	-.050	-.054	.016	1.00			

148

Table 4.40 (cont) *Summary of Correlation Analysis for Demographic/Descriptive Variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
16. Ret1	.636**	.039	-.083	.119	-.018	-.216*	-.560**	-.615**	-.141	.400**	-.392**	-.138	-.082	-.088	-.104	1.00		
17. Ret2	.038	-.015	.092	.119	.055	.037	-.009	-.075	.061	.027	-.147	-.108	-.122	-.233	.084	.323**	1.00	
18. Total	-.189*	.005	-.140	.000	.096	.122	.243**	.450**	.136	-.170*	.024	-.031	-.121	-.021	.032	.428**	.269**	1.00

Note: Year = Year of Birth; Orient = Sexual Orientation; Educ = Education; Eth = Ethnicity; Rel = Relationship Status; Child = Number of Children-; Num = Years at Current Agency; TotNum = Total Years in Federal Law Enforcement; Rank = GS Level/Military Rank; Sup = Supervisory Experience; Perm = Number of Permanent Relocations; Trip = Number of Business Trips > 3 Months; State = Employment in State or Local Law Enforcement; StNum = Years in State or Local Law Enforcement; Sept = Events of 9/11; Ret1 = Years Intent on Staying in Federal Law Enforcement; Ret 2 = Intent on Staying in Federal Law Enforcement in the Near Future; Total = Length of Total Expected Service in Federal Law Enforcement

** significant at p<.01 using a two-tailed test
* significant at p<.05 using a two-tailed test
a = constant

Table 4.41 *Summary of Correlation Analysis between Retention and Factors that Influence Women's Decision to Stay or Depart Federal Law Enforcement*

	Determinants of Retention Intended on Specific Factor	Length of Total Service in Federal Law Enforcement	Expected Retention (Years)	Expected Retention	Length of Total Expected Service
Pervasive Negative Attitudes	.227**	.071	.120	-.124	.306**
Law Enforcement Work Culture	.271**	.137	-.072	-.169*	.171*
Glass Ceiling to Promotions	.263**	.183*	-.060	-.105	.175*
Sexual Harassment	.145	-.035	.137	.032	.160
Sexual Discrimination	.268**	.058	-.012	.002	.122
High-Ranking Female Role Models	.080	-.235**	.279**	.116	.022
Non-Friendly Family-Care Policies	-.080	-.018	-.147	.033	-.172*
Non-Friendly Pregnancy Policies	.014	.044	-.118	.040	-.041

** significant at p<.01 using a two-tailed test
* significant at p<.05 using a two-tailed test

4.42 *Summary of Multivariate Regression for Retention*

	Pervasive Negative Attitudes	Law Enforcement Work Culture	Glass Ceiling to Promotions	Sex Discrimination
Pervasive Negative Attitudes	1.418*** (.442)	- -	- -	- -
Law Enforcement Work Culture	- -	.636 (.533)	- -	- -
Glass Ceiling to Promotions	- -	- -	1.517** (.606)	- -
Sexual Discrimination	- -	- -	- -	.305 (.435)
High-Ranking Female Role Models	.733 (.443)	.591 (.467)	.564 (.449)	.426 (.451)
Number of Children	.521 (.435)	.523 (.453)	.325 (.449)	.505 (.459)
Grade/Rank	.170 (.255)	.163 (.270)	.193 (.273)	.226 (.268)
Supervisory Experience	-2.0583* (1.160)	-1.920 (1.120)	-1.571 (1.201)	-1.835 (1.213)
Number of Permanent Relocations	-.109 (.318)	-.126 (.330)	-.055 (.326)	-.143 (.333)
Constant Standard Error	20.021 (4.318)	22.441 (4.394)	18.584 (4.601)	22.628 (4.403)
n	131	131	129	130
Adjusted R square	.076	.011	.046	.004

*** significant at p<.01 using a two-tailed test
** significant at p<.05 using a two-tailed test
* significant at p<.10 using a two-tailed test

4.43 *Summary of Logistic Regression for Retention in the Near Future*

	Pervasive Negative Attitudes	Law Enforcement Work Culture	Glass Ceiling to Promotions	Sex Discrimination
Pervasive Negative Attitudes	-.271 (.340)	- -	- -	- -
Law Enforcement Work Culture	- -	-.260 (.284)-	- -	- -
Glass Ceiling to Promotions	- -	- -	.264 (.409)	- -
Sexual Discrimination	- -	- -	- -	-.098 (.268)
High-Ranking Female Role Models	1.102** (.555)	.613* (.473)	1.323** (.592)	1.174** (.555)
Number of Children	.122 (.371)	.423 (.465)	.040 (.362)	.076 (.358)
Grade/Rank	-.054 (.233)	.190 (.280)	-.056 (.246)	-.030 (.239)
Supervisory Experience	-1.598 (1.065)	-1.466 (1.222)	-1.836* (1.110)	-1.663 (1.070)
Number of Permanent Relocations	-.531** (.220)	-.071** (.331)	-.547** (.225)	-.528** (.219)
Constant	5.575 (4.360)	18.154 (4.664)	4.170 (4.418)	4.743 (4.262)
n	146	146	143	145
Psuedo R square	.241	.245	.238	.233

*** significant at p<.01 using a two-tailed test
** significant at p<.05 using a two-tailed test
* significant at p<.10 using a two-tailed test

4.44 *Summary of Probability for Retention in the Near Future*

	Probability
Baseline	98.6 %
Role Models – Min (1)	95.7 %
Role Models – Max (5)	99.9 %
Permanent Relocations – Min (0)	99.4 %
Permanent Relocations – Max (10)	43.8 %

Baseline:
Pervasive negative median = 2
Role models median = 2
Child = 1
Grade = 12.75
Supervisory Experience = 1 (Yes)
Permanent Relocation = 1.6

Chapter 5: Qualitative Results

Introduction

The results of the analysis of the qualitative data collected in this study are presented in this chapter. Semi-structured, open-ended interviews were conducted on 20 sworn female federal officers with arrest and firearm authority attending the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference. The first section focuses on demographic information. These descriptive statistics are present to describe the sample and to better understand the participants in this study. The second section focuses on eight factors and its impact on women's retention in federal law enforcement. These descriptive statistics are present to provide explanatory data. Finally, the third section focuses on exploratory data regarding the barriers and challenges that women experience in federal law enforcement, as well as the strategies that women employ to deal with these challenges. In addition, the interviewees indicate why they and other women stay in federal law enforcement and why they believe women are underrepresented in federal law enforcement. Finally, the interviewees provide suggestions on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement. The following questions guide the inquiry:

     1. What is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement?

     2. What other challenges do women face in federal law enforcement?

     3. What strategies do women employ to deal with these challenges?

     4. Why do women stay in federal law enforcement?

5. Why are women underrepresented in federal law enforcement?

6. What can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement?

Demographic Profile

This section provides a demographic profile of the women in this sample. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, are computed. Frequencies and percentages are also compiled for sample description purposes.

A demographic profile of the women in this sample begins with age, ethnicity, educational status, relationship status, and the number of minor children currently living at home (see Tables 5.1 to 5.6). The age of the women in this sample ranges from 29 to 53 years old. The typical woman is Caucasian—60 % (n = 12) describe themselves as Caucasian, 25 % (n = 5) describe themselves as Latina, and 5 % each (n = 1 each) describe themselves as African American, Pacific Islander, and Native American respectively. These women are educated—65 % (n = 13) of the women in this sample has a bachelor's degree, 30 % (n = 6) has a master's degree, and 5 % (n = 1) has a couple of years in college—and the majority are single—40 % (n = 8) report being married, 25 % are separated or divorced, 20 % are single, and 15 % have domestic partners. In addition, 45 % (n = 9) of the women have no children and over half (55 %, n = 11) have no minor children living at home. The mean response for minor children living at home is 0.86 (SD = 1.137).

The agency representation of the women in this sample is grossly underrepresented. This sample represents a mix of 4 mid-size and 6 large-size federal law enforcement agencies (see Table 5.7). These women are experienced federal law enforcement officers. They have between 2 to 26 years at their current federal agency for

155

an average of 11.35 years (SD = 7.213) and an average of 14.9 years (SD = 7.853) in

total federal law enforcement regardless of agency (see Tables 5.8 and 5.9). Slightly over

half (55 %) has experience in at least one other federal law enforcement agency and one

has experience in four different agencies throughout her career. In addition, the typical

woman is a mid-level supervisor. Over half the women (55 %) are working at GS-13 or

higher which is consistent with the 55 % (n = 11) who has supervisory experience in

federal law enforcement (see Table 5.10 and 5.11).

The women in this sample have relocated for their federal law enforcement

careers and have a range of 0 to 5 permanent relocations (see Table 5.12). The mean

response for relocations is 1.70 (SD = 2.029). Similarly, the women have taken extended

business trips and have a range of 0 to 10 business trips lasting longer than 3 months

throughout their federal law enforcement employment (see Table 5.13). The mean

response for trips lasting longer than 3 months is 1.50 (SD = 2.259).

The majority of the women in this sample do not have previous experience in

state or local law enforcement. Of the 35 % (n = 7) who do, the mean response for years

in state or local law enforcement is 5.43 (SD = 3.994) (see Tables 5.14 and 5.15).

Furthermore, in regards to the terrorist events of 9/11, only 25 % (n = 5) of the women

report pursuing or staying in federal law enforcement as a result of 9/11; the others

indicate that by 9/11, they were either already committed to their profession or staying

regardless (see Table 5.16).

Finally, these women are committed to federal law enforcement. Assuming

things in their personal life and work remain the same, retention ranges from 3 weeks

(already at retirement) to 30 years (see Table 5.17). The mean response for retention is

12.0 (SD = 7.732); however, all the women do indicate they will remain in federal law enforcement until eligible for retirement or longer.

Eight Factors and Perceived Expected Retention

This section explains if certain factors explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement. All the women in this sample are career driven and passionate about their jobs. Regardless of the challenges they face in federal law enforcement, they are more determine to overcome them in any manner necessary. As such, several of the factors have the opposite effect by serving as motivators rather than challenges to continue in federal law enforcement.

Pervasive Negative Attitudes

The first set of statements describe whether the women in this sample experience pervasive negative attitudes from their male colleagues and if that factor affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Though 85 % (n = 17) report experiencing pervasive negative attitudes from their male colleagues, 88.2 % (n = 15) indicate they will not depart federal law enforcement as a result of it (see Table 5.18).

Negative Law Enforcement Work Culture

The second set of statements describe whether the women in this sample experience a negative law enforcement work culture at their agency and if that factor affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Though 70 % (n = 14) report experiencing a negative law enforcement work culture at their agency, 85.7 % (n = 12) indicate they will not depart federal law enforcement as a result of this negative work culture (see Table 5.19). In both cases the pervasive negative attitudes and negative law enforcement work culture appear to have an opposite effect because all the women

indicate they want to prove their male colleagues wrong. In addition, this attitude drives

them to succeed even more in law enforcement.

Glass Ceiling to Promotions

The third set of statements describe whether the women in this sample perceive a

glass ceiling to promotions at their agencies and if that factor affects their decision to stay

in federal law enforcement. Slightly less than half (45 %, n = 9) perceives a glass ceiling

to promotions; however, none of the women indicates departing federal law enforcement

as a result of this glass ceiling (see Table 5.20). These women actually want to stay in

federal law enforcement to be the "first" or to "break that glass ceiling."

Sexual Harassment

The fourth set of statements describe whether the women in this sample

experience (and if yes did they report) sexual harassment at their current agency and if

that factor affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Of the 50 % (n = 10)

who has experience with sexual harassment, only 20 % (n = 2) has made a formal report;

however, 90 % (n = 9) indicate they will not be departing federal law enforcement as a

result of sexual harassment (see Table 5.21). The women do not report incidences of

sexual harassment because they want to "fit in" and not be "labeled" or "black-balled" by

their male colleagues, especially early in their careers. In addition, most of the women

indicate that the incidences are one-time events perpetrated by one male colleague.

Sexual Discrimination

The fifth set of statements describe whether the women in this sample experience

(and if yes did they report) sexual discrimination at their current agency and if that factor

affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Of the 55 % (n = 11) who has

experience with sexual discrimination, slightly over half (54.5 %, n = 6) has made a report either informally or formally; however, 81.8 % (n = 9) indicate they will not depart federal law enforcement as a result of sexual discrimination (see Table 5.22). Several of the women do, however, request transfers to another office or division at their agency or leave their agency for another federal agency as a remedy to the situation.

Female Role Models

The sixth set of statements indicate the number of female role models the women in this sample has at their agency and whether that number affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. The mean response for female role models is 2.05 (SD = 1.779) and 94.7 % (n = 18) indicate they will not be departing federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of female role models. These women are hoping to be role models themselves for other women at their agency. In addition, only 40 % (n = 8) of the women in this sample report having a mentor at their agency and of that number, only 37.5 % (n = 3) are female mentors (see Table 5.23).

Pregnancy-Friendly Policies

The seventh set of statements indicates whether the agencies of the women in this sample have pregnancy-friendly policies at the workplace and if that factor affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Though 31.6 % (n = 6) of the agencies do not have pregnancy-friendly policies in place, 77.8 % (n = 14) of the women report they will not be departing federal law enforcement as a result of it (see table 5.24). For the majority, this factor is obsolete because most of the women in this sample do not have children nor have children prior to joining federal law enforcement.

Family-Friendly Policies

Finally, the eighth set of statements indicates whether agencies of the women in this sample have family-friendly policies at the workplace and if that factor affects their decision to stay in federal law enforcement. Though 25 % (n = 5) of the agencies do not have family-friendly policies in place, 57.9 % (n = 11) of the women report they will not be departing federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of family-friendly policies (see Table 5.25); however, of the aforementioned eight factors that may influence women's retention in federal law enforcement, family-friendly policies appear to carry more weight than the other factors since many of the women do express concerns with maintaining a work/family balance. This will be apparent in the next section.

Guided Questions

Following the conclusion of the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference, all the audio recordings are transcribed to facilitate analysis. Each of the six guided questions present many numerous responses (themes). The themes are then organized into higher order categories for each guided question. In order to describe the experiences of women in federal law enforcement, direct quotes from the interviews are included throughout this section. Actual names and agency identifying information have been changed to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of the interviewees. The asterisk that appears next to each name represents a fictitious name.

Biggest Barrier

The first guided question asks, "What is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement?" Seven categories emerge from this question—lack of respect by men, overall lack of female representation and female managers, balancing work and family to

reach ranks, themselves, hiring unqualified women, firearms training, and lack of opportunities (see Table 5.26). The top barrier is lack of respect by male colleagues due to female stereotypes such as women are weak and law enforcement is a man's job. As a result, these women are require to work "twice as hard" as the men to achieve even a moderate level of acceptance to break the "good old boy network." One of the women who work with a group of men at her office told her "she had taken a job away from a man" though she is equally qualified. In addition, woman indicates that "the men automatically have a natural camaraderie with one another whereas I had to earn their trust." Furthermore, another woman shares an incident where she is attending tactics training with approximately 100 men and she is the only female in attendance. While demonstrating a particular tactic, the instructor grabs her "crotch" for comedic effect and to embarrass her. She indicates "I had to beat him up, and I grabbed his private area until it hurt. When I returned back to work the next day I was told to get along...and I was the one that got in trouble." In general, this particular barrier causes several women not to report incidences of sexual harassment because they "want to be one of the guys" or prevent "a death sentence for your career."

The next significant barrier is overall lack of female representation in federal law enforcement, to include female managers. With the percentage of women so low in federal law enforcement, particularly in high-ranking positions, the women do not feel they are able to make an impact for change. Another significant barrier is the ability to balance work and family while still being able to achieve ranks at the agency. The women say "there are no examples of women (at least at her agency) who are successful in both their careers and family life. Most of the successful women are either single or

married and have no kids." They also believe there is a "double standard" for women who have children as oppose to single men who have children. "If a man has to leave early to pick up his kid or take his kid to a medical appointment during the day, no one thought twice about it...if a (single or married) woman did that, well then, that's another story."

Finally, another barrier that interestingly appears to have a recurring presence in the other five guided questions is hiring unqualified women. Because hiring is conducted in "spurts and is not a continuous process," the women believe that agencies are not hiring "qualified female candidates" and as a result of these unqualified women being hired, they "poison the other women at the agency." They further describe these unqualified female candidates as "flighty and whiny...who do not know what to expect as a cop...because federal law enforcement was mandated to hire women, they (agencies) did not care who they got." In addition, "Some women have no interest in firearms or physical fitness. Some women don't want to do the physical work and work desk jobs. This makes other women look bad." Finally, one woman describes a female supervisor who "brought cookies for the guys" and believes this demeans women. As a result, the guys in her office naturally assumed she would bring them cookies too which she did not and told them so. "A bad guy does not ruin it for the men but a bad female ruins it for all the women, and the negative is projected a thousand times." Another example is women sleeping with other male officers and supervisors. "I know they're single but that just makes it look bad for all women like we're lumped in the same category."

Other Challenges

The second guided question asks, "What other challenges do women face in federal law enforcement?" Twelve categories emerge from this question—lack of equal treatment/double standards, lack of diversity, other women, management, lack of training opportunities, sexual harassment/discrimination, lack of an annual physical fitness requirement, gaining respect, physical fitness requirements, lack of continuous hiring, lack of promotional opportunities, and firearms requirement (see Table 5.27). The top three challenges—lack of equal treatment and double standards, lack of diversity and gender ratio, and other women—are very similar to those already mentioned in the first guided question. Of the remaining nine challenges on the list, of particular interest is the lack of an annual physical fitness requirement. In the quantitative portion of this study, less than half (43.3 %) report they are required to take an annual physical agility test as a condition of their employment (see Table 4.34), though 62.9 % are required to take a physical agility test prior to entry selection (see Table 4.32). One of the women indicates that because women have more expectations placed on them than men, "the lack of physical strength led to other challenges for the women." Some of these challenges include the perception of being weak and having difficulty with firearms training. Because her agency has no annual physical agility requirement of some sort, there is "no motivation" for the women to stay fit. Another woman has similar opinions and also believe there should be an annual physical agility requirement simply because "peer pressure can be motivating."

On the other hand, others consider the physical fitness requirement as a challenge for women in federal law enforcement. They do not elaborate further; however, during

163

the quantitative portion of this study, (interestingly) 90.5 % (n = 124) considers the physical agility test fair (see Table 4.35). Two women also mention firearms as a challenge for women in federal law enforcement. "Unlike the boys who grow up playing with guns and are used to them, most women don't even touch a gun for the first time until they get to the academy. It's not that we're bad with guns, it's just that we need time to get used to it." In addition, "because our hands are small we have problems with firearms training. They don't help the women accommodate to the larger weapon." Conversely, during the quantitative portion of this study, 93.3 % (n = 125) of the respondents whose agencies did migrate to the larger caliber weapon do not report experiencing difficulties in their jobs with the larger high-powered weapons.

Coping Strategies

The third guided question asks, "What strategies do women employ to deal with these challenges?" Five categories emerge from this question—maintaining a positive attitude, relocate or transfer to another federal agency, act more masculine, peer and family support, and file informal complaints (see Table 5.28). The top coping strategy is perseverance and maintaining a positive attitude. Many of the women indicate "not taking things personally...sticking it out...grit and determination...and learn to adapt." They recommend that women should "find a niche in your agency and then excel in that niche. Be a visionary for your agency's future goal so you can fit in and be useful in the agency." Still other women adopt an "every person for themselves...and...'got mine' mentality..." to keep on track. Some women maintain their positive attitude through "Avoidance; I just don't deal with it." And other women hire personal trainers and firearm instructors to improve themselves.

For those women who "had enough," they either request a transfer to another office or division within their agency and some just leave their agency and apply with another federal law enforcement agency. Over half the women in this sample have experience with more than one federal law enforcement agency and the majority did leave their first agency because of issues such as sexual discrimination. One woman put in for a hardship transfer and is told, "You shouldn't have married someone who was going to move a lot." Though she has been with this agency for 9 years, she does leave to be with her family and gains employment at another federal law enforcement agency at the new location. Ironically, her old agency contacts her two months later and offers the exact job she initially requests in the hardship transfer.

Another strategy women employ is "to act like one of the boys" and adopt a "if you can't beat them, join them" attitude, causing them to act more masculine as a coping mechanism, or in other words, not themselves. Still, others turn to formal counseling, rely on friends and family as their support network, make informal complaints, or just voice their concern.

Reasons Women Stay in Federal Law Enforcement

The fourth guided question asks, "Why do women stay in federal law enforcement?" Five categories emerge from this question—pride and personal satisfaction, pay and benefits, challenging job, ability to transfer to other federal agencies, and opportunities for advancement (see Table 5.29). The top three reasons include personal satisfaction, pay, and the job itself. Overwhelmingly, the women articulate, "I love my job...I've always wanted to be a cop since I was a kid." For others, they "found a niche I like to do in a specific agency" or "knew what to expect because I worked in

165

local law enforcement for 4 years before moving over to federal so it was easier to deal with it."

Due to the current economic situation, pay and benefits are also important to these women. "Where else can you retire after only 20 years and get a retirement check and still have (health) benefits? Even if you have a 'rubber gun' job, you still get (law enforcement availability pay) LEAP." (Because LEAP constitutes 25 % of your base pay, most of the women who are GS-13 or higher make between $90-$105K a year not including locality pay). Finally, as with the previous comments, the ability to transfer to another federal law enforcement agency is even more important in why they stay in federal law enforcement. If they have problems in one agency, they do not lose their "vested time" in federal government and are able to continue a career in federal law enforcement.

Reasons Women Are Underrepresented in Federal Law Enforcement

The fifth guided question asks, "Why are women underrepresented in federal law enforcement?" Five categories emerge from this question—law enforcement work culture, poor recruiting/recruitment barriers, lack of women in management, family sacrifices, and women feeling undervalued (see Table 5.30). The overwhelming reason for underrepresentation stems from society's view of law enforcement. The women believe that, "Society views law enforcement as a male-dominated field...and women don't think they can do this type of work. A lot of women don't want to do this type of work because they think it's too hard. It's not too hard and it's not all physical every day." They also believe there's an impression of law enforcement "being scary, too physical, and too dangerous." When one woman tells her family she is pursuing law

enforcement, they do not support her because they believe it is too dangerous. "Parents aren't encouraging their daughters to be cops, teachers yes, cops no." They also believe, "We don't do enough to market our field. They only know what they see on TV and in the movies. It's not like that. Women don't know about the good pay. We're not just FBI."

Another reason for underrepresentation has to do with poor recruiting or recruiting barriers. As with the previous comments, many believe the wrong women are being hired. "Recruiters need to be more honest from the beginning so they (recruits) are not surprised what the job requires." In addition, one of the biggest complaints is that "Men are doing the interviews and it's like a beauty contest. They don't care if she's qualified. They hire the wrong women and they (women) quit later on. We need to put more women in recruiting." On the other hand, other women believe "We just don't recruit enough women. We're not reaching our college recruits. Women just don't go into (criminal justice) CJ field."

Another reason for underrepresentation has to do with family life. A couple of women indicate that "when women start families, they leave law enforcement, and there's nothing we can do." In addition, "some women are not willing to make family sacrifices." In the quantitative portion of this study, over half the women (52.4 %) in the survey have no children and even more (61.9 %) have no minor children living at home (see Tables 4.6 and 4.7). Furthermore, of the women who do have children, over half have only one child. These numbers suggest that law enforcement do not necessarily attract women who want kids and for those who do and also remain in law enforcement, they typically have just one or two.

167

Finally, the sixth guided question asks, "What can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement?" Ten categories emerge from this question— more outreach my men, more training and opportunities for advancement, recruiting the right women, mentorship by higher-ranked women, more policy conducive to family life, more diversity and representation, maternity leave program, more women in special duty assignments, telecommute or domicile agents, maintain inclusive team environment, and nothing (see Table 5.31). No one proposal has a majority response and many are issues that have been brought up throughout this study such as men having an open mind, recruiting the right women, and more representation; however, two suggestions are of particular interest. The first has to do with the maternity leave program. Though 75 % (n = 15) of the interviewees indicate their agencies have family-friendly policies in place, none of them have a separate maternity leave program separate from sick leave or vacation leave. If the women do not have sick leave or exhaust all their vacation leave, they are on leave without pay. One woman suggests that federal law enforcement agencies adopt maternity leave programs similar to New York Police Department (NYPD) and the military. Female military members and NYPD officers are automatically given 6-weeks of paid maternity leave separate from sick leave or vacation leave. In addition, male military members are given 2-weeks of paid paternity leave when their wives give birth. This initiative can potentially send the message for those women who want to have kids that their agencies support them.

Another interesting proposal is telecommuting or having domicile agents (agents who work from home full-time). Admittedly, this suggestion for retaining more women

in federal law enforcement cannot work for every agency but certainly for many, particularly the Office of Inspector General (OIG) agencies. Since balancing work and family is a significant barrier from women in federal law enforcement, perhaps these initiatives will allow federal law enforcement to retain more women.

The following final chapter provides a recap of the purpose of the study, summary of methodology, summary of findings, limitations in the study, implications of the findings for theory, and direction for suture research.

Table 5.1 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Year of Birth*

Mean	Median	Mode	Min	Max	n = 20
1969	1966	1962	1958	1982	

Table 5.2 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Ethnicity*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Caucasian	12	60.0	
Latina	5	25.0	
African American	1	5.0	
Asian/Pacific Islanders	1	5.0	
Native American	1	5.0	

Table 5.3 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Educational Level*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Some college	1	5.0	
Bachelors	13	65.0	
Masters	6	30.0	

Table 5.4 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Current Relationship Status*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Single	4	20.0	
Married	8	40.0	
Domestic partner	3	15.0	
Separated/Divorced	5	25.0	

Table 5.5 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Children*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
0	9	45.0	
1	4	20.0	
2	4	20.0	
3	2	10.0	
5	1	5.0	

Mean = 1.15
Standard Deviation = 1.387

Table 5.6 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Minor Children Living at Home*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
0	11	55.0	
1	3	15.0	
2	5	25.0	
4	1	5.0	

Mean = 0.85
Standard Deviation = 1.137

Table 5.7 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Employers*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
ATF	2	10.0	
DEA	2	10.0	
DOT	1	5.0	
DOJ OIG	1	5.0	
ICE	6	30.0	
NOAA	1	5.0	
PFPA	2	10.0	
USDA OIG	1	5.0	
USPP	3	15.0	
USSS	1	5.0	

Table 5.8 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Tenure in Current Federal Agency*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 20
11.35	7.213	9.5	2	26	

Table 5.9 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Tenure in Federal Law Enforcement*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 20
14.90	7.853	15.0	2	26	

Table 5.10 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' GS-Level*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
GS-9	2	10.0	
GS-11	3	15.0	
GS-12	1	5.0	
GS-13	6	30.0	
GS-14 or O-5	5	25.0	
Non-GSA pay scale	3	15.0	

Table 5.11 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Supervisory Experience in Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%	n = 20
Yes	11	55.0	
No	9	45.0	

Table 5.12 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Relocations for Federal Law Enforcement Employment*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 20
1.7	2.029	1	0	5	

Table 5.13 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Number of Business Trips Lasting Longer Than 3 Months*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 20
1.5	2.259	1	0	10	

Table 5.14 *Frequency Distribution of Whether Respondents Have Experience in State or Local Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%	n = 20
Yes	7	35.0	
No	13	65.0	

Table 5.15 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Years Employed in State or Local Law Enforcement*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 7
5.43	3.994	4	2	14	

Table 5.16 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Decision to Stay or Pursue Federal Law Enforcement as a Result of 9/11*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Yes	5	25.0	
No	15	75.0	

Table 5.17 *Frequency Distribution of Further Years Respondents Plan on Staying in Federal Law Enforcement*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 20
12.0	7.732	10.0	0	30	

174

Table 5.18 *Frequency Distribution of Pervasive Negative Attitudes Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%	n = 20
Have respondents experienced pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues at their current agency?			
Yes	17	85.0	
No	3	15.0	
If yes, likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues.			
Yes	2	11.8	
No	15	88.2	

Table 5.19 *Frequency Distribution of Negative Law Enforcement Work Culture Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%	n = 20
Have respondents experienced a negative law enforcement work culture at their current agency?			
Yes	14	70.0	
No	6	30.0	
If yes, likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of a negative law enforcement work culture.			
Yes	2	14.3	
No	12	85.7	

Table 5.20 *Frequency Distribution of Glass Ceiling Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Do respondents perceive a glass ceiling to promotions at their current agencies?			
Yes	9	45.0	
No	11	55.0	
If yes, likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of a perceived glass ceiling to promotions.			
Yes	0	0.0	
No	9	100.0	

Table 5.21 *Frequency Distribution of Sexual Harassment Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Have respondents experienced sexual harassment at their current agency?			
Yes	10	50.0	
No	10	50.0	
If yes, did she report it?			
Yes	2	20.0	
No	8	80.0	
If yes, likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of sexual harassment.			
Yes	1	10.0	
No	9	90.0	

Table 5.22 *Frequency Distribution of Sexual Discrimination Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Have respondents experienced sexual discrimination at their current agency?			
Yes	11	55.0	
No	9	45.0	
If yes, did she report it?			
Yes	6	54.5	
No	5	45.5	
If yes, likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of sexual discrimination.			
Yes	2	18.2	
No	9	81.8	

Table 5.23 *Frequency Distribution of the Number of Female Role Models Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Mean	Std Dev	Median	Min	Max	n = 19
2.05	1.779	2	0	6	

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of the number of female role models.

Response	n	%	n = 19
Yes	1	5.3	
No	18	94.7	

Do respondents have a mentor at their federal agencies?   N = 20

Yes	8	40.0	
No	12	60.0	

If yes, is the mentor female?

Yes	3	37.5	
No	5	62.5	

Table 5.24 *Frequency Distribution of Pregnancy-Friendly Policies Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%	n = 19

Do respondents' current agencies have pregnancy-friendly policies?

Yes	13	68.4	
No	6	31.6	

Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of pregnancy-friendly policies.   n = 18

Yes	4	22.2	
No	14	77.8	

Table 5.25 *Frequency Distribution of Family-Friendly Policies Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Do respondents' current agencies have family-friendly policies?			
Yes	15	75.0	
No	5	25.0	
Likelihood respondents would depart federal law enforcement as a result of the lack of family-friendly policies.			n = 19
Yes	8	42.1	
No	11	57.9	

Table 5.26 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions as to What the Biggest Barrier for Women is in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Lack of respect by men	7	35.0	
Overall lack of female representation / managers	4	20.0	
Balancing work and family to reach ranks	3	15.0	
Themselves; lack of confidence	3	15.0	
Hiring unqualified women	1	5.0	
Firearms training	1	5.0	
Lack of opportunities	1	5.0	

Table 5.27 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions as to Other Challenges Women Face in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	n	%	n = 20
Lack of equal treatment / double standards	5	25.0	
Lack of diversity / gender ratio	3	15.0	
Other women	3	15.0	
Management	2	10.0	
Lack of training opportunities	2	10.0	
Sexual harassment / sexual discrimination	2	10.0	
Lack of annual physical fitness requirement	2	10.0	
Maintaining strong personality / gaining respect	2	10.0	
Physical fitness requirements	2	10.0	
Lack of continuous hiring versus hiring spurts	1	5.0	
Lack of promotional opportunities	1	5.0	
Firearms requirement	1	5.0	

Table 5.28 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions on Strategies Women Employ to Deal with the Challenges*

Response	n	%	n = 20
Maintain positive attitude / not take things personal	13	65.0	
Relocate office or transfer to another federal agency	3	15.0	
Act more masculine	3	15.0	
Peer and family support / counseling	3	15.0	
File informal complaints / voice their concerns	2	10.0	

181

Table 5.29 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions on Why Women Stay in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Pride and personal satisfaction	17	85.0	
Pay / benefits	13	65.0	
Challenging job	11	55.0	
Ability to transfer to other federal agencies	5	25.0	
Opportunities for advancement	2	10.0	

Table 5.30 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions on Why Women Are Underrepresented in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
Law enforcement work culture	13	65.0	
Poor recruiting / recruiting barriers	9	45.0	
Lack of women in management / glass ceiling	2	10.0	
Family sacrifices / start families	2	10.0	
Women feel undervalued and leave	2	10.0	

Table 5.31 *Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Opinions on What Can or Should Be Done to Retain More Women in Federal Law Enforcement*

Response	*n*	%	n = 20
More outreach by men / have an open-mind	6	30.0	
More training and opportunities for advancement	4	20.0	
Recruiting the right women / honest recruiters	4	20.0	
Mentorship by higher-ranked women	3	15.0	
More policy conducive to family life	3	15.0	
More diversity and representation	2	10.0	
Maternity leave program	1	5.0	
More women in special duty assignments	1	5.0	
Telecommute or domicile agents	1	5.0	
Maintain inclusive team environment	1	5.0	
Nothing	1	5.0	

Chapter 6: Discussion, Future Research and Conclusion

Introduction

Women in federal law enforcement tend to be amongst the least visible of all women in policing (Schulz 2009). This is further evident by the lack of existing research on women in federal law enforcement by the policing research community and even more by those who study nontraditional occupations (Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009). To date, only five studies exist whose target population examines female federal law enforcement officers (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Blasdel 2010; Doll 2010; Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009); however, with over 100 federal law enforcement agencies (Ackerman 2006; Bumgarner 2006) that employ over 105,000 sworn officers authorize to make arrests and carry firearms, the women in federal law enforcement are worth exploring, especially since the percentage of women in federal law enforcement has remain relatively static at a time when there is a vast increase in the overall number of federal law enforcement personnel in the past 10 years (Langton 2010).

The latest report has women's participation in federal law enforcement at 16.1 % (Reaves 2006), despite the fact that 46.7 % of all working Americans are women (US Department of Labor 2011) and research has shown there are advantages to hiring and retaining female federal law enforcement officers (Balkin 1988; Casidy, Nicholl and Ross 2011; Fry and Greenfeld 1980; Grennan 1987; Horne 2006; Horvath 1987; Martin 2001; Martin and Jurik 2006; Mayo 2006; NCWP 2002a, 2002b, 2003a; Pike 1985; Tuomey and Jolly 2009). These numbers are not reflective of the population demographics to

which they serve and underscore the importance of bureaucratic representation. This study hopes to explain why women are underrepresented in federal law enforcement and provides policy recommendations for increasing women's participation in federal law enforcement in order to achieve gender parity.

Purpose of the Study

Research in primarily state and local law enforcement shows there are eight factors that account for women's turnover in law enforcement—pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues, negative law enforcement work culture, perceived glass ceiling to promotions, sexual harassment and sexual discrimination, lack of high-ranking female role models, and lack of pregnancy-friendly policies and family-friendly policies. The purpose of this study is to investigate these eight factors to determine if any one of them explains the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement. In addition, this study describes women in federal law enforcement and identifies the challenges they face in federal law enforcement, as well as the strategies they utilize to best overcome these challenges. Furthermore, it explains why women stay in federal law enforcement, why they are underrepresented in this field, and provides recommendations on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement. Finally, this study contributes to the existing base of knowledge about bureaucratic representation.

Research Questions

In order to investigate these eight factors that account for women's turnover in law enforcement, the following eight research questions (Q) guide both the quantitative and qualitative portions of this study:

185

Q_1: Does perceived pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_2: Does a perceived traditional law enforcement work culture explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_3: Does a perceived glass ceiling to promotions explain the underrepresentation of

women in federal law enforcement?

Q_4: Does perceived sexual harassment from male colleagues explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_5: Does perceived sexual discrimination from male colleagues explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_6: Does a perceived lack of high-ranking female role models in federal law enforcement

explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_7: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly pregnancy policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

Q_8: Do agencies perceived with non-friendly family care policies explain the

underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement?

In addition, the following six questions further guide the qualitative portion of this

study:

1. What is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement?

2. What other challenges do women face in federal law enforcement?

3. What strategies do women employ to deal with these challenges?

4. Why do women stay in federal law enforcement?

5. Why are women underrepresented in federal law enforcement?

6. What can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement?

Summary of Methodology

The quantitative portion of this study utilizes a written survey by 168 sworn female federal law enforcement officers attending the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference. The first part of the survey collects responses to 19 demographic/descriptive-type questions primarily to collective descriptive data. The remainder of the survey uses various questions/statements to investigate the eight factors that may or may not explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement, as well as other items of interest. Analysis is conducted using descriptive statistics, bivariate statistics and multivariate statistics.

The qualitative portion of this study utilizes semi-structured, open-ended interviews with 20 sworn female federal law enforcement officers attending the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference. This portion uses pattern matching to identify the biggest barrier and other challenges women face in federal law enforcement. In addition, it identifies the strategies women use to best overcome these challenges and explains why women stay in federal law enforcement and why they are underrepresented in this field. Finally, it provides recommendations on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement.

Summary of Findings

Demographic Summary

This sample (n = 168) consists mostly of white women with an average age of 39. Over half (64.9 %) are married or have been married though less than half (47.7 %) have children. Slightly over half (50.1 %) are currently single, separated, or divorced. These

women are educated with 84.5 % having at least a bachelor's degree. The demographic

makeup of this sample are comparable to previous studies that find women in

nontraditional occupations and law enforcement as primarily white, older, educated

(Garrison et al. 1988; Keverline 2003; Moore and Rickel 1980; Schulz 2009) unmarried

(Keverline 2003; Martin 1980; Schultz 2009; Wexler and Logan 1983); and have few to

no children (Garrison et al. 1988; Keverline 2003).

Over half (58.7 %) are classify at GS-13 or higher and 54.8 % have supervisory

experience. The majority of the women come from agencies within the Department of

Homeland Security (DHS), which is consistent with the fact that DHS employs more

federal law enforcement officers than any other federal department (Hess 2009). In

addition, these women are experienced federal law enforcement officers having an

average of 10.01 years at their current agency. An overwhelming 91.2 % indicate they

will remain in federal law enforcement assuming things in their personal life and work

remain the same, and they will stay another 12.89 years taking them to or beyond

retirement. These findings lend support to previous research that examines the

relationship between tenure and retention (Keverline 2003; Lynn, Cao and Horn 1996;

Mitchell 1981; Werbel and Bedeian 1989). These studies find that tenure is positively

related to intentions to stay with an organization.

A quarter (27.5 %) of the respondents report some influence by the events of 9/11

for pursuing or staying in federal law enforcement. For those women born after 1980, the

percentage increases to 34.4 %. In addition, less than a fifth (18.5 %) has prior

experience in state or local law enforcement, and the women on average have 1.61

permanent relocations and 1.31 business trips lasting longer than 3 months for their federal law enforcement employment.

Summary of Hypotheses and Factors

This research supports one of eight hypotheses in this study to explain why women depart federal law enforcement. Multivariate analysis using logistic regression shows that women's retention in federal law enforcement for the near future decreases with the lack of high-ranking female role models. The women in this study report an average of 2.81 female role models at their current agency and of the 33.5 % who have a mentor at their agency, only 40 % have female mentors. The general lack of female representation in federal law enforcement likely contributes to these low numbers. On the other hand, if women perceive there are many high-ranking role models, then retention increases. In addition, though not one of the original eight hypotheses in this study, the number of permanent relocations also affects women's retention in the near future. As the number of permanent relocations increases, retention of women in federal law enforcement for the near future decreases.

As for the other seven factors that may or may not explain women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement, multivariate analysis using the ordinary least squares method show that two of the factors—pervasive negatives attitudes by male colleagues and a perceived glass ceiling to promotions—also has a statistically significant relationship with retention; however, they appear to have the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to remain in federal law enforcement. The biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement continues to be lack of respect by male colleagues due to female stereotypes such as women are weak and law enforcement is a man's job

189

lending support to previous research by Keverline (2003), Seklecki and Paynish (2007) and Timmons and Hainsworth (1988); however, the women in this appear un-intimidated by their male colleagues and perhaps want to prove them wrong. Or the challenge of breaking the glass ceiling and being the next generation of female role models and mentors encourage women to remain in federal law enforcement. Or perhaps other benefits of remaining in federal law enforcement outweigh the costs. Regardless, these two factors do not explain why women are underrepresented in this field but rather highlight that the women in this study perceive these challenges in a positive light. These women are motivated to excel or overcome these challenges by maintaining a positive attitude lending support to research put forth by Lee (2000), Lent, Hackett and Brown (2000) and Luzzo (1996) who suggests women in nontraditional occupations face challenges head-on, using them as self-tests and motivation. Other studies report similar results with women in policing, suggesting that the negative aspects of the job serve as built in motivation for persistence (Keverline 2003; Poole and Pogrebin 1988) and their need to prove they are just as good as the men (Doerner 1995; Keverline 2003).

Regardless of the barriers and challenges women face, women stay in federal law enforcement for personal satisfaction, pay, and the job itself. These findings lend support to previous research by Poole and Pogrebin (1988) and Keverline (2003) for reasons why women stay in federal law enforcement. The results also support previous studies of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, predicting fewer turnovers (Moore 1999; Shaffer et al. 2000; Shaw 1999). On the other hand, these findings contrast Gottfredson's (1981) notion that occupational barriers will discourage women from certain professions and the presence of occupational barriers such as sexual harassment and sexual

190

discrimination directly affects employees' intentions to stay in an occupation (Shaffer et al. 2000).

Bivariate analysis show two additional factors—a negative law enforcement work culture and sexual discrimination—also has a statistically significant relationship with retention; however, they too appear to have the opposite effect by positively influencing women's decision to remain in federal law enforcement. Nonetheless, 43 % of the women in this study report experiencing sexual discrimination at one time or another during their career in federal law enforcement. This percentage is higher than the rates (38.2 %) Keverline (2003) reports in her study, suggesting sexual discrimination is on the rise.

As for the remaining three factors—sexual harassment, lack of pregnancy-friendly policies, and lack of family-friendly policies—they are not statistically significant in predicting retention; however, they do reveal other important information. In regards to sexual harassment, 39.8 % of the women in this study experience sexual harassment at one time or another during their career in federal law enforcement. This percentage is less than the numbers (48.9 %) Keverline (2003) reports in her previous study of female federal law enforcement officers and much less than the rates (63 %) Hunt (1990) reports in her study of female officers in local and state law enforcement; however, the percentage of women who experience sexual harassment in this study is higher than two recent studies that report 29 % (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011) and 27.2 % (Seklecki and Paynish 2007) respectively experience sexual harassment confirming women are still experiencing sexual harassment. As for the pregnancy-friendly and family friendly policies, 30.7 % of the women in this study indicate they will leave their

agency because they did not provide adequate support during their pregnancy. This

number is higher than the rates (21.4 %) Keverline (2003) reports in her previous study,

suggesting pregnancy support is still an important issue with women in federal law

enforcement. In addition, 31.7 % of the women in this study indicate they will leave their

agency as a result of non-friendly family policies. This number is slightly lower than the

rates Keverline (2003) reports in her previous study (44.2 % for inadequate support in

raising a family and 25.7 % for inadequate support in caring for elderly parents);

suggesting family care support is also still an important issue with women in federal law

enforcement.

Limitations

There are several known limitations to this study that can affect the validity and

generalizability of the results. First, the population from which the sample is drawn is

limited to those women in federal law enforcement who attend the 12th Annual WIFLE

Leadership Training Conference. This limits the sample frame of possible women in

federal law enforcement that might have been part of the study and may therefore not be

representative of all sworn female federal law enforcement officers; however, there is no

reason to believe a particular group or subgroup is excluded from attending the

conference.

Second, the single wave of data collection at the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership

Training Conference may also limit the representation of all female federal officers.

Third, other factors (variables) may exist that explain why women stay or depart federal

law enforcement; however, there is no feasible way to control for all of these

possibilities. Fourth, responses rely on the self-reporting of the participants. Since all

192

subjects have unique characteristics, different orientations, and different perceptions, there may be some reporting bias; however, to minimize bias or misinterpretation, two individuals who are familiar with federal law enforcement and one individual who has no knowledge of federal law enforcement accomplish a pre-test of the survey to ensure appropriate technical language is clear.

Fifth, because the women chose to attend the 12th Annual WIFLE Leadership Training Conference or are their agencies representative, they are likely already career-driven and want to improve the status of women in federal law enforcement. As a result, the respondents may answer some of the questions to portray a positive light on women in federal law enforcement. Sixth, because there is one sole interviewer, there may be an element of bias in the questions, even though attempts are made to reduce any bias by utilizing semi-structured open-ended questions.

Finally, the last limitation is the sample itself. As previously mention, the responses rely on the self-reporting of the participants. Since 31.5 % of the conference attendees respond to the survey, a large pool of potential respondents is missing. In particular, the younger federal officers are missing. This is evident by the mean response of 12.23 years for total years in federal law enforcement. As such, the women in this sample are already career-driven and will likely overcome any barrier to reach retirement, thereby automatically increasing retention. As a result, examining factors that may cause women to depart federal law enforcement may not have been achievable from the beginning.

Implications of the Findings for Theory

This study from the beginning attempts to identify specific factors as a form of explanatory theory to explain the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement. One of the eight factors that is the focus of this study—lack of high-ranking female role models—appear to be a predictor for causing women to depart federal law enforcement, thereby producing one direct explanatory theory for the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement. In addition, a descriptive variable—the number of permanent relocations—also appear to be a predictor for causing women to depart federal law enforcement, producing another direct explanatory theory. Therefore, administrators can use the findings of this study to exercise discretion in placing more women in high-ranking positions or implement policies that will increase the perception of high-ranking female role models such as assigning a female mentor for every new female officer entering an agency. Other suggestions include placing more women in special duty assignments to highlight women's contribution within an agency and pro-active efforts to ensure at least one woman receives a training slot for every training opportunity that comes up. Unfortunately, due to the decentralized nature of federal law enforcement, it is up to each agency director to determine if they are willing to endorse and implement these types of policy recommendations.

As for the number of permanent relocations a federal officer must make throughout their federal law enforcement career, this may be an area that cannot improve. It is common knowledge within the major federal law enforcement agencies that to move up the career ladder, federal officers must move to DC where their headquarters is located. Due to the decentralized nature of federal law enforcement, virtually all major

federal law enforcement agencies have their headquarters located in or around DC with field offices spread throughout the US. In order to gain more experience and oversee more personnel and bigger projects, a federal officer must work at their agency headquarters. If they do not want to move to DC due to the high cost of living or family inconvenience such as changing schools for the kids or their husband's occupation, women's promotional opportunities become limited beyond a certain grade at their current location and will not progress beyond middle management.

In addition to producing direct explanatory theories, there are broad theory implications within the study of public administration. In recent years, there has been much literature on representative bureaucracy which examines the relative reflection of population demographics in comparison to the agency/organization being studied (Bowling et al. 2006; Dolan 2000, Keiser et al. 2002, Kelly and Newman 2001; Naff 2001; Riccucci 2002; Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006) and tokenism (Brown 1998; Franklin 2005; Green and del Carmen 2002; Kanter 1977; Krimmel and Gormley 2003; Martin 1999; Pike 1985; Rabe-Hemp 2008; Wertsch 1998; Yoder 1994). In 2010, 46.7 % of all working Americans are women (US Department of Labor 2011); however, women comprise only 16.1 % of all sworn officers in federal law enforcement.

According to Kanter's (1977) theory of proportional representation or tokenism, employment organizations having a very low percentage of minority workers place multiple stressors on those persons. She characterizes the dominant group outnumbering the minority group by ratios ranging from 99:1 through 85:15 (Kanter 1977; Krimmel and Gormley 2003). Yoder (1994) further interprets Kanter's (1977) definition of tokenism by stating tokenism occurs whenever the minority makes up less than 15 % of

the whole. Though women in federal law enforcement (barely) surpass this token threshold, Brown (1998), who concurs that the low number of women in organizations serve as an influential inhibitor in the equal treatment of women in the workforce, further suggests that until women reach a 25 % proportion of the total workforce, they will continue to suffer token status, which ultimately reinforces negative stereotypes (Krimmel and Gormley 2003). Dahlerup (1988; 2005) also extends Kanter's (1977) analysis and pin points 30 % as the crucial cut-off point for impact by a minority group. Though organizations such as WIFLE, Inc. hope to achieve gender parity in federal law enforcement, research suggests that until a certain minimum representation, i.e. 25 % or 30 %, is met, women will not be able to make a substantial difference in promoting women-friendly policy change or to influence their male colleagues (Childs and Krook 2008). This is important considering 'lack of respect by male colleagues' is identified in this study as the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement. In addition, two of the three factors that are the focus of this study to have the highest percentage of "unsure" as their response for leaving federal law enforcement are women-friendly type policies—pregnancy-friendly policies and family-friendly policies. As for the third factor that has a high percentage of "unsure" as a response for leaving federal law enforcement, a perceived glass ceiling to promotions will continue to exist until a certain minimum representation is met.

Furthermore, according to Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006, 850), "Representative bureaucracy concerns not just the composition of the bureaucracy but also the repercussions that representation has for policy making and policy implementation." The theory assumes that similar experiences or values, which may or

may not be shared across gender or race divisions, fundamentally affect the decisions and actions the bureaucrat makes (Meier 1993). As such, increasing women's representation in male dominated environments may just require more women in positions of power (Stokes and Scott 2006; Warner, Steel, and Lovrich 1989). This assertion lends support to Dahlerup's (1988; 2005) argument that it's not always the numbers, i.e. 30 %, that count but the performance of a few outstanding women as role models. With the recent appointment of Michelle Leonhart as the Director of the DEA and Stacia Hylton as the Director of the USMS, we will see if their appointment will not only increase women's recruitment into federal law enforcement but generate more high-ranking female role models not only in their agencies but throughout federal law enforcement, as well as more women-friendly policies to increase women's representation in federal law enforcement. Hopefully, other agency directors will be able to look to the DEA and the USMS to implement similar or new policy initiatives to increase women's representation in federal law enforcement.

In addition, due to the decentralized nature of federal law enforcement, agency directors can also look to reputable non-profit organizations such as WIFLE, Inc. who are leading the charge in promoting women-friendly policies throughout federal law enforcement and making policy recommendations on topics such as pregnancy to all federal agency directors. The role of non-profit organizations is critical to the institutional arrangement of the intergovernmental system and for building public capacity (Hale 2011). Without WIFLE to advocate for these women, there is no guarantee the over 100 federal law enforcement agencies independently will provide extra support to their female federal officers.

Direction for Future Research

This study contributes to the existing base of knowledge about bureaucratic representation specifically in regards to women in federal law enforcement; however, as with most studies, it also leads to additional questions that present opportunities for further inquiry. For example, many of the women in this study have experience in at least one other federal law enforcement agency prior to their current agency. This leads to further questions such as why they left their first agency and does that agency have a reputation for high-turnover? In addition, what is attractive about their current agency? Are some agencies more supportive of their female officers than others? Perhaps studying women in federal law enforcement as a whole is not the best method but rather studying individual agencies. In Schulz' (2009) first-ever study about female Special Agents in Charge, she too suggests paying closer attention to individual agencies and to career moves within the federal service.

In addition, Schulz (2009) believes that even a cursory review of the profiles of federal law enforcement officers publish by the USDOJ BJS shows that the macro figures tell only a small portion of the story. The percentages (and in some cases the actual numbers) of women are much higher in some agencies than in others. A closer study of the hiring practices and personnel policies of individual agencies will be useful to the agencies not only for recruiting women but also for retaining them (Schulz 2009). For example, it appears that women are making the greatest progress, at entry and at management positions, in the OIGs. What is it about the OIGs that lead them to have higher percentages of women than the older, more traditional federal law enforcement agencies? The higher percentage of women in these agencies may have something to do

198

with the investigative nature of these agencies, possibly making the positions less

attractive to men who define "real" law enforcement as "doing doors" rather than "doing

paperwork" (Schulz 2009). During the qualitative portion of this study, the women who

work at the OIGs suggest that women are indeed attracted to these "rubber gun" positions

because they receive the same pay, to include law enforcement availability pay (LEAP),

and have even more opportunities for advancement. Whatever the reasons, female

federal law enforcement officers comprise almost 30 percent of the OIGs' staff in the

Departments of Agriculture, Education, Health and Human Services, Interior, Small

Business Administration, and Treasury Tax Administration (Reaves 2006; Schulz 2009).

Furthermore, there is great variation among the federal law enforcement agencies

than with local or state law enforcement. The federal government employs law

enforcement personnel in more than 40 job series (Damp 2008), as well as six primary

functions for full-time federal officers with arrest and firearm authority: criminal

investigation, police response and patrol, inspections, corrections and detention, court

operations, and security and protection (Reaves 2006). Without consideration of the

individual characteristics or cultures of federal agencies, it becomes nearly impossible to

determine why women may be more successful in one agency over another (Schulz

2009). This wide-angle focus on federal law enforcement often makes it appear that

federal law enforcement is administer through one large government bureaucracy, rather

than the over 100 federal law enforcement agencies that exist today (Ackerman 2006;

Bumgarner 2006) contributing to its decentralized nature. While some agencies provide

uniformed services, others are strictly investigative. Some require federal officers to

interact frequently with violent offenders while others focus on white-collar, non-violent

offenders. Additionally, some federal agencies may require more night and weekend

work than do others, just as some require more travel than others. Even within these

variations, more precise variations may exist.

Schulz (2009) also suggests that because some federal law enforcement agencies

are better known than others and perceive to have more prestige, research might

determine that these agencies are more desirable for long-term employment but are

harder to enter from the outside or vice versa. This could explain why the FBI and BOP

are negligible in the present study or why so many of the women began their careers in

federal agencies other than the ones in which they are now employed.

Schulz (2009) also recommends conducting exit interviews to better document

which employees are leaving, why they are leaving, and whether there are certain points

at which employees are more likely to leave. Examples might include being passed over

for a promotion or being asked to accept a transfer that is not seen as career-enhancing or

that presents problems for the employee's family. The research community, and agencies

themselves, might want to know whether some agencies serve as "career starters," places

from which women move to larger or more prestigious agencies or if transfers from

larger to smaller agencies provide greater opportunities for upward mobility (a large fish

in a small pond theory) (Schulz 2009)? However, federal law enforcement agencies have

not been forthcoming with providing the names of their female officers who are departing

their agencies for reasons such as the Privacy Act. In addition, though FLETC serves as

the inter-agency law enforcement training organization for 89 federal law enforcement

agencies, for reasons unknown, they do not allow the research community access to their

female trainees who do not complete the training program. Perhaps another approach is

to contact the DEA, the USMS, or the US Park Police whose recent appointment of female directors may be more cooperative with the research community.

Finally, a replication of this study may be useful with two conditions. First, use a purposeful sample to identify women who only have between 5-7 years of federal law enforcement experience. Previous research from the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) suggests that women leave law enforcement after an average of five years of service (IACP 1998). In order to examine why certain factors may or may not influence women's decision to remain in federal law enforcement, the women must be in a position to depart federal law enforcement without having ties to retirement. Second, identify the sample at a single agency as opposed to a broad group as this study has done. This will ensure variation is kept to a minimum. In summary, a major obstacle in determining why women depart federal law enforcement is simply the small body of research on federal law enforcement. Without additional research, academics and the agencies themselves are left to guess at the answers.

Conclusions

Research on women in federal law enforcement is limited to five studies whose target population consist of female federal law enforcement officers (Barratt, Thompson and Bergman 2011; Blasdel 2010; Doll 2010; Keverline 2003; Schulz 2009). This study examines eight specific factors to identify which (if any) influence women's decision to stay or depart federal law enforcement. Several conclusions can be drawn from the quantitative and qualitative results of this study. First, only one of the eight factors when accounting for other variables appears to be a predictor for women departing federal law enforcement in the near future. As such, perhaps we need to look at the types of women

201

that are being recruited into this field. For those women who know what they are getting themselves into, no amount of barriers or challenges will prevent them from fulfilling a career in federal law enforcement. For those women who are lied to for whatever reason during recruitment and truly do not know what law enforcement is all about, the agencies are setting them up for failure resulting in their departure from federal law enforcement. As such, an analysis of methods to retain more women in federal law enforcement actually produces several suggestions to improve efforts to recruit the right women in federal law enforcement. First, send female federal officers to recruiting fairs and be completely honest with potential recruits regarding the law enforcement work culture and what is expected of them. Second, recruit potential applicants continuously throughout the year vice hiring in spurts. This will prevent hiring women just for the sake of hiring women. In order to increase women's representation in federal law enforcement, we must start with the right recruits.

Starting a family continues to affect women's underrepresentation in federal law enforcement. Two initiatives emerge for retaining more women in federal law enforcement: paid maternity leave and telecommuting. The Department of Defense provide all active duty female military members 6-weeks of paid maternity leave separate from sick leave or vacation leave. In addition, male military members also receive 10 days of paid paternity leave when their wives give birth. As a federal agency, federal law enforcement can adopt a similar program to that of the Department of Defense to promote the importance of family and taking care of female officers who give birth. As for telecommuting, working from home benefits those women who are having difficulty balancing work and family, an issue that has been brought up several times in this study.

Both methods support women raising a family early in their careers and help balance life and work issues.

The biggest barrier and challenge to women in federal law enforcement continues to be lack of respect by male colleagues lending support to previous studies with similar results (Keverline 2003; Seklecki and Paynish 2007; Timmons and Hainsworth 1988). As long as women in federal law enforcement continue to hover around 16.1 %, no amount of organizational 'sensitivity' training will change the masculine identity of law enforcement. Until 25 % - 30 % representation is met, perhaps one method to earn respect by male colleagues is to ensure all federal agencies have an annual (with gender-norming) fitness requirement. This will (hopefully) eliminate (some of) the perception of women being weak and ensure those with firearms difficulty maintain proper upper body strength. Regardless, women (and men) have the option of requesting a transfer to another office or division within their agency or just leaving their agency for another federal law enforcement agency if the challenges are too much. Since men and women join law enforcement for similar reasons, the ability to gain employment at another federal agency without losing years already obtained at a previous agency towards retirement is clearly the best aspect of federal law enforcement.

In summary, the results of this research adds to the study of bureaucratic representation in regards to women in federal law enforcement and the factors that may or may not influence their decision to stay or depart federal law enforcement. Further, it identifies the biggest barrier and other challenges women face in federal law enforcement, including how they cope with these challenges, and what can be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement. Administrators and decision-makers can

use this information to implement policy initiatives to further recruit or retain more

women in this field; however, far more research will be require to fully understand

women's experience in federal law enforcement and the factors that drive them to depart

federal law enforcement.

References

Ackerman, Thomas H. 2006. *Federal law enforcement careers: Profiles of 250 high-powered positions and surefire tactics for getting hired*. Indianapolis, IN: JIST Works.

Agranoff, Robert. 2007. *Managing within networks: Adding value to public organizations.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Agranoff, Robert and Michael McGuire. 2003. *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local government*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Appier, Janis. 1998. *Policing women: The sexual politics of law enforcement and the LAPD*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Ash, Phillip, Karen B. Slora, and Cynthia F. Britton. 1990. Police agency officer selection practices. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 17 No 4: 258-269.

Baber, Kristine M. and Patricia Monaghan. 1988. College women's career and motherhood expectations: New options, old dilemmas. *Sex Roles* Vol 19: 189-203.

Balkin, Joseph. 1988. Why policemen don't like police women. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 16 No 1: 29-38.

Barratt, Clare L., Rebecca J. Thompson, and Mindy E. Bergman. 2011. *Executive summary: Women in federal law enforcement: Why do non-supervisory sworn female officers seek promotion into supervisory roles and how did female supervisors get there?* Paper presented at the 12th Annual Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE) Leadership Training Conference, June 21-23, in Long Beach, CA.

Bell, Daniel J. 1982. Policewomen: Myths and reality. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 10: 112-120.

Belknap, Joanne and Jill K. Shelley. 1992. The new lone ranger: Policewomen on patrol. *American Journal of Police* Vol 12: 47-76.

Berg, Bruce L. and Kimberly J. Budnick. 1986. Defeminization of women in law enforcement: A new twist in the traditional police personality. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 14 No 4: 314-319.

Betz, Nancy E. and Gail Hackett. 1997. Applications of self-efficacy theory to the career assessment of women. *Journal of Career Assessment* Vol 5 No 4: 383-402.

Betz, Nancy E. 2002. Self-efficacy theory as a basis for career assessment. *Journal of Career Assessment* Vol 8 No 3: 205-222.

Blasdel, Earl. 2010. *Glass ceiling effect: A study of women federal law enforcement*. PhD diss., University of Phoenix.

Bloch, Peter B. and Deborah Anderson. 1974. *Policewomen on patrol: Final report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Bowling, Cynthia J., Christine A. Kelleher, Jennifer Jones, and Deil S. Wright. 2006. Cracked ceilings, firmer floors, and weakening walls: Trends and patterns in gender representation among executives leading American state agencies, 1970-2000. *Public Administration Review* Vol 66 No 6: 823-836.

Bowman, Ann O. and George A. Krause. 2003. Power shift: Measuring policy centralization in US intergovernmental relations, 1947-1998. *American Politics Research* Vol 31 No 3: 301-325.

Brown, Jennifer M. and Stephen Sargent. 1995. Policewomen and firearms in British police service. *Policing* Vol 18: 1-16.

Brown, Jennifer M. and Jennifer Grover. 1997. Stress and the women sergeant. *The Police Journal* Vol 71: 47-54.

Brown, Jennifer M. 1998. Aspects of discriminatory treatment of women police officers serving in forces in England and Wales. *British Journal of Criminology* Vol 38 No 2: 265-282.

Brown, Jennifer M. and Frances Heidensohn. 2000. *Gender and policing*. London: Macmillan.

Brown, Michael K. 1981. *Working the street*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Burlingame, David and Agnes L. Baro. 2005. Women's representation and status in law enforcement: Does CALEA involvement make a difference. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* Vol 16 No 4: 391-411.

Bumgarner, Jeffrey B. 2006. *Federal agents: The growth of federal law enforcement in America*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Carlan, Philip E. and Elizabeth C. McMullan. 2009. A contemporary snapshot of policewomen attitudes. *Women and Criminal Justice* Vol 19 No 1: 60-79.

Carless, Sally A. 2005. The influence of fit perceptions, equal opportunity policies, and social support network on pre-entry police officer career commitment and intentions to remain. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 33 No 4: 341-352.

Cassidy, Michael, Caroline G. Nicholl, and Carmen R. Ross. 2001. *Results of a survey conducted by the metropolitan police department of victims who reported violence against women*. Washington, DC: DC Metropolitan Police Department.

Chambers, Veronic. 2003. *Having it all? Black women and success*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Cheryan, Sapna and Victoria C. Plaut. 2010. Explaining underrepresentation: A theory of precluded interest. *Sex Roles* Vol 63: 475–488.

Charles, Michael T. 1982. Women in policing: The physical aspect. *Journal of Political Science and Administration* Vol 10 No 2: 194-205.

Childs, Sarah and Mona L. Krook. 2008. Critical mass theory and women's political representation. *Political Studies* Vol 56 No 3: 725-736.

Cockburn, Cynthia. 1991. *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Colker, Ruth. 1986. Rank-order physical abilities selection devices for traditionally male occupations as gender-based employment discrimination. *UC Davis Law Review* Vol 19: 761-805.

Comeau, Michelle J. 2011. *Representation and recruitment: A three-part analysis of the police hiring process within New York state*. MS thesis, Rochester Institute of Technology.

Comeau, Michelle J. and John Klofas. 2010. *Women in policing: The assumption of gender difference working paper # 2010-02*. Rochester, NY: Center for Public Safety Initiatives Rochester Institute of Technology.

Creswell, John W. and Vicky L. Plano-Clark 2007. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crowley, Jocelyn E. 2006. Moving beyond tokenism: Ratification of the equal rights amendment and the election of women to state legislatures. *Social Science Quarterly* Vol 87 No 3: 519-539.

Dahlerup, Drude. 1988. From a small to a large minority: Women in Scandinavian politics. *Scandinavian Political Studies* Vol 11 No 4: 275-297.
_____. 2005. *The theory of a "critical mass" revisited*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1-4, Washington, DC.

Damp, Dennis V. 2008. *The book of US government jobs: Where they are, what's available and how to get one,* 10th Ed. McKees Rocks, PA: Bookhaven Press, LLC.

Dempsey, John S. and Linda S. Forst. 2005. *An introduction to policing*, 3rd Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Dew, Rosemary and Pat Pape. 2004. *No backup: My life as a female FBI special agent*. New York, NY: Carroll and Graft Publishers.

Dick, Penny and Devi Jankowicz. 2001. A social constructionist account of police culture and its influence on the representation and progression of female officers. *Policing* Vol 24: 181-199.

Doerner, William G. 1995. Officer retention patterns: An affirmative action concern for police agencies? *American Journal of Police* Vol 14 No 3-4: 197-210.

Doll, Jason. 2010. *Results of WIFLE stress study*. Paper presented at the monthly Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE) meeting, May 17, Washington, DC.

Ermer, Virginia B. 1978. Recruitment of female police officers in New York. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 6 No 3: 233-245.

Evans, David H. 1980. Height, weight, and physical agility requirements: Title VII and public safety employment. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 8 No 4: 414-436.

Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). 2004. *Crime in the United States 2003*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC). 2010. http://www.fletc.org (accessed November 15, 2010).

Felkenes, George T. and Peter C. Unsinger. 1992. *Diversity, affirmative action and law enforcement*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Felkenes, George T., Paul Peretz, and Jean R. Schroedel. 1993. An analysis of the mandatory hiring of females: The Los Angeles police department experience. *Women and Criminal Justice* Vol 4 No 2: 31-63.

Flavin, Jeanne. M. and Richard. R. Bennett. 1997. *Gender and policing: The relative effects of occupational and societal influences*. Washington DC: American Sociological Association.

Flavin, Jeanne M. 2001. Feminism for the mainstream criminologist: An invitation. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 29: 271-285.

Foerstel, Herbert N. 2008. *The patriot act: A documentary and reference guide*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Franklin, Cortney A. 2005. Male peer support and the police culture: Understanding the resistance and opposition of women in policing. *Women and Criminal Justice* Vol 16 No 3: 1-25.

Friedman, Andrea. 2007. The strange career of Annie Lee Moss: Rethinking race, gender, and McCarthyism. *The Journal of American History* Vol 94 No 2: 445-468.

Fry, Lincoln J. 1983. A preliminary examination of the factors related to the turnover of women in law enforcement. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 11 No 2: 149-155.

Fry, Louis W. and Sue Greenfeld. 1980. An examination of attitudinal differences between police women and police men. *Journal of Applied Psychology* Vol 65: 123-126.

Gaines, Larry K., Steve Falkenberg, and Joseph A. Gambino. 1993. Police physical agility testing: An historical and legal analysis. *American Journal of Police* Vol 12 No 4: 47-66.

Gainor, Kathy A. 2006. Twenty-five years of self-efficacy in career assessment and practice. *Journal of Career Assessment* Vol 14 No 1: 161-178.

Garcia, Venessa. 2003. Difference in the police department: women, policing, and doing gender. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* Vol 19 No 3: 330-344.

Garrison, Carole, Nancy Grant, and Kenneth McCormick. 1988. Utilization of police women. *The Police Chief* Vol 53 No 9: 32-35, 69-73.

Gates, Gary J. 2011. *How many people are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender?* The Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law, April 2011. http://www3.law.ucla.edu/williamsinstitute/pdf/How-many-people-are-LGBT-Final.pdf (accessed July 2, 2011).

Gerston, Larry N. 2007. *American federalism: A concise introduction*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Gottfredson, Linda S. 1981. Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* Vol 28 No 6: 545-579.

Greene, Taylor H. and Alejandro Del Carmen. 2002. Female police officers in Texas: Perceptions of colleagues and stress. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* Vol 25 No 2: 385-398.

Grennan, Sean A. 1987. Findings on the role of officer gender in violent encounters with citizens. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 15: 78-85.

Grube-Farrell, Beth. 2002. Women, work, and occupational segregation in the uniformed services. *Affilia* Vol 17 No 3: 332-353.

Haarr, Robin N. 1997. Patterns of interaction in a police bureau: Race and gender barriers to integration. *Justice Quarterly* Vol 14: 53-85.
_____. 2005. Factors influencing the decision of police recruits to drop out of police work. *Police Quarterly* Vol 8 No 4: 431-453.

Haarr, Robin N. and Merry Morash. 2005. Police workplace problems, coping strategies and stress: Changes from 1990 to 2003 for women and racial minorities. *Law Enforcement Executive FORUM* Vol 4 No 3: 165-185.

Haba, Calvin W. 2007. *Race/ethnicity and the attitudes of college students toward women in policing*. MA thesis, The University of Texas at Arlington.

Hale, Donna C. and Daniel J. Menniti. 1993. Discrimination and harassment: Litigation by women in policing. In *It's a crime: Women and Justice,* edited by Roslyn Muraskin and Ted Alleman, 177-189. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Regents/Prentice Hall.

Hale, Kathleen. 2011. *How information matters: Networks and public policy innovation*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Heidensohn, Frances. 1992. *Women in control? The role of women in law enforcement*. London: Oxford University Press.

Hellriegel, Don and Larry Short. 1972. Equal employment opportunity in the federal government: A comparative analysis. *Public Administration Review* Vol 32 No 6: 851-858.

Herman, Susan N. and Paul Finkelman. 2008. *Terrorism, government, and the law: National authority and local autonomy in the war on terror*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Hess, Karen M. 2009. *Introduction to law enforcement and criminal justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hewlett, Sylvia A. 2002. *Creating a life: Professional women and the quest for children*. New York, NY: Talk Miramax Books.

Hickman, Mathew J. and Brian A. Reaves. 2006a. Local police departments, 2003. *US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin May 2006, NCJ 210118*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
_____. 2006b. Sheriffs' offices, 2003. *US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin May 2006, NCJ 210361*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Hochstedler, Ellen. 1984. Impediments to hiring minorities in public police agencies. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 12: 227-240.

Horne, Peter. 1980. *Women in law enforcement*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
_____. 2006. Policewomen: Their first century and the new era. *The Police Chief* Vol 73 No 9: 56-61.

Horvath, Frank. 1987. The police use of deadly force: A description of selected characteristics of intrastate incidents. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 15 No 3: 226-238.

House, Cathryn. 1993. The changing role of women in law enforcement. *The Police Chief* Vol 60 No 10: 139-144.

Hughes, Patrick J. 2011. A new sheriff in town: The barriers of structural discrimination facing women leaders. *Advancing Women in Leadership* Vol 31: 8-13.

Hunt, Jennifer C. 1984. The development of rapport through negotiation of gender in field work among police. *Human Organization* Vol 43: 283-296.
_____. 1990. The logic underlying police sexism. *Women and Criminal Justice* Vol 1 No 2: 3-30.

International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP). 1998. *The future of women in policing: Mandates for action.* Washington DC: Author.

International Association of Women Police (IAWP). 2011. http://www.iacp.org (accessed October 15, 2011).

Johnson, Bonnie J. and Belinda D. Crum-Cano. 2011. Glass walls in urban planning: An examination of policy type and gender segregation within a profession. *Review of Public Personnel Administration* Von 20 No 10: 1-24.

Kaminski, Robert J. 1993. Police minority recruitment: Predicting who will say yes to an offer for a job as a cop. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 21 No 4: 395-409.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. 1977. *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic.

Kelso, Laura and Joyce McDonald. 1989. US Marshals 200th birthday. *Women Police* Winter: 12-13.

Keverline, Susan. 2003. *Women's persistence in nontraditional occupations: A study of federal law enforcement*. PhD diss., The George Washington University.

Kim, Pan S. and Berhanu Mengistu. 1994. Women and minorities in the work force of law-enforcement agencies. *The American Review of Public Administration* Vol 24 No 2: 161-179.

Kickert, Walter J.M., Erik-Hans Klijn, and Joop F.M. Koppenjan. 1997. Introduction: A management perspective on policy networks. In *Managing complex networks: Strategies for the public sector*, edited by Walter J.M. Kickert, Erik-Hans Klijn, and Joop F.M. Koppenjan. London: Sage.

Klijn, Erik-Hans. 2003. Networks and governance: A perspective on public policy and public administration. In Governing networks, edited by Ari Salminem. Amsterdam: IUS Press.

Kranda, April. 1998. Women in policing: The importance of mentoring. *The Police Chief* Vol 65 No 10: 54-56.

Krimmel, John T. and Paula E. Gormley. 2003. Tokenism and job satisfaction for policewomen. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 28 No 1: 73-88.

Kruger, Karen J. 2006. Pregnancy and policing: Are they compatible? *The Berkeley Electronic Press Paper 1357*. http://law.bepress.com/expresso/eps/1357 (accessed November 15, 2010).

Kuerston, Ashlyn K. 2003. *Women and the law: Leaders, cases, and documents*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC CLIO.

Lambert, Eric, Nancy Hogan, and Shannon Barton. 2001. The impact of job satisfaction in turnover intent: A test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *The Social Science Journal* Vol 38: 233-250.

Langton, Lynn. 2010. Women in law enforcement, 1987-2008. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Crime Data Brief June 2010, NCJ 230521*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Lent, Robert W., Gail Hackett, and Stephen D. Brown. 2000. Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology* Vol 47 No 1: 36-49.

Lewis, Gregory B. and David W. Pitts. 2008. *Representation of lesbian and gay men in federal, state, and local bureaucracies.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 28, in Boston, MA.

Long, Rebecca J. 2003. *Women in law enforcement: A study of female sworn officers of the Illinois state police*. Illinois: Western Illinois University.

Lonsway, Kimberly. 2003. Tearing down the wall: problems with consistency, validity, and adverse impact of physical agility testing in police selection. *Police Quarterly* Vol 6 No 3: 237-277.

Lunneborg, Patricia W. 1980. *Women police officers*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

212

Luzzo, Darrell A. 1996. Exploring the relationship between the perception of occupational barriers and career development. *Journal of Career Development* Vol 22: 239-248.

Lynn, Susan A., Le T. Cao, and Betty C. Horn. 1996. The influence of career stage on the work attitudes of male and female accounting professionals. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* Vol 17 No 2: 135-149.

Markoff, Helene S. 1972. The federal women's program. *Public Administration Review* Vol 32 No 2: 144-151.

Martin, Susan E. 1980. *Breaking and entering: Police women on patrol*. Berkley: University of California Press.
_____. 1990. *On the move: The status of women in policing*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
_____. 1991. The effectiveness of affirmative action: The case of women in policing. *Justice Quarterly* Vol 8: 489-504.
_____. 1999. Police force or police service? Gender and emotional labor. *Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Sciences* Vol 561: 111-126.

Martin, Susan E. and Nancy C. Jurik. 1996. *Doing justice, doing gender: Women in law and criminal justice occupations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
_____. 2006. *Doing justice, doing gender: Women in legal and criminal justice occupations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Mayer, Matt A. 2009. *Homeland security and federalism: Protecting America from outside the beltway*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, LLC.

Mayo, Louis. 2006. College education and policing. *The Police Chief* Vol 73 No 8: 20-38.

Meagher, M. Steven and Nancy A. Yentes. 1986. Choosing a career in policing: A comparison of male and female perceptions. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 14 No 4: 320-327.

Meier, Kenneth J. and Jill Nicholson-Crotty. 2006. Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement: The case of sexual assault. *Public Administration Review* Vol 66 No 6: 650-660.

Milgram, Donna. 2002. Recruiting women to policing: Practical strategies that work. *The Police Chief* Vol 69 No 4: 23-29.

Miller, Susan L. 1999. *Gender and community policing: Walking the talk*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

Mitchel, James O. 1981. The effect of intentions, tenure, personal and organizational variables on managerial turnover. *Academy of Management Journal* Vol 24: 742-751.

Moore, Loretta M. and Annette U. Rickel. 1980. Characteristics of women in traditional and nontraditional managerial roles. *Personnel Psychology* Vol 33: 317-333.

Mosher, Frederick C. 1982. *Democracy and the public service,* 2nd Ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mueller, Stephen L. 2008. Gender role orientation as a determinant of entrepreneurial self-efficacy. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* Vol 13 No1 : 3–20.

Myers, Gloria. 1995. *A municipal mother: Portland's Lola Greene Baldwin, America's first policewoman.* Corvallis: Oregon State University Press.

National Association of Women Law Enforcement Executives (NAWLEE). 2011. http://nawlee.com (accessed October 15, 2011).

National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP). 2001. *Recruiting and retaining women: A self-assessment guide for law enforcement.* http://www.ncjrs.org (accessed November 15, 2010).
_____. 2002a. *Equality denied: The status of women in policing: 2001.* http://www.womenandpolicing.org/PDF/2002_Status_Report.pdf (accessed September 29, 2010).
_____. 2002b. *Men, women and police excessive force: A tale of two genders: A content analysis of civil liability cases, sustained allegations and citizen complaints.* http://www.womenandpolicing.org/PDF/2002_Excessive_Force.pdf (accessed September 29, 2010).
_____. 2003a. *Hiring and retaining more women: The advantages to law enforcement agencies.* http://www.womenandpolicing.org/HiringAdvantage.pdf (accessed September 29, 2010).
_____. 2003b. *Under scrutiny: The effect of consent decrees on the representation of women in sworn law enforcement.* http://www.womenandpolicing.org/pdf/Fullconsentdecreestudy.pdf (accessed September 29, 2010).
_____. 2011. http://www.womenandpolicing.org/aboutus.asp (accessed October 15, 2011).

Ortmeier, Patrick J. and Edwin Meese. 2010. *Leadership, ethics, and policing: Challenges for the 21st century,* 2nd Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

O'Toole, Mary E. 1987. *Women in law enforcement: In search of an authentic stereotype.* PhD diss., Golden State University.

O'Toole, Laurence J. 2007. *American intergovernmental relations: Foundations, perspectives, and issues*, 4th Ed. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Palombo, Bernadette. J. 1992a. Affirmative action and the law. In *Diversity, affirmative action and law enforcement*, edited by George T. Felkenes and Peter. C. Unsinger, 38-56. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

_____. 1992b. Attitudes, training, performance and retention of female and minority police officers. In *Diversity, affirmative action and law enforcement,* edited by George T. Felkenes and Peter. C. Unsinger, 57-90. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Paoline, Eugene A. III. 2003. Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 31: 199-214.

Pike, Diane L. 1985. Women in police academy training: Some aspects of organizational response. In *The changing roles of women in the criminal justice system: Offenders, victims, and professionals*, edited by Imogene L. Moyer, 250-270. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Poole, Eric and Mark Pogrebin. 1988. Factors affecting the decision to remain in policing: A study of women officers. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 16 No 1: 49-55.

Potts, Lee W. 1983. Equal employment opportunity and female employment in police agencies. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 11: 505-523.

Price, Barbara R. 1985. Sexual integration in American law enforcement. In *Police ethics*, edited by William C. Hefferman and Timothy Stroup, 205-214. New York, NY: John Jay Press.

Prokos, Anastasia and Irene Padavic. 2002. There oughta be a law against bitches: Masculinity lessons in police academy training. *Gender, Work, and Organization* Vol 9 No 4: 439-459.

Pynes, Joan and H. John Bernardin. 1992. Entry-level police selection: The assessment center as an alternative. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 20: 41-52.

Rabe-Hemp, Cara. 2008. Survival in an "all boys club": Policewomen and their fight for acceptance. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* Vol 31 No 2: 251-270.

Reaves, Brian A. 1998. Federal law enforcement officers, 1996. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin January 1998, NCJ 164617.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

_____. 2006. Federal law enforcement officers, 2004. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin July 2006, NCJ 212750.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

_____. 2007. Census of state and local law enforcement agencies, 2004. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin June 2007, NCJ 212749.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

_____. 2009. State and local law enforcement training academies, 2004. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Bulletin February 2009, NCJ 222987.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Reaves, Brian A. and Timothy C. Hart. 2000. Federal law enforcement officers, 1998. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin March 2000, NCJ 177607.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.
_____. 2001. Federal law enforcement officers, 2000. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin July 2001, NCJ 187231.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Reaves, Brian A. and Lynn M. Bauer. 2003. Federal law enforcement officers, 2002. *Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin August 2003, NCJ 199995.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Reaves, Brian A. and Mathew J. Hickman. 2004. Law enforcement management and administrative statistics, 2000: Data for individual state and local agencies with 100 or more officers. *US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin March 2004, NCJ 203350.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Remmington, Patricia W. 1983. Women in police: Integration or separation? *Qualitative Sociology* Vol 6 No 2: 118-135.

Riccucci, Norma M. 1990. *Women, minorities, and unions in the public sector*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Rourke, Francis E. 1984. *Bureaucracy, politics, and public policy*, 3rd Ed. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Saba, Anne. 2003. US Customs Service: Always there…ready to serve. *US Customs Today* February 2003.

Samuelson, Nancy B. 1998. Some notes on Oklahoma's federal marshals. *Quarterly of the National Association for Outlaw and Lawman History* Vol 22 No 3: 5-8

Sass, Tim R. and Jennifer L. Troyer. 1999. Affirmative action, political representations, unions, and female police employment. *Journal of Labor Research* Vol 20 No 4: 571-587.

Schroeder, Lucinda D. 2006. *A hunt for justice: The true story of a woman undercover wildlife agent*. Guilford, CT: The Lyons Press.

Schultz, Dorothy M. 2002. Law enforcement leaders; A survey of women police chiefs in the United States. *The Police Chief* Vol 69 No 3: 25-29.
_____. 2004. *Breaking the brass ceiling: Women police chiefs and their paths to the top*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

_____. 2005. Women in federal agency law enforcement. In *Encyclopedia of law enforcement Vol 2*, edited by Larry Sullivan, 908-911. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

_____. 2009. Women special agents in charge: The first generation. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* Vol 32 No 4: 675-693.

Seklecki, Richard and Rebecca Paynich. 2007. A national survey of female police officers: An overview of findings. *Police Practice and Research* Vol 8 No 1: 17-30.

Shaffer, Margaret A., Janice R. Joplin, Mrytle P. Bell, Theresa Lau, and Ceyda Oguz. 2000. Gender discrimination and job-related outcomes: A cross-cultural comparison of working women in the United States and China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* Vol 57 No 3: 395-427.

Simek, Pamela D. 2004. *A recruiting program model developed for law enforcement agencies in northwest Louisiana through examination of background characteristics of current sworn female officer*s. Shreveport: Louisiana State University.

Simpson, Sally S. 1989. Feminist theory, crime, and justice. *Criminology* Vol 27 No 4: 605–632.

Sowa, Jessica E. and Sally C. Selden. 2003. Administrative discretion and active representation: An expansion of the theory of representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review* Vol 63 No 6: 700-710.

Steele, Brent S. and Nicholas P. Lovrich Jr. 1987. Equality and efficiency tradeoffs in affirmative action—real or imagined? The case of women in policing. *The Social Science Journal* Vol 24 No 1: 53-70.

Stephens, G. Ross and Nelson Wikstrom. 2007. *American intergovernmental relations: A fragmented federal polity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Stokes, Larry D. and James F. Scott. 1996. Affirmative action and selected minority groups in law enforcement**. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 24 No 1: 29-38.

Sugden, Natasha. 2005. *Disruptive bodies: Women performing policing*. PhD diss., Charles Stuart University.

Swerdlow, Marian. 1989. Men's accommodations to women entering a nontraditional occupation: A case of rapid transit operatives. *Gender and Society* Vol 3: 373-387.

Texeira, Mary T. 2002. Who protects and serves me? A case study of sexual harassment of African American women in one US law enforcement agency. *Gender and Society* Vol 16 No 4: 524-545.

Timmons, William M. and Brad E. Hainsworth. 1989. Attracting and retaining females in law enforcement: Sex-based problems of women cops in 1988. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* Vol 33: 197-207.

Townsey, Roi D. 1992. Female patrol officers: A review of the physical capacity issue. In *The criminal justice system and women: Women offenders, victims and workers*, edited by Barbara R. Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff, 413-425. New York, NY: Clark Boardman.

TRAC Syracuse University. 2010. *IRS at work: IRS history*. http://trac.syr.edu/tracirs/atwork/current/irsHistory.html (accessed September 29, 2010).

Trauth, Eilene M. 2002. Theorizing gender and information technology research. In *Encyclopedia of gender and information technology,* edited by Eilene M. Trauth, 1154-1159. Hershey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.

Tuomey, Lianne and Rachel Jolly. 2009. Step up the law enforcement: A successful strategy for recruiting women into the law enforcement profession. *The Police Chief* Vol 76 No 6: 68-73.

Turk, David. 2005. *United States Marshals Service: Historical perspective*. Washington, DC: USMS Historian Office.

US Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2007. *Women in the labor force: A databook. September 2007. Report 1002.* http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-databook-2007.pdf (accessed June 26, 2011).
_____. 2010. *Women in the labor force: A databook. December 2010. Report 1026.* http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-databook-2010.pdf (accessed July 2, 2011).

US Census. 2010. http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/ (accessed July 2, 2011).

US Coast Guard. 2002. *US Coast Guard: A historical overview*. Washington, DC: USCG Historian's Office.

US Department of Labor. 2011. *Women's employment during the recovery: May 3, 2011.* http://www.dol.gov/_sec/media/reports/FemaleLaborForce/FemaleLaborForce.pdf (accessed June 26, 2011).

US Department of Labor Women's Bureau. 2009. *Nontraditional occupations for women in 2009.* http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/nontra2009.htm (accessed June 26, 2011).
_____. 2010a. W*omen in the labor force in 2010*. http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/Qf-laborforce-10.htm (accessed June 26, 2011).
_____. 2010b. *20 leading occupations of employed women: 2010 annual averages*. http://www.dol.gov/wb/factsheets/20lead2010.htm (accessed June 26, 2011).

US Postal Service. 2010. *History of the United States Postal Service 1775-1993*. http://www.usps.com/history/his1_5.htm (accessed September 29, 2010).

US Senate Historian. 2010. *The capitol police*. http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/briefing/Capitol_Police.htm (accessed September 29, 2010).

Valian, Virginia. 1998. *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Vines, Lynn. 1981. The first female agents. *The Investigator* May: 4-6.

Waddington, Peter .A. 1999. Police (canteen) subculture: An appreciation. *British Journal of Criminology* Vol 39: 287-309.

Walker, Samuel and Charles M. Katz. 2005. *Police in America: An introduction,* 5th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Wells, Sandra K. and Betty L. Alt. 2005. *Police women: Life with the badge*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Werbel, James D. and Arthur G. Bedeian. 1989. Intended turnover as a function of age and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* Vol 10 No 3: 275-281.

Wertsch, Teresa L. 1998. Walking the thin blue line: Policewomen and tokenism today. *Women and Criminal Justice* Vol 9: 23-61.

Wexler, Judie G. and Deana D. Logan. 1983. Sources of stress among police women officers. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* Vol 11: 46-53.

Whetstone, Thomas S. and Deborah G. Wilson. 1999. Dilemmas confronting female police officers promotional candidates: Glass ceilings, disenfranchisement, or satisfaction? *International Journal of Police Science and Management* Vol 2 No 2: 128-143.

White, Michael D., Jonathon A. Cooper, Jessica Saunders, and Anthony J. Raganella. 2010. Motivations for becoming a police officer: Re-assessing officer attitudes and job satisfaction after six years on the street. *Journal of Criminal Justice* Vol 38 No 4: 520-530.

Whittenberg-Cox, Avivah and Alison Maitland. 2008. *Why women mean business: Understanding the emergence of our next economic revolution*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Wilkins, Vicky M. 2006. Exploring the causal story: Gender, active representation, and bureaucratic priorities. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* Vol 17: 77-94.

Williams, Jeff and Brian H. Kleiner. 2001. Sexual harassment and discrimination in law enforcement. *Equal Opportunities International* Vol 20: 100-105.

Winters, Clyde A. 1989. Affirmative action and Chicago female police. *Police Journal* Vol 62: 136-142.

Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE). 1991. *Celebrating 20 years of women in federal law enforcement*. http://www.wifle.org/conference1991/1991_ICWIFLE.htm (accessed September 29, 2010).
_____. 2009a. http://wifle.org/about/history.htm (accessed October 15, 2011).
_____. 2009b. http://wifle.org/about/mission.htm (accessed October 15, 2011).

Wood, Richard L., Mariah Davis, and Amelia Rose. 2004. Diving into quicksand: Program implementation and police subcultures. In *Community policing: Can it work,* edited by Wesley G. Skogan, 136-162. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Wright, Deil S. 2007. Models of national, state, and local relationships. In *American intergovernmental relations: Foundations, perspectives, and issues,* edited by Laurence J. O'Toole Jr, 72-85. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Yim, Youngyol. 2009. Girls, why do you want to become police officers? Career goals/choices among criminal justice undergraduates. *Women and Criminal Justice* Vol 19 No 2: 120-136.

Yoder, Janice D. 1994. Looking beyond numbers: The affects of gender status, job prestige, and occupational gender-typing on tokenism processes. *Social Psychology Quarterly* Vol 57 No 2: 150-159.

Young, Malcolm. 1991. *An inside job: Policing and police culture in Britain*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Zhao, Jihong, Ni He, and Nicholas P. Lovrich. 2006. Pursuing gender diversity in police organizations in the 1990s: A longitudinal analysis of factors associated with the hiring of female officers. *Police Quarterly* Vol 9 No 4: 463-485.

Appendix A

Chapters of the Federal Criminal Code[13]
Title 18 - Part I (Crimes)
Index of Chapters

Chapter 1.	General Provisions
Chapter 2.	Aircraft and Motor Vehicles
Chapter 3.	Animals, Birds, Fish, and Plants
Chapter 5.	Arson
Chapter 7.	Assault
Chapter 9.	Bankruptcy
Chapter 10.	Biological Weapons
Chapter 11.	Bribery, Graft, and Conflicts of Interest
Chapter 11A.	Child Support
Chapter 11B.	Chemical Weapons
Chapter 12.	Civil Disorders
Chapter 13.	Civil Rights
Chapter 15.	Claims and Services in Matters Affecting Government
Chapter 17.	Coins and Currency
Chapter 17A.	Common Carrier Operation Under Influence of Alcohol or Drugs
Chapter 18.	Congressional, Cabinet, and Supreme Court Assassination, Kidnapping, and Assault
Chapter 19.	Conspiracy
Chapter 21.	Contempts
Chapter 23.	Contracts
Chapter 25.	Counterfeiting and Forgery
Chapter 26.	Criminal Street Gangs
Chapter 27.	Customs
Chapter 29.	Elections and Political Activities
Chapter 31.	Embezzlement and Theft
Chapter 33.	Emblems, Insignia, and Names
Chapter 35.	Escape and Rescue
Chapter 37.	Espionage and Censorship
Chapter 39.	Explosives and Other Dangerous Activities
Chapter 40.	Importation, Manufacture, Distribution and Storage of Explosive Materials
Chapter 41.	Extortion and Threats
Chapter 42.	Extortionate Credit Transactions
Chapter 43.	False Personation
Chapter 44.	Firearms
Chapter 45.	Foreign Relations

---

[13] Source: Bumgarner, Jeffrey B. 2006. *Federal agents: The growth of federal law enforcement in America.* Westport, CT: Praeger, Appendix A. Table was modified by author.

List of Federal Law Enforcement Agencies and Types of Officers They Employ[14] [15]

US Capitol
     US Capitol Police (police officers)

US Department of Agriculture
     US Forest Service (rangers and special agents)

US Department of Commerce
     Office of Export Enforcement (special agents)
     NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement (patrol officers and special agents)

US Department of Defense
     Air Force Office of Special Investigations (special agents)
     Army Criminal Investigation Division (special agents)
     Defense Criminal Investigative Service (special agents)
     Naval Criminal Investigative Service (special agents)
     Pentagon Force Protection Agency (police officers)

US Department of Health and Human Services
     US Food and Drug Administration, Office of Criminal Investigation (special agents)

US Department of Homeland Security
     Customs and Border Protection (inspectors)
     Federal Air Marshal Service (air marshals)
     Federal Protective Service (police officers and special agents)
     Immigration and Customs Enforcement (special agents)
     US Secret Service (police officers and special agents)
     US Coast Guard Investigative Service (security officers and special agents)
     US Border Patrol (border patrol agents)

US Department of Interior
     Bureau of Indian Affairs Law Enforcement Services (police officers and special agents)
     Bureau of Land Management Office of LE and Security (rangers and special agents)
     Bureau of Reclamation (police officers)

---

[14] Source: Bumgarner, Jeffrey B. 2006. *Federal agents: The growth of federal law enforcement in America.* Westport, CT: Praeger, Appendix A.
[15] Source: US Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Federal law enforcement officers, 2004*, NCJ 212750 (Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, 2006).

Fish and Wildlife Services (rangers and special agents)
National Park Service (rangers and special agents)
US Park Police (police officers)

US Department of Justice
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (special agents)
Drug Enforcement Administration (special agents)
Federal Bureau of Investigation (special agents)
Federal Bureau of Prisons (prison officers)
US Marshals Service (marshals and deputy marshals)

US Department of Treasury
Bureau of Engraving and Printing Police (police officers)
Internal Revenue Service (special agents)
US Mint Police (police officers)

US Department of State
Bureau of Diplomatic Security (special agents)

US Department of Veterans Affairs
VA Police (police officers)

US District Court
Administrative Office of the US Courts (probation officers and pretrial services officers)

US Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division (special agents)

US Postal Service
Postal Inspection Service (postal inspectors)
Postal Service Police (police officers)

US Supreme Court
US Supreme Court Police (police officers)

National Railroad Passenger Corporation
Amtrak Police (police officers)

Smithsonian Institution
Smithsonian Police (police officers)

Tennessee Valley Authority
TVA Police (police officers)

Offices of Inspector General
(all agencies listed below employ special agents or criminal investigators)

Agency for International Development
Amtrak
Appalachian Regional Commission
Central Intelligence Agency
Commodity Futures Trading Commission
Consumer Product Safety Commission
Corporation for National and Community Service (Americorps)
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
Department of Agriculture
Department of Commerce
Department of Defense
Department of Education
Department of Energy
Department of Health and Human Services
Department of Homeland Security
Department of Housing and Urban Development
Department of Interior
Department of Justice
Department of Labor
Department of State
Department of Transportation
Department of Treasury
Department of Veteran Affairs
Environmental Protection Agency
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
Export-Import Bank of the United States
Farm Credit Administration
Federal Communications Commission
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
Federal Election Commission
Federal Housing Finance Board
Federal Labor Relations Authority
Federal Maritime Commission
Federal Reserve Board
Federal Trade Commission
General Services Administration
Government Printing Office
Legal Services Corporation
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
National Archives and Records Administration
National Credit Union Administration
National Endowment for the Arts
National Endowment for the Humanities

National Labor Relations Board
National Science Foundation
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Personnel Management
Peace Corps
Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation
Railroad Retirement Board
Security and Exchange Commission
Small Business Administration
Smithsonian Institution
Social Security Administration
Tennessee Valley Authority
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration
US International Trade Commission
United States Postal Service

Appendix C

Federal Law Enforcement Employment Occupations[16]

Law Enforcement Employment Occupations			
Job Series (GS)	**Title**	**Total Employ-ment**	**Largest Employing Department**
0006	Correctional Administration	1,693	Justice (1,660)
0007	Correctional Officer	13,097	Justice (13,059)
0019	Screener	28,000	Homeland Security (30,000)
0025	Park Ranger	6,276	Interior (4,821)
0072	Fingerprint Identification	818	Justice (779)
0080	Security Administration	6,719	Defense (3,631)
0083	Police Officer	8,731	Defense (3,137)
0101	Social Science	6,768	Defense (2,032)
0132	Intelligence	5,407	Defense (2,791)
0180	Psychology	3,666	Vet. Admin. (1,926)
0249	Wage and Hour Compliance	1,120	Labor (1,120)
0390	Communications Relay	710	Defense (382)
0436	Plant Protection/Quarantine	1,635	Agriculture (1,635)
1169	Internal Revenue Officer	6,626	Treasury (6,626)
1397	Document Analysis	118	Justice (57)
1801	General Insp and Investigation	11,205	Homeland Security (5,337)
1802	Compliance Insp and Support	7,552	Justice (4,901)
1810	General Investigation	2,739	Defense (1,246)
1811	Criminal Investigation	35,840	Justice (20,933)
1812	Game Law Enforcement	270	Interior (218)
1816	Immigration Inspection	4,921	Homeland Security (4,921)
1822	Mine Safety and Health	1,244	Labor (1,244)
1854	Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms	822	Treasury (822)
1889	Import Specialist	1,189	Treasury (1,187)
1896	Border Patrol Agent	8,265	Homeland Security (8,265)
2121	Railroad Safety	403	Transportation (391)
2151	Radio Dispatching	431	Defense (373)
2181	Aircraft Operations	2,668	Defense (1,943)

---

[16] Source: Damp, Dennis V. 2008. *The book of US government jobs: Where they are, what's available and how to get one,* 10th Ed. McKees Rocks, PA: Bookhaven Press, LLC. pg 241, Table 11.1. Table is modified by author.

Appendix D

List of Court Cases

A.L.A Schechter Poultry Corp v. United States, 295 U.S. 495 (1935).

Alspaugh v. Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council, 246 Mich. App. 547 (2001).

Blake v. City of Los Angeles, 595 F. 2d 1367 (9th Cir. 1979).

Burney v. Pawtucket, 728 F.2d 547 (1st Cir. 1983).

Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936).

City of Boerne v. Flores, 521 U.S. 507 (1997).

Dothard v. Rawlinson, 433 U.S. 321 (1977).

Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).

Franz v. City of O'Fallon, MO, US District Court of St Louis (1995).

Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971).

Lanning v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, 181 F.3d 478 (3rd Cir. 1999).

Officers for Justice v. Civil Service Commission of San Francisco, 979 F.2d 721 (9th Cir. 1975).

Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928).

Peanick v. US Marshals Service, US District Court of St. Louis (1994).

Powell v. Reno, CA, 96-2743 (NHJ, slip op at 69 D.C. July 24, 1997).

Prigg v. Pennsylvania, 41 U.S. 539 (1842).

Printz v. United States, 521 U.S. 898 (1997).

Reed v. Reed, 404 U.S. 71 (1971).

Thomas v. City of Evanston, 610 F. Supp. 422 (N.D. Ill, 1985).

United States v. City of Wichita Falls, 704 F. Supp. 709 (N.D. Tex., 1988).

United States v. City of Los Angeles, 599 F.2d 1386 (9th Cir. 1979).

United States v. Darby, 312 U.S. 100 (1941).

United States v. Lopez, 514 U.S. 549 (1995).

United States v. Morrison, 529 U.S. 598 (2000).

Vanguard Justice Society v. Hughes, 471 F.Supp. 670 (D. Md., 1979).

Wickard v. Filburn, 317 U.S. 111 (1942).

Appendix E

Quantitative Codebook

	Variable	Description	Type	Coding
A1	Year	Respondent's year of birth	Interval	Numeric Year
A2	Sex	Respondent's gender	Dummy	0 = Males 1 = Females
A3	Orient	Respondent's sexual orientation	Nominal	1 = Heterosexual 2 = Bisexual 3 = Homosexual
A4	Educ	Highest level of education attained by respondent	Nominal	1 = High School 2 = Some college 3 = Bachelors 4 = Masters 5 = Doctoral
A5	Eth	Respondent's ethnicity	Nominal	1 = African American 2 = Asian/Pacific Islanders 3 = Caucasian 4 = Latina 5 = Native American 6 = Other 7 = Multiracial
A6	Rel	Respondent's current relationship status	Nominal	1 = Single 2 = Married 3 = Domestic partner 4 = Separated/Divorced 5 = Widowed
A7	Child	Respondent's number of children	Interval	Numeric (0-6)
A8	Minor	Respondent's number of minor children living at home	Interval	Numeric (0-4)
A9	Sworn	Respondent's status as a sworn federal officer with arrest and firearm authority	Dummy	0 = Not sworn 1 = Sworn

				AFOSI = Air Force Office of Special Investigations
				ATF = Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms
				CBP = DHS Customs and Border Protection
				CGIS = US Coast Guard
				DEA = Drug Enforcement Agency
				DHS = Department of Homeland Security
				DLA = Defense Logistics Agency
				DOE OIG = US Dept of Energy OIG
				DOJ OIG = US Dept of Justice OIG
				EDUC OIG = US Dept of Education OIG
				FAMS = DHS TSA Federal Air Marshal Service
				FBI = Federal Bureau of Investigations
				FDIC OIG = Federal Deposit Insurance Corp
				FPS = DHS Federal Protective Service
				HHS OIG = US Dept of Health and Human Services OIG
				HUD OIG = US Dept of Housing and Urban Development OIG
				ICE = DHS HSI Immigration and Customs Enforcement
				IRS = Internal Revenue Service Criminal Investigations
				NCIS = Naval Criminal Investigative Service
A10	Agency	Respondent's current federal LE agency	Nominal	NOAA = US Dept of Commerce NOAA

				NRC OIG = Nuclear Regulatory Commission OIG OIG = Office of the Inspector General PFPA = Pentagon Force Protection Agency SSA OIG = Social Security Administration OIG TSA = Transportation Security Administration USBP = DHS US Border Patrol USDA OIG = US Dept of Agriculture OIG USMP = US Mint Police USMS = US Marshals Service USPIS = US Postal Inspection Service USPO = US Probations Office USPP = US Park Police USPS OIG = US Postal Service OIG USSS = US Secret Service VA OIG = US Dept of Veterans Affairs OIG
A11	Num	Number of years respondent has been employed by her current employer/agency	Interval	Numeric (1-33)
A12	TotNum	Total number of years respondent has been working in federal LE	Interval	Numeric (1-33)

				5 (GS-5 or E-5)
				7 (GS-7 or E-6/E-7)
				9 (GS-9 or E-8/E-9)
				11 (GS-11 or O-1/O-2)
				12 (GS-12 or O-3)
				13 (GS-13 or O-4)
				14 (GS-14 or O-5)
				15 (GS-15 or O-6)
				16 (SES or O-7+)
		Respondent's GS level or		17 (Other non-GS pay
A13	Rank	military rank	Ordinal	scale)
A14	Sup	Respondent's supervisory experience in LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
A15	Perm	Number of permanent relocations respondent has made for her federal LE employment	Interval	Numeric (0-10)
A16	Trip	Number of business trips or TDYs respondent has made that lasted more than 3 months for her federal LE employment	Interval	Numeric (0-15)
A17	State	Respondent's experience in either state or local LE prior to federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
A18	StNum	Number of years respondent worked in either state or local LE	Interval	Numeric (1-15)
A19	Sept	Respondent's decision to pursue or stay in federal LE as a result of 9/11	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
B1	PT	If respondent had to take a physical agility test prior to federal entry-level selection	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
B2	SepPT	If the standards for respondent's physical agility testing is separate for men and women	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
B3	AnnPT	If respondent is required to take an annual physical agility test	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

				1 = Good old boy network; politics
				2 = Male co-workers/male supervisors pre-conceived notions of women being weak and not equal w/men
				3 = Lack of women supervisors
				4 = Lack of promotions
				5 = Balancing work and family
				6 = Pregnancy
				7 = Other women feeling entitled
				8 = Themselves; lack of confidence
				9 = Equipment/gear/ clothing unsuitable for women
				10 = Physical agility standards
				11 = Double standard; doing more than men
				12 = Lack of training opportunities
				13 = Firearms training
				14 = Relocation for promotions
				15 = Un-acceptance of women in male culture
				16 = Lack of communication by management
				17 = None
		Respondent's opinion on what the biggest barrier for		18 = Lack of women at agency
B4	Barrier1	women is in federal LE	Nominal	19 = Job stability
B5	Role1	Number of female role models at respondent's federal LE agency	Interval	Numeric (0-27)
B6	Mentor	If respondent has a mentor at her federal LE agency	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
B7	FemMen	If respondent's mentor is female	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

		Further years respondent plans on staying in federal		
B8	Ret1	LE	Interval	Numeric (0-30)
C1	NegAtt	If respondent experience pervasive negative attitudes from male colleagues	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C2	AttRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of pervasive negative attitudes from male collagues	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C3	NegWk	If respondent experience a negative LE work culture	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C4	WkRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of a negative LE work culture	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C5	SexHar	If respondent experience sexual harassment	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C6	HarRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of sexual harassment	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C7	SexDis	If respondent experience sexual discrimination	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C8	DisRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of sexual discrimination	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

C9	Barrier2	If respondent has many barriers that make it difficult to achieve career goals	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C10	Role2	If respondent has many female role models at agency	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C11	RoleRet1	Likelihood respondent would remain in federal LE if there were more high-ranking female role models	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C12	RoleRet2	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of the lack of high-ranking female role models	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C13	Fam	If respondent's agency has family-friendly policies	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C14	FamRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of the lack of family-friendly policies	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C15	Preg	If respondent's agency has pregnancy-friendly policies	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
C16	PregRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of the lack of pregnancy-friendly policies	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Unsure 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
D1	Ret2	Respondent's likelihood to remain in federal LE	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

				1 = Strongly Disagree
D2	Sat	If respondent's work is satisfying	Ordinal	2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
D3	Adv	If respondent's agency has good opportunities for advancement	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
D4	Prom	If promotions are based on ability at respondent's agency	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
D5	Glass	If a perceived glass ceiling to promotions exist at respondent's agency	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
D6	GlassRet	Likelihood respondent would depart federal LE as a result of a received glass ceiling to promotions	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
D7	Barrier3	Respondent's ability to overcome any barriers to achieving goal	Ordinal	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neither Agree/Disagree 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree
E1	AdvPreg	If respondent suffered any adverse employment consequence from pregnancy	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
E2	Nurse	If respondent's agency provide accommodations for breastfeeding and other nursing care	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

		If increase of fire power to duty weapon has created difficulties in respondent's job		
E3	Caliber		Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
E4	FairPT	Does respondent consider the physical agility test fair	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
E5	HarRep	If respondent reported sexual harassment	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
E6	DisRep	If respondent reported sexual discrimination	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

Appendix F

Copy of Information Letter and Survey

DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

(NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICPATE UNLESS IRB APPROVAL INFORMATION WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS DOCUMENT)

INFORMATION LETTER

for a Research Study entitled

"An Examination of Eight Factors Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law Enforcement"

You are invited to participate in a research study that will collect, describe and analyze data about women in federal law enforcement to determine why women are underrepresented in federal law enforcement. The study is being conducted by Helen H. Yu, a doctoral candidate in the Public Administration and Public Policy program at Auburn University. The study is funded completely by the researcher. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a member of the federal law enforcement group and are age 19 or older.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a written survey about your experiences in federal law enforcement. Your total time commitment to complete the survey will be approximately 15-20 minutes. You are also requested to participate in Part II of this study involving interviews about your experiences in federal law enforcement, as well as your opinion on several issues.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risks associated with participating in this study are minimal. You may choose not to respond to any question and you may terminate your participation at any time. Your participation is entirely voluntary and your responses will be anonymous.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to help the researcher gain a better understanding on the current issues affecting women's retention in federal law enforcement and significantly contribute to the existing small base of knowledge about women in federal law enforcement. The findings from this research will be reported in my dissertation as a condition of graduation.

Will you receive compensation for participating? The researcher is unable to provide any compensation for your participation. I hope you will agree that research about women's retention in federal law enforcement is an important objective and one that deserves specific study.

Are there any costs? There are no costs associated with this study other than the time you spend completing the written survey.

Page 1 of 2 pages

If you change your mind about participating you can withdraw at any time by stating you no longer want to participate, at which point, if you so choose, I will return any documents on which you have completed. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Political Science, or the researcher.

Any data obtained from this study will remain anonymous. I will protect your privacy and the data you provide by analyzing the data as anonymous. Information gathered through the written surveys will be analyzed and presented in my dissertation and may be reported at scholarly conferences of state or national associations of public administrators, policy analysts and other similar groups, as well as published in academic scholarly journals.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Helen H. Yu at 334-782-3853 or hzy0008@tigermail.auburn.edu. In addition, you may also contact Dr Kathleen Hale at 334-844-6155 or halekat@auburn.edu or Dr Mitchell Brown at 334-844-6170 or brown11@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone at 334-844-5966 or email at hsubjec@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, THE DATA YOU PROVIDE WILL SERVE AS YOUR AGREEMENT TO DO SO. THIS LETTER IS YOURS TO KEEP.

_____
Helen H. Yu Signature   Date

PLEASE COMPLETE THE SURVEY AND RETURN IT TO THE CONFERENCE REGISTRATION TABLE IN THE BOX MARKED "SURVEY RETURNS." I APPRECIATE YOUR TIME AND EFFORT. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO PARTICIPATE IN PART II OF THIS STUDY INVOLVING INTERVIEWS, PLEASE TEAR OFF THE BOTTOM OF THIS PAGE AND RETURN IT TO THE CONFERENCE REGISTRATION TABLE MARKED "INTERVIEW REQUESTS."

_____   _____
Name   Phone Contact Information

The Auburn University Institutional
Review Board has approved this
document for use from
3/30/11 to 3/29/12
Protocol # 11-040 EP 1103

Survey

1) Year of birth _____

2) Gender: (Circle one)　　　　　　a. Male　　　　　　　　b. Female

3) Sexual orientation: (Circle one)

　　a. Heterosexual　　　　　b. Bisexual　　　　　　c. Homosexual

4) Highest level of education attained: (Circle one)

　　a. High School　　　　　b. Some college　　　　c. Bachelors degree
　　d. Masters degree　　　　e. Doctoral degree

5) Ethnicity: (Circle as many as applicable)

　　a. African American　　　b. Asian/Pacific Islander　　c. Caucasian
　　d. Latina　　　　　　　　e. Native American

6) Current relationship status: (Circle one)

　　a. Single　　　　　　　　b. Married　　　　　　c. Domestic partner
　　d. Separated/Divorced　　e. Widowed

7) Number of children: _____

8) Number of minor children living at home: _____

9) Are you a sworn federal officer with arrest and firearm authority?

　　a. Yes　　　　　　　　　b. No

10) What federal law enforcement agency do you currently work for? _____
_____

11) How many years have you been employed with this federal agency? _____

12) How many years *total* have you been working in federal law enforcement? _____

13) What is your GS-level or military rank? _____

242

14) Do you have any law enforcement supervisory experience?

     a. Yes   b. No

15) How often have you permanently relocated for your federal law enforcement employment? _____

16) How many business trips or temporary duties (TDYs) (duration of 3 months or longer) have you made for your federal law enforcement job? _____

17) Have you worked in either state or local law enforcement *prior* to working in federal?

     a. Yes   b. No (skip to question 19)

18) How many years did you work in either state or local law enforcement? _____

19) Did the events of 9/11 affect your decision to pursue or stay in federal law enforcement?

     a. Yes   b. No

B. Please fill in the blanks and circle the appropriate response when necessary. Please answer every question.

---

1) Were you required to take a physical agility test *prior* to federal entry-level selection?

     a. Yes   b. No

2) Are the standards for physical agility testing separate for men and women?

     a. Yes   b. No

3) Do you have a requirement to take an annual physical agility test?

     a. Yes   b. No

4) What is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement? _____
_____

5) How many women do you consider to be role models in your agency? _____

6) Do you have a mentor in your federal law enforcement agency?

     a. Yes   b. No (skip to question 8)

7) Is your mentor female?

       a. Yes   b. No

8) Assuming things in your personal life and work remain the same, how many more years do you plan on staying in federal law enforcement? _____

C. Using the following scale (1 – Strongly Disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Unsure, 4 – Agree, 5 – Strongly Agree) circle the degree to which you agree with each of these items.

---

1) I experience pervasive negative attitudes[17] from my male colleagues.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

2) Pervasive negative attitudes from my male colleagues will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

3) I experience a negative law enforcement work culture[18] at my agency.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

4) A negative law enforcement work culture will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

5) I experience sex harassment[19] in my federal law enforcement employment.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

6) Sexual harassment will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

7) I experience sexual discrimination[20] in my federal law enforcement employment.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

8) Sexual discrimination will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

9) There are many barriers that make it difficult for me to achieve my career goals.
       Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

---

[17] Beliefs and actions that women cannot handle the job physically or emotionally.

[18] Characterized by heavy drinking, crude jokes, racism, and homophobia with demands that women who enter it subsume 'male characteristics' to achieve a limited social acceptability.

[19] A sexual advance or proposition with which the women must comply or forfeit an employment benefit. In addition, unwanted sexual behaviors such as touching, teasing, and making comments about a woman's appearance or sexuality.

[20] The practice of letting a person's sex unfairly become a factor when deciding who receives an initial job, promotion, training opportunity, job assignment, compensation, or other employment benefit.

10) There are many high-ranking female role models[21] in my agency.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

11) If there are more high-ranking female role models, I will likely remain in federal law enforcement.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

12) The lack of high-ranking female role models will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

13) My agency has adopted a "family-friendly" policy[22] in the workplace.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

14) The lack of "family-friendly" policies in my agency will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

15) My agency has adopted a "pregnancy-friendly" policy[23] in the workplace.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

16) The lack of "pregnancy-friendly" policies in my agency will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.
        Present federal law enforcement job 1   2   3   4   5

D. Rate the degree to which you agree with each of the statements.

1) Assuming things in my personal life and work remain the same, I will remain in federal law enforcement in the near future.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

---

[21] Serves as examples in an organization and whose behavior is emulated by others.
[22] Family-friendly policies include maternity/paternity leave, flex time to accommodate general family needs, in-house day care options, accommodations for breastfeeding and other nursing care, and the ability to stay in one location for an extended period of time without jeopardizing one's career.
[23] Pregnancy-friendly policies include maternity benefits that make it easier for pregnant women to continue to work during pregnancy, such as light duty assignments and safety measures during range qualifications, and returning to work after delivery without jeopardizing one's career.

2) My work is satisfying and gives me a sense of accomplishment.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3) There are good opportunities for advancement at my agency.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4) Promotions are based on ability at my agency.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5) A perceived glass ceiling to promotions[24] exists in my agency.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6) A perceived glass ceiling to promotions will likely cause me to depart federal law enforcement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7) I will be able to overcome any barriers that stand in my way of achieving my goals.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree

---

[24] An invisible or artificial barrier preventing women from advancing past a certain level in the workplace.

E. Respond to each question based on three possible answers: Yes, No, and Not Applicable.

1) Have you ever suffered an adverse employment consequence from your pregnancy while employed as a federal law enforcement officer?   Yes   No   NA

2) Does your agency provide accommodations for breastfeeding and other nursing care?   Yes   No   NA

3) Has the increase of fire power to your duty weapon (.40 caliber) created difficulties in your job?   Yes   No   NA

4) Do you consider the physical agility test fair?   Yes   No   NA

5) If you have experienced sexual harassment, did you report it?   Yes   No   NA

6) If you have experienced sexual discrimination, did you report it?   Yes   No   NA

Appendix G

Qualitative Codebook

	Variable	Description	Type	Coding
1	Barrier	Respondent's opinion on what the biggest barrier for women is in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Good old boy network 2 = Overall lack of women representation 3 = Lack of women managers 4 = Lack of respect by men/ stereotypes/work twice hard 5 = Hiring unqualified women 6 = Firearms training 7 = Balancing work and family to reach ranks 8 = Themselves; lack of confidence 9 = Lack of opportunities
2A	Role	Number of female role models at respondent's federal LE agency	Interval	Numeric
2B	RoleRet	Will number of female role models affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
3A	Mentor	If respondent has a mentor at her federal LE agency	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
3B	FemMen	If respondent's mentor is female	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
4A	NegAtt	If respondent experienced negative attitudes from male colleagues	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
4B	AttRet	If yes, likelihood negative attitudes from male colleagues affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
5A	NegWk	If respondent experienced a negative LE work culture	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
5B	WkRet	If yes, likelihood negative LE work culture affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

6A	Glass	If a perceived glass ceiling to promotions exist at respondent's agency	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
6B	GlassRet	If yes, likelihood perceived glass ceiling to promotions affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
7A	SexHar	If respondent experienced sexual harassment	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
7B	HarRep	If yes, did respondent report sexual harassment	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
7C	HarRet	If yes, likelihood sexual harassment affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
8A	SexDis	If respondent experienced sexual discrimination	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
8B	DisRep	If yes, did respondent report sexual discrimination	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
8C	DisRet	If yes, likelihood sexual discrimination affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
9A	Preg	If respondent's agency has pregnancy-friendly policies	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
9B	PregRet	Will pregnancy-friendly policies affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
10A	Fam	If respondent's agency has family-friendly policies	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
10B	FamRet	Will family-friendly policies affect respondent's decision to stay in federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11A	Chall1	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *management*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11B	Chall2	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of continuous hiring vs spurts*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11C	Chall3	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of diversity/gender ratio*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

11D	Chall4	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of training opportunities*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11E	Chall5	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of education*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11F	Chall6	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of equal treatment/ double standards*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11G	Chall7	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *sexual harassment/sexual discrimination*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11H	Chall8	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of annual physical fitness requirement*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11I	Chall9	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *maintaining strong personality/gaining respect*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11J	Chall10	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *other women*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11K	Chall11	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *lack of promotional opportunities*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11L	Chall12	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *firearms*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
11M	Chall13	Respondent's opinion on other challenges women face in federal LE: *physical fitness requirements*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12A	Strats1	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *relocate office or agency*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

12B	Strats2	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *file informal complaints/voice their concerns*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12C	Strats3	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *act more masculine*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12D	Strats4	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *counseling*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12E	Strats5	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *maintain a positive attitude/improve themselves/find niche and excel/grit and determination*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12F	Strats6	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *peer/family support*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12G	Strats7	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *hire personal trainer/firearms instructor*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
12H	Strats8	Respondent's opinion on what strategies women employ to deal with these challenges: *not take things personal/avoidance*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13A	Stay1	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *challenging job*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13B	Stay2	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *ability to transfer to other federal agencies/vested time in federal/steady job*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13C	Stay3	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *pride and personal satisfaction*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

		Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *loyalty*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13D	Stay4	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *loyalty*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13E	Stay5	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *pay*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13F	Stay6	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *benefits*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13G	Stay7	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *calling*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
13H	Stay8	Respondent's opinion on why women stay in federal LE: *opportunities for advancement*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
14A	Under1	Respondent's opinion on why women are under-represented in federal law enforcement: *women feel undervalued and leave*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
14B	Under2	Respondent's opinion on why women are under-represented in federal law enforcement: *poor recruiting/recruiting barriers*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
14C	Under3	Respondent's opinion on why women are under-represented in federal law enforcement: *societal views that LE is for men/women don't think they can do this type of job/need better marketing*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
14D	Under4	Respondent's opinion on why women are under-represented in federal law enforcement: *lack of women in management/glass ceiling*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
14E	Under5	Respondent's opinion on why women are under-represented in federal law enforcement: *family sacrifices/start families*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15A	Retain1	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *more training and opportunities for advancement*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

15B	Retain2	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *more diversity and representation*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15C	Retain3	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *more outreach by men/open mind*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15D	Retain4	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *recruiting the right women at the front/honest recruiters*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15E	Retain5	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *maternity leave program (w/out using sick or vacation leave)*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15F	Retain6	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *more women in special duty assignments*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15G	Retain7	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *mentorship by higher ranked women*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15H	Retain8	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *more policy conducive to family life*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15I	Retain9	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *nothing can remedy those women who want to be stay home moms*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
15J	Retain10	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *telecommute or domicile agents*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

15K	Retain11	Respondent's opinion on what can or should be done to retain more women in federal LE: *maintain inclusive team environment*	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
16	Year	Respondent's year of birth	Interval	Numeric Year
17	Eth	Respondent's ethnicity	Nominal	1 = African American 2 = Asian/Pacific Islanders 3 = Caucasian 4 = Latina
18	Educ	Highest level of education attained by respondent	Nominal	1 = High School 2 = Some college 3 = Bachelors 4 = Masters
19	Rel	Respondent's current relationship status	Nominal	1 = Single 2 = Married 3 = Domestic partner 4 = Separated/Divorced
20A	Child	Respondent's number of children	Interval	Numeric (0-6)
20B	Minor	Respondent's number of minor children living at home	Interval	Numeric (0-6)
21A	Agency	Respondent's current federal LE agency	Nominal	ATF = Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms DEA = Drug Enforcement Agency DOJ OIG = US Dept of Justice OIG DOT = US Department of Treasury ICE = Immigration and Customs Enforcement NOAA = National Fishery Service PFPA = Pentagon Force Protection Agency USDA OIG = US Dept of Agriculture OIG USPP = US Park Police USSS = US Secret Service
21B	Num	Number of years respondent has been employed by her current employer/agency	Interval	Numeric (0-30)

21C	TotNum	Total number of years respondent has been working in federal LE	Interval	Numeric (0-30)
22	Sworn	Respondent's status as a sworn federal officer with arrest and firearm authority	Dummy	0 = Not sworn 1 = Sworn
23	Rank	Respondent's GS level or military rank	Ordinal	9 (GS-9 or E-9) 11 (GS-11 or O-2) 12 (GS-12 or O-3) 13 (GS-13 or O-4) 14 (GS-14 or O-5) 15 (GS-15 or O-6) 16 (SES or O-7+) 17 (Non-GS pay scale)
24	Sup	Respondent's supervisory experience in LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
25	Ret1	Further years respondent plans on staying in federal LE	Interval	Numeric (0-30)
26	Perm	Number of permanent relocations respondent has made for her federal LE employment	Interval	Numeric (0-10)
27	Trip	Number of business trips or TDYs respondent has made that lasted more than 3 months for her federal LE employment	Interval	Numeric (0-10)
28A	State	Respondent's experience in either state or local LE prior to federal LE	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No
28B	StNum	Number of years respondent worked in state or local LE	Interval	Numeric (0-30)
29	9/11	Respondent's decision to pursue or stay in federal LE as a result of 9/11	Nominal	1 = Yes 2 = No

Appendix H

Copy of Information Letter and Interview Protocol

DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICAL SCIENCE

AUBURN UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

**(NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICPATE UNLESS IRB APPROVAL
INFORMATION WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS
DOCUMENT)**

INFORMATION LETTER

for a Research Study entitled

**"An Examination of Eight Factors Influencing Women's Retention in Federal Law
Enforcement"**

You are invited to participate in a research study that will collect, describe and analyze data
about women in federal law enforcement to determine why women are underrepresented in
federal law enforcement. The study is being conducted by Helen H. Yu, a doctoral candidate in
the Public Administration and Public Policy program at Auburn University. The study is funded
completely by the researcher. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a
member of the federal law enforcement group.

What will be involved if you participate? Your participation is completely voluntary. If you
decide to participate in this research study, you will be audio-taped and asked several questions
about your experiences in federal law enforcement, as well as your opinion on several issues.
Your total time commitment to being interviewed will take approximately 30-60 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risks associated with participating in this study are
minimal. You may choose not to respond to any question and you may terminate your
participation at any time. Your participation is entirely voluntary. Your sign-up will be kept
confidential and your responses will be anonymous.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to
help the researcher gain a better understanding on the current issues affecting women's retention
in federal law enforcement and significantly contribute to the existing small base of knowledge
about women in federal law enforcement. The findings from this research will be reported in my
dissertation as a condition of graduation.

Will you receive compensation for participating? The researcher is unable to provide any
compensation for your participation. I hope you will agree that research about women's retention
in federal law enforcement is an important objective and one that deserves specific study.

Are there any costs? There are no costs associated with this study other than the time you spend
being interviewed.

Page 1 of 2 pages

The Auburn University Institutional
Review Board has approved this
document for use from
2/24/11 to 2/23/12
Protocol # 11-046 EP 1102

7080 Haley Center, Auburn, AL 36849-5208; Telephone: 334-844-5370; Fax: 334-844-5348
w w w . a u b u r n . e d u

256

If you change your mind about participating you can withdraw at any time by stating you no longer want to participate, at which point, if you so choose, I will return any documents on which you have completed and will delete the audio-tape. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Political Science, or the researcher.

Any data obtained from this study will remain anonymous. I will protect your privacy and the data you provide by analyzing the data as anonymous. Information gathered through the interviews will be analyzed and presented in my dissertation and may be reported at scholarly conferences of state or national associations of public administrators, policy analysts and other similar groups, as well as published in academic scholarly journals.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Helen H. Yu at 334-782-3853 or hzy0008@tigermail.auburn.edu. In addition, you may also contact Dr Kathleen Hale at 334-844-6155 or halekat@auburn.edu or Dr Mitchell Brown at 334-844-6170 or brown11@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone at 334-844-5966 or email at hsubjec@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE SIGN AND DATE BELOW. A COPY OF THIS LETTER WILL BE PROVIDED FOR YOU TO KEEP.

_____   _____

Helen H. Yu Signature   Date   Participant (Print Name)

_____

Participant Signature

_____

Date

> The Auburn University Institutional
> Review Board has approved this
> document for use from
> 2/24/11 to 2/23/12
> Protocol # 11-046 EP 1102

Page 2 of 2 pages

Interview Protocol

   Good morning/afternoon/evening. Thank you for volunteering to be interviewed. My name is Helen Yu and I am a doctoral candidate at Auburn University conducting research on the underrepresentation of women in federal law enforcement. Your direct participation will shed light on this important issue. First, I'd like for you to read the following information letter and if you consent to being interviewed and audio-taped, please sign at the bottom. As a reminder, you may choose not to respond to any question and you may terminate your participation at any time. In addition, your sign-up is confidential and your responses will be analyzed as anonymous.

   The interview will be broken up into two parts. First, I'd like to ask you several questions about your direct experiences in federal law enforcement and solicit your opinion on several issues and second, I'd like to ask several demographic/descriptive-type questions about yourself. Before we begin, do you have any questions?

   Let's begin with the first part of the interview:

1) What do you believe is the biggest barrier for women in federal law enforcement?

2) How many women do you consider to be role models (defined as someone who serves as an example in an organization and whose behavior is emulated by others) in your agency? Will the number of female role models affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

3) Do you have a mentor in your federal law enforcement agency? Is your mentor female?

4) Have you experienced negative attitudes (defined as beliefs and actions that women cannot handle the job physically or emotionally) from your male colleagues? If yes, will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

5) Have you experienced a negative law enforcement work culture (characterized by heavy drinking, crude jokes, racism, and homophobia with demands that women who enter it subsume 'male characteristics' to achieve a limited social acceptability) at your agency? If yes, will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

6) Do you perceive a glass ceiling (defined as an invisible or artificial barrier preventing women from advancing past a certain level in the workplace) to promotions for women? If yes, will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

7) Have you experienced sexual harassment (defined as a sexual advance or proposition with which the women must comply or forfeit an employment benefit; in addition, unwanted sexual behaviors such as touching, teasing, and making comments about a woman's appearance or sexuality) from your male colleagues? If yes, did you report it? If yes, will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

8) Have you experienced sexual discrimination (defined as the practice of letting a person's sex unfairly become a factor when deciding who receives an initial job, promotion, training opportunity, job assignment, compensation, or other employment benefit) from your male colleagues? If yes, did you report it? If yes, will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

9) Does your agency have pregnancy-friendly policies (such as maternity benefits that make it easier for pregnant women to continue to work during pregnancy, such as light duty assignments and safety measures during range qualifications, and returning to work after delivery without jeopardizing one's career)? Will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

10) Does your agency have family-friendly policies (such as maternity/paternity leave, flex time to accommodate general family needs, in-house day care options, accommodations for breastfeeding and other nursing care, and the ability to stay in one location for an extended period of time without jeopardizing one's career)? Will that affect your decision to stay in federal law enforcement?

11) What other challenges do you think women face in federal law enforcement?

12) What strategies do you think women employ to deal with these challenges?

13) Why do you think women stay in federal law enforcement?

14) Why do you think women are underrepresented in federal law enforcement?

15) What can or should be done to retain more women in federal law enforcement?

    That concludes the first part of the interview. As a reminder, the second half will involve demographic/descriptive-type questions about yourself.

16) What year were you born?

17) What is your ethnicity?

18) What is your highest level of education attained?

19) What is your current relationship status?

20) Do you have children and if so, how many do you have, and how many still live at home?

21) What federal law enforcement agency do you currently work for and how long have you been with them? How many years total have you been working in federal law enforcement?

22) Are you a sworn federal officer? Do you have arrest and firearm authority?

23) What is your GS-level or military rank?

24) Do you have any law enforcement supervisory experience?

25) Assuming things in your personal life and work remain the same, how many more years do you plan on staying in federal law enforcement?

26) How many times have you relocated for your federal law enforcement employment?

27) How many business trips or temporary duty (TDY) assignments (duration of 3 months or longer) have you made for your federal law enforcement job?

28) Have you worked in either state or local law enforcement *prior* to working in federal law enforcement? If yes, how many years did you work in either state or local law enforcement?

29) Did the events of 9/11 affect your decision to pursue or stay in federal law enforcement?