'There Oughtta Be a Law Against Bitches': Masculinity Lessons in Police Academy Training

Anastasia Prokos* and Irene Padavic

This article draws on participant observation in a law enforcement academy to demonstrate how a hidden curriculum encourages aspects of hegemonic masculinity among recruits. Academy training teaches female and male recruits that masculinity is an essential requirement for the practice of policing and that women do not belong. By watching and learning from instructors and each other, male students developed a form of masculinity that (1) excluded women students and exaggerated differences between them and men; and (2) denigrated women in general. Thus, the masculinity that is characteristic of police forces and is partly responsible for women's low representation on them is not produced exclusively on the job, but is taught in police academies as a subtext of professional socialization.

Law enforcement training instructors often showed us episodes of the television show *COPS* as a teaching tool. In one episode, the cops arrested a shirtless man after his girlfriend had called the police. Angry at being arrested, the man yelled out, 'There oughtta be a law against bitches!' Our classroom exploded in laughter. For the remaining four months of training, when students wanted to joke about something a woman trainee had done or about women in general, they would exclaim, 'There oughtta be a law against bitches.' I estimate that I heard the phrase 25 times or more. To me, it came to epitomize the way many men recruits felt about women becoming police officers with them; women simply did not belong. (Excerpt from field notes)

Address for correspondence: *Anastasia Prokos, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4504 Maryland Parkway, Box 455033, Las Vegas, NV 89154-5033, USA

Introduction

Recent theories of gender in organizations focus on the logic and processes that sustain the gender status quo (Acker, 1990, 1999a; Connell, 1987; Scott, 1986). More specifically, gender operates in organizations through several interacting processes: the construction of divisions along gender lines, the construction of symbols that reinforce those divisions, interactions between groups that produce gendered social structures, and, as outcomes of these processes, the production of gendered components of individual identity and of a gendered frame for understanding other social structures (Acker, 1990; see also Scott, 1986). Workplaces are a key site of such operations, where a seemingly gender-neutral organizational logic embeds gendered assumptions and practices deeply into the fabric of modern work.

Workers, not just work organizations, are complicit in gender creation, as ethnographic research shows, although asymmetries of power between women and men mean that they do not necessarily contribute equally to the definition of gender that prevails in a situation (Barrett, 1996; Britton, 1997; Chetkovich, 1997; Collinson, 1992; Collinson and Collinson, 1989; DiTomaso, 1989; Leidner, 1991; P. Martin, 1996, 2001; Ogasawara, 1998; Pierce, 1995; Williams, 1995; Willis, 1977). P. Martin (1998a, p. 324) explains the importance of 'framing men as agents who actively create gender hierarchy at work' (see also Collinson and Hearn, 1996; P. Martin, 2001), and Collinson and Hearn (1994, p. 5) speak of the need to 'make "men" and "masculinity" explicit [and] to talk of men's power'. Yet, as Reskin (2000) notes, much gendering is based on unconscious tendencies and need not be motivated by hostility (see also Jackman, 1994; Scott, 1990).

This article investigates a cultural practice — the creation of masculinity in police academy training — that may be implicated in a structural outcome — the low representation of women on US police forces (13.3% in 1997; National Center for Women in Policing, 1999). Police academy training represents recruits' first formal encounter with a police organization and is the first step in their professional socialization. We argue that in addition to the formal curriculum, which covers the procedures, policies, and practices of being an officer, police academies also teach the lessons of an informal 'hidden curriculum' (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; K. Martin, 1998) about masculinity. This curriculum, taught obliquely by teachers and students, instructs students about the particular form of masculinity that is lauded in police culture, the relationship between extreme masculinity and police work, and the nature of the groups that fall 'inside' and 'outside' of the culture of policing.

Because much research has shown that masculinity construction is largely an enterprise undertaken by men, why do we examine how the presence of women affects masculinity construction? In the masculinity-construction drama through which men must show to themselves, and to

other men, that they conform to the dictates of appropriate masculinity, women are usually regarded as mere bit players. It is other men, not women, who put their imprimatur on appropriate masculinity (Bird, 1996, pp. 127–8; Cockburn, 1991). According to Kimmel (1994, p. 129), 'We test ourselves, perform heroic feats, take enormous risks, all because we want other men to grant us our manhood.' However, we argue that women's presence can reveal much. Masculinity is rendered most visible in situations where it is challenged, as when men face unemployment, enter traditionally female occupations (Brandth, 1998; Morgan, 1992; Williams, 1995), or, as in this case, when women enter jobs that traditionally had been used to confirm masculinity (Cockburn, 1991; Gerson and Peiss, 1985; Padavic, 1991). Thus, rather than showing that masculinity exists, we believe that studying what happens when women enter police academy training may provide insights into the *process* of masculinity construction.

While men may prefer single-sex work groups (see P. Martin, 2001), they are not always possible, and in such cases women's presence can further the masculine project in two ways. First, women can be used as a foil, allowing masculinity to be defined by what it is not. As Gamson (1997, p. 181) noted, the process of establishing a collective identity requires difference. Merely highlighting commonalities is not enough; marking off 'who we are not' is equally necessary (Barrett, 1996). As we show below, academy women became tools in the construction of boundaries that delineated who was 'in' and who was 'out' (P. Martin, 2001), in large part by making much of gender differences or creating them when they were not there. Second, women's presence can be used to elevate men's status. Devaluing women is equally as important a task as demarcating them as 'other'. As Cockburn (1988, p. 223) pointed out, the masculine identity concerns that men partly resolve by highlighting differences between the sexes inevitably produce inequality. More generally, Reskin (1988) argued that differentiation is the basis for devaluation in hierarchical systems. In this research we show that men students and instructors reinforced notions that men were superior to women in the police academy, on police forces, and in society more generally.

This is not to imply that men are the only institutional actors. A companion piece (Prokos, n.d.) shows that women did not respond uniformly to academy training. Women's responses ranged from capitalizing on stereotypical femininity, to trying to fit in with the masculine culture of the organization, to rejecting ideas about policing that equated competence with masculinity. Other researchers have documented policewomen's attitudes, identity construction, and the tension women police face between femininity and the dictates of police work (e.g. Brewer, 1991; Coffey, Brown and Savage, 1992; S. Martin, 1980). Thus, while women are more than foils or victims, the data analyzed here center on men's, not women's, actions.

Masculinity and policing

Masculinity is a social construction reproduced through everyday interactions. Its quality as a social construction rather than as a property of individual men can be seen in this definition by Kerfoot and Knights (1996, p. 86): 'the socially generated consensus of what it means to be a man, to be "manly" or to display such behaviour at any one time'. Multiple forms of masculinity exist because men (and women) construct masculinity in particular social and historical contexts. In contemporary Western society, however, 'hegemonic masculinity' (Connell, 1995) is the dominant form for reinforcing men's power on the cultural and collective levels. Although hegemonic masculinity takes different forms (Burris, 1996; P. Martin, 1998b), it is generally defined through work in the paid labor force, subordination of women, heterosexism, uncontrollable sexuality, authority, control, competitive individualism, independence, aggressiveness, and capacity for violence (Connell, 1995; Messerschmidt, 1996).

Hegemonic masculinity is a central defining concept in the culture of police work in the United States. Male police officers have drawn on images of a 'masculine cop' to enhance their sense of masculinity and to resist women's growing presence (Martin and Jurik, 1996). Hunt (1984, 1990) contended that the policeman's symbolic world is one of opposing qualities directly related to gender. Male officers equate women with feminine moral virtue, the domestic realm, social service, formal rules, administration, cleanliness, and emotions. In contrast, they equate men and masculinity with guns, crimefighting, a combative personality, resistance to management, fights, weapons, and a desire to work in high crime areas (Hunt, 1990). Thus, it is no surprise that many male police officers strongly believe that women are incapable of being good police officers.

Police officers — both managers and rank-and-file officers — share a myth of policing as action-filled, exciting, adventurous, and dangerous (Brown et al., 1993). The reality of police work, however, involves much tedium and paperwork and relatively little crime fighting or violence. Regardless of the reality, male police officers cling to the image of police officers as crime fighters and downplay the femininely labeled aspects of the job, such as paperwork and social service (Hunt, 1990). Women's presence and competent performance of the masculine aspects of the job mean that the job can no longer be enlisted straightforwardly in the project of confirming masculinity. Another factor that influences male supervisors' and co-workers' responses to women cops is fear of exposure. Because women are both 'outsiders' and stereotyped as moral, male supervisors anticipate that women will expose corruption, and male rank-and-file officers anticipate that women will expose excessive violence or extramarital (or on-duty) sex (Hunt, 1990).

The first line of defense when women attempt to gain a foothold in a male preserve, thus challenging its masculine status, is to try to stop the invasion. Indeed, research shows many examples of resistance from superiors and co-workers to women's presence on police forces. Unduly harsh treatment from supervisors is common. For example, one trainer forbade a woman trainee from going to the bathroom or talking to other officers while on patrol for the first three months of her training (Heidensohn, 1992), and another sent a female officer out alone to patrol a high-crime area after she complained of unfair treatment (Feinman, 1994). Rank-and-file officers have resisted and demeaned women co-workers through their use of language and through sexual harassment. The offensive use of profanity (Morash and Haarr, 1995), the use of anti-women remarks, refusal to speak to women altogether (Balkin, 1988), and the use of affectionate terms of address such as 'hon' and 'sweetheart' (Martin and Jurik, 1996) are common. Innuendoes about women officers' sexuality, typically by referring to them as 'whores' or 'dykes', are widespread (Heidensohn, 1992; Hunt, 1984, 1990). Finally, male co-workers sexually harass women on and off duty. 'Women find sex magazines, dildos, and vibrators in their lockers and mailboxes; they encounter betting pools on who will be the first to have sex with a new female officer' (Martin and Jurik, 1996, p. 38). If this first line of defense does not succeed in eliminating women from the occupation, women's threat to the masculine character of the job can be mitigated if they can be segregated into the non-masculine, paperwork-dominated, aspects of the job, thus preserving the masculine character of the crime-fighting policeman (Hunt, 1990). If segregation is not possible, a third alternative is to use women's presence to confirm the masculine nature of the job by showing women to be unfit for it.

These elements of resistance on the part of supervisors and co-workers may have developed spontaneously in police departments. It is possible, however, that officer training programs sowed the seeds of these resistance behaviors, a possibility that we investigate here. If so, then the culture of masculinity encouraged by academy training (and further encouraged on police forces) can limit opportunities of women officers and help explain the persistent under-representation of women cops.

The hidden curriculum

In its general form, the term 'hidden curriculum' refers to the lessons schools teach students that go beyond the explicit curriculum (Bowles and Gintis, 1976). This concept originated among scholars examining the role of the schools in reproducing social class across generations. They found that schools endorse orientations that correspond to the needs of employers, such as the importance and naturalness of hierarchy and obedience (Bowles

and Gintis, 1976; Giroux and Purpel, 1983). Gender scholars have recently applied the idea of a hidden curriculum to the reproduction of gender inequality (Addelston and Stirratt, 1996; K. Martin, 1998). They have pointed out that hidden curricula are crucial to the construction of gender, as schools teach and enforce what it means to be masculine and feminine and how to behave masculinely and femininely. Although research on police academy training has shown that recruits learn unrecognized and unintentional lessons during academy training (Harris, 1973), the gendered dimension of such lessons is unknown.

The setting

Certification is the first step toward establishing a law enforcement career in the United States. Police academies teach the nuts and bolts of being a police officer: here recruits practise shooting, defensive tactics, patrol-car driving, and first aid, as well as learn about state and federal law, investigations, and patrolling. Most instructors are sworn police officers from local and state law enforcement agencies, and most students and instructors are men (S. Martin, 1994; Martin and Jurik, 1996; Pike, 1992).

Because this research investigates only one academy, which is located in a rural county in the southeastern USA, the findings may not be generalizable to urban academies or to ones in other regions. Despite the academy's rural location, however, its students came from a nearby mid-sized city and almost all had graduated from one of the city's two universities; thus the student body is not exceptional on the rural/urban dimension. Residents of the south tend to hold more conservative gender attitudes (although they have become more liberal over time, see Rice and Coates, 1995), and thus we cannot make claims about the national representativeness of this study. We note, however, that while geographically limited ethnographic research cannot be considered definitive, it can add to our understanding by illustrating the processes by which women and men students learn about masculinity on police forces.

Methodology

This research is based on participant observation the first author conducted in 1997 while enrolled in a law enforcement training academy program lasting five months. She is a white woman, 27 years old at the time of the research. The other 30 students were mostly white men in their early twenties who held bachelor's degrees. There were four other women in the class, all white, and three African-American men. Of the more than 40 instructors who taught classes at various times, about 12% were women, one

of whom was African-American. The academy course met eight hours a day, five days a week. Most students paid the $1000 tuition themselves, but a few were sponsored by a local police department.

Because this article is based on the participant observation of the first author, we hereinafter use the first-person voice to describe her experiences. The data for this research include notes and observations I made during my training at the academy. These data consist of short comments I wrote in the margins of my class notebooks and notes that I took after hours, often talking into a tape recorder during the commute home. I transcribed over 100 pages of such field notes. Additional data include class notes on the formal curriculum taught in lectures, as well as over 500 pages of academy-provided materials.

I used the grounded theory method to analyze the data and generate theory. The goal of grounded theory is to use data to develop theory rather than to test existing theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). When using grounded theory, the processes of data collection, coding, and analysis are simultaneous (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), and for much of the project this was the case. However, some of the coding was completed after the academy ended. Data analysis proceeded from coding, to developing conceptual categories based on the codes, to defining the conceptual categories, and finally to clarifying the links between the conceptual categories.

After passing the written and oral board entrance exams, an ethical dilemma arose concerning whether or not to inform other participants and school administrators of my intent to conduct participant observation research. This is the same dilemma many researchers face in doing participant observation (Diamond, 1992; Punch, 1986; Van Maanen, 1983). It became clear that making the research agenda known would jeopardize my chances of acceptance into the academy and would substantially alter my treatment by administrators, instructors, and other students, even if I were admitted. Thus, I did not reveal my identity as a researcher. The academy administration was aware that I was a graduate student in sociology and that I planned to finish my PhD. Many of the students knew that I had a master's degree (in fact, my nickname at the beginning of training was 'Masters') and that I planned to study women in law enforcement. Because the administration and other students were unaware that I was observing academy training, I rarely took field notes when I could be observed.

As a woman observing mostly male recruits, my experiences were probably different from those a man would have had. While my female status enabled my access to a wealth of data, it forced me to decide how I would handle mistreatment (Warren, 1988). As a woman in policing, there is a tension between being accepted by the group and proving that one is capable of performing police work. Acceptance often required acting in a stereotypically feminine way, yet acting capably usually contradicted such behavior (see S. Martin, 1980, for an explanation of how this occurs 'on the

job' for women police). This is, in fact, the central tension women faced in the police academy: trying to negotiate acceptance as a woman and as a cop at the same time. My solution was to challenge men's behavior toward me when it implied that I was unqualified, but to not challenge their opinions about and treatment of other women.

Results

The explicit curriculum and the hidden curriculum at the police academy stood in stark contrast to one another. The explicit curriculum was gender-neutral; the hidden curriculum was riddled with gendered lessons. The ostensibly gender-neutral curriculum of the academy had as its stated goal the production of professional and competent police officers, regardless of gender. The student policy manual was scrupulously gender-neutral. The use of gender-neutral pronouns, for example, was consistent throughout the manual, as were all sections describing personal grooming (e.g. 'trainee will present a neat and clean appearance') except in rare cases (e.g. 'sideburns will not extend past the center of the ear') that were directed to one sex only. Finally, the manual stated that, 'No sexual, racial, ethnic, or religious slurs will be tolerated. Any violation will result in your dismissal from the academy.' Field notes from the first day corroborate this message by noting the instructor's repeated avowal that inappropriate sexual or racial language was inexcusable.

Despite the gender-neutral formal curriculum, hegemonic masculinity continually reappeared in the hidden curriculum, inserted by male instructors and students via their treatment of each other and of women. The first two sections, below, describe how gender boundary-setting occurred in the police academy. The second two sections show how most men students and instructors conceptualized themselves — and men more generally — as not only different from but better than women. Table 1 summarizes these elements of the hidden curriculum.

Treating women as outsiders

Men in police academy training treated women students as outsiders by using gendered language, eliminating them from classroom examples, and excluding them from bonding experiences. Women learned that they were not considered members of the 'in-group', which was defined by masculinity. Men also learned that women were outsiders in policing and that there are no repercussions for treating them as such.

Instructors' use of gendered language was pervasive. Specifically, instructors used the male pronoun when referring to students or to law enforcement officers generally. The academy's director delivered a lecture in

Table 1: The hidden curriculum in law enforcement training

	Lessons for men	Lessons for women
Treating women as outsiders	Social and physical boundaries can be created through language that excludes women, through the assumption that cops are men, through bonding with other recruits around activities that exclude women.	Instructors and other students assume cops are men. Women are virtually ignored in curriculum and are excluded from social groups.
Exaggerating gender differences	Women and men are very different and this matters more than other differences between people. If women are strong, they are like men, which is inappropriate. 'Feminine' women are incapable of the physical demands of police work.	Women and men are very different and this matters more than other differences between people. Women are the ones who are different, men are the norm, so women will be treated differently.
Denigrating and objectifying women	Women are sexual objects. Women and women's issues (such as women's victimization) are not as valuable, good, or important as men or men's issues.	The place of women in the criminal justice system is as victims and as objects of men's fantasies and ridicule.
Resisting powerful women	Women in positions of power do not need to be taken seriously.	Women asserting authority will not be taken seriously by male police officers.

which he referred to us as 'gentlemen' and 'guys'. Only twice did he catch himself and add 'and ladies', a term with more connotations of sex-appropriate behavior than the term 'women'. Instructors' use of 'guys' when addressing us was normative. Regardless of the speaker's intent, people tend to picture men when hearing the words 'man' and 'he' (Richardson, 1993). Certainly women and men students learned that the normative cop was a man.

It sometimes seemed that female police officers did not exist in the instructors' worlds. For example, when instructing class members about how to perform searches, an instructor demonstrated a search on a male student and showed how men searching a woman would do things somewhat

differently in order to insure that her sexual privacy was not illegally invaded. (He made clear that the impetus behind such concern was fear of a lawsuit.) Yet, he never mentioned how women officers should search men suspects to similarly insure privacy. Clearly, he assumed that his audience of students was men, thus disregarding the women students.

Women instructors, too, perpetuated women's outsider status. One female instructor of 'employment skills' taught about appropriate attire for an interview, explaining that men should wear suits unless the interview were with a small, casual, department, in which case they might wear khaki pants, a nice shirt, and a tie. She spoke at length about how to determine which departments were casual. She mentioned that women, too, should wear suits and asked an already employed female student what she had worn to her interview, and that ended the discussion of women's interview attire. The instructor provided no details about how women should dress for different types of departments or what type of suit they should wear, leaving women recruits to ponder alone the relative merits of skirted and trouser suits. While attire is a minor issue, of course, the lesson that men's issues take precedence, even when a woman is directing the discussion, is not minor.

Police department recruiters hoping to hire new graduates gave periodic presentations, and they, too, pitched their material to a male audience. For example, one set of recruiters outlined the physical standards for male employees and completely ignored the female standard. Thus, students learned that 25-year-old men were required to run a mile and a half in approximately 12 minutes in order to be hired by a police department; no mention was made of the requirement for women. Other recruiters mentioned salary and benefit structures, but none mentioned parental leave or efforts to better integrate women. Students had opportunities to ask questions, but issues of specific interest to women recruits were not part of any recruiter's prepared presentation and were never asked in discussion.

Many men students acted as if the classroom were a male preserve by creating bonding experiences that excluded women. For example, one group of about ten men occasionally engaged in 'farting contests' and frank discussions about their sex lives. These discussions or activities usually terminated when a woman approached the group. In explaining why a loud and lively group of men tended to grow quiet when a woman approached, men students said things like, 'We can't talk about that now because there are ladies in the room', or 'That's not fit conversation in front of the ladies'. As Kanter (1977) pointed out over 20 years ago, such 'boundary heightening' remarks remind women that they are outsiders who are not welcome as full group members.

The glorification of violent masculinity further served to knit together men and exclude women. Male students frequently got together after class

in one another's homes or in bars to watch football games on television; women were not invited. On one occasion, a man brought a videotaped football game into the classroom and showed it during the lunch break; the female students remained silent and did crossword puzzles. While watching, the students debated referee calls and argued over which team was better. These disputes led to alliances over teams, further intensifying the female exclusionary ties built around football.

Physical fighting was a theme dwelled on by students and instructors alike during downtimes. In one instance, the women and men students were sitting around in the gymnasium waiting for the next activity when the head physical training instructor joined us to reminisce about his younger days as a police officer and the fights he would get into. In one story, he had left the scene, only to return minutes later to assist the uniformed officers who had shown up to break up the fight that he had precipitated! Much laughing on the part of the students ensued. Other of his stories similarly glorified bar fights and associated them with being a police officer. The link that men created between masculinity and violence in its vicarious form (football) and in its instantiated form (bar-room brawls) emphasized their commonalities as men and women's difference.

In sum, male instructors and students participated in constructing an ideology in which the term 'woman cop' was oxymoronic. Through language and bonding experiences it became clear that the 'in-group', in addition to other characteristics (such as whiteness, youth, and hetero-sexuality), was exclusively male. Thus, women and men learned that women are outsiders in the police world, and that women police officers can be ignored as exceptions who must learn to adjust to the existing environment.

Exaggerating gender differences

Male instructors and students exaggerated differences between themselves and the women they encountered and claimed that women's differences made them inferior to men. Students of both sexes learned that women and men by nature are very different and that gender differences supersede other differences, such as those stemming from race, ethnicity, or social class. In addition, men learned that women are rarely as physically strong as men and that those who are strong are 'like men', and thus not feminine. Women learned that women are treated differently at the academy, further serving to demonstrate that they are not entirely welcome in this envir-onment, or at least not welcome as equals.

The 'human diversity' instructor conducted class exercises that entailed physically segregating students by sex, race, geographic region, and whether or not recruits had a family member in law enforcement. This resulted in one group of white women (seen as a sex group), one group of

black men (seen as a race group), and four groups of white men (a southern group, a northern group, a state-regional group, and a group with family members in law enforcement). A categorization problem arose for students whose characteristics spanned categories: which group should they align with? The instructor's solution was that sex and race 'trumped' the other categories: women and African-Americans were supposed to stay in 'their' sex or race groups even if they had family in law enforcement or identified with a region. While the ostensible point of the exercise was to make students aware of race and gender issues, the unintended effect of the hidden curriculum was to reify differences.

Another example of categorizing people in a way that reified sex differences occurred in defensive tactics class, where instructors paired women with women and men with men, purportedly to match similar-sized people. The matching of men was unproblematic: instructors suggested that men pair with men of similar size but did not suggest specific pairs. However, because we had an odd number of women, the last woman in line had to be paired with a larger man. Although at 5'9" I was larger than all of the women (and several of the men), I had already been paired with a woman. Yet if size, not gender, were the guiding criterion, the instructor would have reassigned me to partner with the man. The assignments seemed, for women at least, to be based less on size than on gender.

Instructors highlighted sex differences between recruits in several other ways. The 'human diversity' instructor showed an ABC-network video hosted by conservative media personality John Stossel that stressed the biological imperative of gender differences. The 'communication' instructor taught us that women and men communicate entirely differently, with women seeking emotional connectedness and men seeking solutions. Another instructor explained that while a few women were quite strong, such exceptions were 'not really like women at all'. Once he had tried to arrest a 250-pound woman whom he had mistakenly 'treated like a lady'. He explained, with great animation, that the woman almost escaped because he had been unprepared for her strength and fighting ability. His distinction between 'real women' (who were 'ladies' and physically weak) and 'strong women' (perpetrators who are unwomanly, and indeed, scary: 'they can kick you so that you won't be able to have children') put female recruits in a double bind: to be feminine they need to sacrifice strength; to be a cop they need to sacrifice femininity.

Some instructors treated women and men differently based on the stereotype that women were not naturally gifted at fighting. One instructor aggressively 'picked on' women in the physical training class. Class members practiced techniques wherein they close their eyes and await the 'attack', which they fend off with the new tactic being taught. The instructor moved around the room to replace the attacking student, yet he only attacked women students. When I asked him why, he said that, in fact, he

had attacked men but I simply had not seen him. (I am confident in my claim.) Because it is much more difficult to successfully perform defensive tactics against an experienced attacker, women students ended up appearing less competent (to themselves, to other students, and to the instructor) than men students, who only had to defend themselves against fellow inexperienced students. Women also experienced the opposite problem of not having enough instructor attention; another instructor demonstrated defensive tactics only on men.

Students, too, emphasized gender differences, claiming that partnering with a woman could be life-threatening (see also Charles, 1981). During obstacle-course training, for example, students had to pull a 150-pound dummy approximately 25 yards. Equal proportions of men and women had trouble with the dummy drag, as it was near the end of the physically exhausting obstacle course. Yet a student complained after the exercise that he would not want a woman to be his partner because she would never be able to drag him in an emergency. No other students publicly disagreed with him, and none of the instructors present intervened in the conversation.

Male students often treated women as if they were fragile. In physical training class, we practiced punching in pairs with protective pads. Each time, the same two or three men would very gently punch the pads women held, barely grazing the pad. These men would resume punching normally when they were switched to a male partner. Fellow students' treatment of me similarly assumed female fragility, even though I did not act in any stereotypically feminine ways. Our class president took me aside to ascertain whether I could stand up to the remarks of several male recruits who had 'gone too far' in talking about their sex lives and bodily functions in my presence. In doing so, he assumed both that I was offended (which, as a 'lady', I should have been) and that I needed help in confronting other students. Another insisted on trying to give me gun-shooting advice, even though I had both an instructor and a female student acting as coaches. While these men may have thought they were being helpful, such help was predicated on men's lack of respect for women's abilities and reified the notion of female weakness.

Male students and instructors emphasizing gender differences and acting on stereotypes of women's fragility can damage women's progress in policing. Students and instructors perpetuated the idea that women are not as qualified for police jobs as are men because they are different and inferior. Women recruits learned that they would be treated differently from male recruits at the academy and that men viewed them as intrinsically less capable and less qualified. Men learned that women are fundamentally different and thus are inadequate as police officers. They also learned some of the rudiments of appropriate masculinity by virtue of seeing it contrasted with a caricature of femininity.

Denigrating and objectifying women

We now turn to the evidence supporting the claim that masculinity is constructed not simply through lessons about what is masculine and what is not; in addition, men and women are taught that being male is better than being female. Men learned to disparage women by verbally denigrating and objectifying them (as in the comment 'there oughtta be a law against bitches'), and women students learned that such behavior is condoned by the institution they seek to enter. Men students belittled women and things associated with women — such as class material on domestic violence and rape — in addition to objectifying them. Women students learned that the expected role of women in the criminal justice system is as victims and as objects of male workers' fantasies and ridicule.

Male students' denigration of women occurred at the most basic level in their use of language. They called fellow male students 'pussies' when they failed to act appropriately manly. Besides its crudity, this expression equates femaleness with weakness, reinforcing other lessons about women's not belonging. Similarly, when students were cleaning the training room once, a man called out to the male broom-pushers, 'Why are you all sweeping? That's women's work!' This statement had the effect of insulting the men and women and delineating sharp boundaries around which tasks were masculine and which were not.

Another way that training denigrated and objectified women was through the presentation of women in training films and men's response to them. The class watched a recently made video about driving emergency vehicles in which a male officer daydreamed of a beautiful woman in a negligee when he was supposed to be concentrating on the road. The scene looked like it could have come from a pornographic film: the woman on the screen was on all fours crawling toward the camera while she licked her lips. As the class watched the film, many of the men chanted things like 'ohhh, baby' and 'hot mama'. In another instance, male students, with the instructor's unwitting complicity, dismissed the importance of crimes against women. The instructor left the room after activating the VCR to show a training film about domestic violence. Many class members ignored the film and talked loudly, often evaluating the appearance of the women in the film, particularly the women victims, saying things like 'hubba hubba' and 'ooh, she's cute!' When a woman who did not meet their standards of attractiveness appeared on the video, many men made fun of her appearance, groaning and calling out, 'she's ugly'. In this way, male students indicated their disregard for the material by ignoring the films when they were not busy rating actresses' beauty. Their actions also implied that women's appearance is more important than violence against them, indicating that to some extent they did not object to violence against women. The instructor's absence allowed the

men to demean women and disregard the importance of crimes against women.

Instructors chose films that degraded and objectified women, and men students learned from such course material and from fellow students' reactions that objectification of women was acceptable. They also learned that women are not as important or valuable as men. Male students also drew on negative images of women to insult one another during training. Thus, men's interactions with each other, along with training materials and men's responses to the materials, reconstructed stereotypes about women. Women recruits learned from these lessons of the hidden curriculum that men in the criminal justice system are likely to view women as victims and sexual objects who are subject to ridicule and contempt.

Resisting powerful women's authority

The academy taught male recruits that they need not treat women in positions of power or authority with the same respect or seriousness as they accord men. Several male students resisted women instructors' institutional power by 'acting out' and by openly questioning their authority. On one occasion, a woman instructor started a video about victims of burglary, robbery, domestic violence, and rape and left the room. She had explained that we were to watch all four segments of the video, but at the end of the first segment, one of the male students turned off the VCR. The male students laughed and joked about how we did not have to do anything at all since the instructor wasn't present. It is unclear whether the men's rebellion was directed at the woman instructor, the subject matter, or both. Nonetheless, it was clear that these men did not accept the authority of this woman instructor. In another instance, almost all the men (and most of the women) laughed disrespectfully at a woman instructor-trainee who had demonstrated a physical technique incorrectly. Students also talked among themselves during female instructors' lectures more often and more loudly than during male instructors' lectures. A female instructor's lecture on 'employment skills' was repeatedly interrupted by rowdiness, until finally a female student complained to the administration.

The disrespect accorded women instructors spilled over onto treatment of female students. On the firing range, we lined up in rows, with each student coaching the shooter in front as we rotated through the shooting position. When it was my turn to coach a male student, he listened to my comments, and explained that he would not do as I suggested because he had a shooting style he liked and did not intend to change. When instructors later gave him the same advice, he obeyed. Of course, he also might have rejected advice from a male student, but I overheard no instances of this in any of the range practices.

In sum, students treated female instructors with less courtesy and respect. Male students learned that they need not accept women as superiors, or perhaps even as equals. Female students learned that male police officers may not listen to them or accept their advice were they to be in positions of authority or even equality. Because women cops will be in situations where it is crucial to relay information to men officers who then may not take it seriously, this lack of respect may give rise to second thoughts for women would-be officers.

Conclusion

While there may be no law against women (or bitches) entering the police academy, the hidden curriculum there taught recruits that dominant masculinity is necessary to performing their duties as cops. Women's presence at the academy facilitated these lessons by indicating the boundaries surrounding masculinity (accomplished through differentiation) and by highlighting masculinity's superiority over things not-masculine. Specifically, male students learned that it is acceptable to exclude women, that women are naturally very different from men and thus can be treated differently, that denigrating and objectifying women is commonplace and expected, and that they can disregard women in authority. For each of these lessons, male recruits learned accompanying strategies for excluding and antagonizing women, strategies that effectively communicated to women that they were not welcome as equals.

Three decades of research have indicated the informal barriers that male co-workers and supervisors establish to counter the threat of women's entry into traditionally male occupations (Gruber and Bjorn, 1982; Cockburn, 1988; Swerdlow, 1989; Gruber, 1998). Some male resistance stems from women's disruption of male bonding and the equation of masculine men with masculine work. We have extended understanding of the resistance process by showing that women's presence can, in fact, further the project of masculinity construction, and we offer evidence from the training grounds of one of the most masculine professions. In police academy training male students and instructors used the presence of women to aid in their construction of divisions along gender lines. As Acker (1990, 1999b) explained, the construction of such divisions sustains the gender status quo of organizations.

Why is men's domination of this particular occupation so resistant to change when women have successfully entered other formerly male domains, such as law? Perhaps the comparison of police work to other legal-system occupations is ill conceived. Men's resistance to women in policing is probably more similar to military men's resistance to women, since both involve a particular type of masculinity defined by men's control

of violence. Men have always maintained a monopoly on organized violence (Connell, 1987, p. 107, 1995; Enloe, 1989; Messerschmidt, 1993; see also Barrett, 1996). In general, most militaries and police — and the individuals who control them, such as judges and general — are men. The exclusion of women from the means of organized violence, including instruction in the use of weapons and military technique is not accidental (Connell, 1987, p. 107, 1995). Indeed, as Enloe (1989, p. 6) noted, '[S]ocial processes and structures ... have been created and sustained over the generations — sometimes coercively — to keep most women out of any political position with influence over state force.' Control over institutionalized violence is a core component of men's authority in western cultures (Connell, 1987). Thus, while police culture, like the culture of many other male-dominated occupations, defines itself through masculinity, it is perhaps the association not only with masculinity, but also with violence, that leads men to resist women in policing.

Directions for future research

Women are not the only group used to help construct masculinity in police academies and departments. The culture of masculinity in these sites has traditionally excluded some men, particularly those who do not fit the requirements of hegemonic masculinity (see Bird, 1996; Acker, 1999b). Hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation to other masculinities as well as in relation to femininity (Connell, 1995). For this reason, the presence of men who do not conform to hegemonic masculinity may threaten some men's association of masculine identity and police work. How is masculinity constructed in relation to other men as well as women? Specifically, on what criteria do men judge other men for police group membership? The construction of masculinity is complex, and understanding how men construct it in relation to other men may offer insights into their hostility towards women's presence.

Our findings are limited to the experiences and treatment of white women in one academy. These limitations point to the importance of gathering data from multiple programs and types of departments, thus permitting investigation into the crucial question of which organizational characteristics lead to less hostile training environments for women. Similar research unpacking the relationship between notions of race and ethnicity to notions of masculinity (Cose, 1995) and how various organizational practices can mediate the treatment of people of color in academies and on police forces is also crucial. Understanding the nature of the barriers faced by women, minorities, and other groups who are 'outsiders' to hegemonic masculinity is the first step in fighting for their inclusion in a politically crucial occupational niche.

Acknowledgements

References

Acker, J. (1990) Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4,2, 139–58.

Acker, J. (1999a) Rewriting class, race, and gender: problems in feminist rethinking. In Feree, M.M., Lorber, J. and Hess, B.B. (eds) *Revisioning Gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Acker, J. (1999b) Gender and organization. In Chafetz, J. (ed.) *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Addelston, J. and Stirratt, M. (1996) The last bastion of masculinity: gender politics at The Citadel. In Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Balkin, J. (1988) Why policemen don't like policewomen. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 16,1, 29–38.

Barrett, F.J. (1996) The organizational culture of hegemonic masculinity: the case of the US Navy. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 3,3, 129–42.

Bird, S. (1996) Welcome to the men's club: homosociality and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. *Gender & Society*, 10,2, 120–32.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books.

Brandth, B. (1998) Masculinity and childcare: the reconstruction of fathering. *Sociological Review*, 46,2, 293–314.

Brewer, J.D. (1991) Hercules, Hippolyte and the Amazons — or policewomen in the RUC. *British Journal of Sociology*, 42,2, 231–47.

Britton, D.M. (1997) Gendered organizational logic: policy and practice in men's and women's prisons. *Gender & Society*, 11,6, 796–818.

Brown, J., Maidment, A. and Bull, R. (1993) Appropriate skill-task matching or gender bias in deployment of male and female police officers? *Policing and Society*, 3,2, 121–36.

Burris, B.H. (1996) Technocracy, patriarchy and management. In Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. London: Sage.

Charles, M.T. (1981) The performance and socialization of female recruits in the Michigan State Police Training Academy. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 9,2, 209–23.

Chetkovich, C. (1997) *Real Heat: Gender and Race in the Urban Fire Service*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Cockburn, C. (1988) *Machinery of Dominance: Women, Men and Technical Know-How*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Cockburn, C. (1991) *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Coffey, S., Brown, J. and Savage, S. (1992) Policewomen's career aspirations: some reflections on the role and capabilities of women in policing in Britain. *Police Studies*, 15,1, 13–19.

Collinson, D.L. (1992) *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Collinson, D.L. and Collinson, M. (1989) Sexuality in the workplace: the domination of men's sexuality. In Hearn, J., Sheppard, D., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization*. London: Sage.

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1994) Naming men as men: implications for work, organization, and management. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 1,1, 2–22.

Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (1996) Breaking the silence: on men, masculinities, and managements. In Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. London: Sage.

Connell, R.W. (1987) *Gender and Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Cose, E. (1995) *A Man's World: How Real is Male Privilege and How High is its Price?* New York: HarperCollins.

Diamond, T. (1992) *Making Gray Gold: Narratives of Nursing Home Care*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DiTomaso, N. (1989) Sexuality in the workplace: discrimination and harassment. In Hearn, J., Sheppard, D., Tancred-Sheriff, P. and Burrell, G. (eds) *The Sexuality of Organization*. London: Sage.

Enloe, C. (1989) *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Feinman, C. (1994) *Women in the Criminal Justice System*, 3rd edn. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Gamson, J. (1997) Messages of exclusion: gender, movements, and symbolic boundaries. *Gender & Society*, 11,2, 178–99.

Gerson, J. and Peiss, K. (1985) Boundaries, negotiation, consciousness: reconceptualizing gender relations. *Social Problems*, 32,4, 317–31.

Giroux, H. and Purpel, D. (1983) *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Gruber, J. (1998) The impact of male work environments and organizational policies on women's experiences of sexual harassment. *Gender & Society*, 12,3, 301–20.

Gruber, J. and Bjorn, L. (1982) Blue-collar blues: the sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work and Occupations*, 9,3, 271–98.

Harris, R. (1973) *The Police Academy: An Inside View*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Heidensohn, F. (1992) *Women in Control? The Role of Women in Law Enforcement*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hunt, J. (1984) The development of rapport through the negotiation of gender in field work among police. *Human Organization*, 43,4, 283–96.

Hunt, J. (1990) The logic of sexism among police. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 1,2, 3–30.

Jackman, M. (1994) *The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kanter, R.M. (1977) *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kerfoot, D. and Knights, D. (1996) 'The best is yet to come?': the quest for embodiment in managerial work. In Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. London: Sage.

Kimmel, M. (1994) Masculinity as homophobia: fear, shame, and silence in the construction of gender identity. In Brod, H. and Kaufman, M. (eds) *Theorizing Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Leidner, R. (1991) Serving hamburgers and selling insurance: gender, work, and identity in interactive service jobs. *Gender & Society*, 5,2, 154–78.

Martin, K. (1998) Becoming a gendered body: practices of preschools. *American Sociological Review*, 63,4, 494–511.

Martin, P.Y. (1996) Gendering and evaluating dynamics: men, masculinities, and managements. In Collinson, D.L. and Hearn, J. (eds) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Martin, P.Y. (1998a) Gender and organizations. In Myers, K.A., Anderson, C.D. and Risman, B.J. (eds) *Feminist Foundations: Towards Transforming Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, P.Y. (1998b) Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Connell's *Masculinities. Gender & Society*, 12,4, 472–4.

Martin, P.Y. (2001) 'Mobilizing masculinities': women's experience of men at work. *Organization,* 8 (forthcoming).

Martin, S.E. (1980) *Breaking and Entering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Martin, S.E. (1994) 'Outsider within' the station house: the impact of race and gender on black women police. *Social Problems*, 41,3, 383–400.

Martin, S.E. and Jurik, N.C. (1996) *Doing Justice, Doing Gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Messerschmidt, J. (1993) *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Messerschmidt, J. (1996) Managing to kill: masculinities and the space shuttle *Challenger* explosion. In Cheng, C. (ed.) *Masculinities in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morash, M. and Haarr, M. (1995) Gender, workplace problems, and stress in policing. *Justice Quarterly*, 12,1, 113–40.

Morgan, D. (1992) *Discovering Men*. London: Routledge.

National Center for Women in Policing (1999) Equality denied: the status of women in policing, 1997. http://www.feminist.org/police/status.html

Ogasawara, Y. (1998) *Office Ladies and Salaried Men: Power, Gender and Work in Japanese Companies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Padavic, I. (1991) The re-creation of gender in a male workplace. *Symbolic Interaction*, 14,3, 279–94.

Pierce, J. (1995) *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pike, D.L. (1992) Women in police academy training: some aspects of organizational response. In Moyer, I.L. (ed.) *The Changing Roles of Women in the Criminal Justice System: Offenders, Victims, and Professionals*, 2nd edn. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Prokos, A. (n.d.) Tough cops and reasoned responses: the making of women and men police officers. Unpublished manuscript.

Punch, M. (1986) *The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Reskin, B. (1988) Bringing the men back in: sex differentiation and the devaluation of women's work. *Gender & Society*, 2,1, 58–81.

Reskin, B. (2000) The proximate causes of employment discrimination. *Contemporary Sociology*, 29,2, 319–29.

Rice, T.W. and Coates, D.L. (1995) Gender role attitudes in the southern United States. *Gender & Society*, 9,6, 744–56.

Richardson, L. (1993) Gender stereotyping in the English language. In Richardson, L. and Taylor, V. (eds) *Feminist Frontiers III*. New York: Random House.

Scott, J.C. (1990) *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Scott, J.W. (1986) Gender: a useful category of historical analysis. *American Historical Review*, 91, 1053–75.

Swerdlow, M. (1989) Men's accommodations to women entering a nontraditional occupation: a case of rapid transit operatives. *Gender & Society*, 3,3, 373–87.

Van Maanen, J. (1983) The moral fix: on the ethics of fieldwork. In Emerson, R. (ed.) *Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Warren, C.A.B. (1988) *Gender Issues in Field Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Williams, C. (1995) *Still a Man's World: Men Who Do 'Women's Work'*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labour*. Farnborough: Saxon House.