UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

On The Thin Blue Line: Examining the Mexican American Officer Experience in the Los Angeles Police Department

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

by

Roberto Gallardo

September 2018

Dissertation Committee:
Dr. Adalberto Aguirre, Chairperson
Dr. Tanya Nieri
Dr. Augustine Kposowa

The Dissertation of Roberto Gallardo is approved:

_____

_____

_____

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

On The Thin Blue Line: Examining the Mexican American Officer Experience in the Los Angeles Police Department

by

Roberto Gallardo

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Sociology
University of California, Riverside, September 2018
Dr. Adalberto Aguirre, Chairperson

This study focuses on the impact of race on Mexican-American minority law enforcement officers' ideology and experiences in the LAPD. Previous studies have focused on the issue of race within a municipal police department, however these studies have generally not included Hispanic/Latino officers. Most research has strictly focused on the impact of race on White and African-American officers, the impact of race on Hispanic/Latino officers (and especially Mexican-American officers) is relatively unknown. Interviews of Mexican-American officers were used gain the information required for analysis. The study finds that using a binary view of race, respondents understand and interpret interactions with other officers under a color blind ideology. Respondents also understand racism and discrimination as strictly an overt action or response. This is influenced by their occupational culture, their own history, and negative interactions with the community.

Table of Contents

I. Chapter 1: Introduction

A. Introduction……...…….……..1

B. The Thin Blue Line: Us v Us? …….……..6

C. What Do We Know About Minorities in Policing?.....7

D. Minorities in a Minority-Majority Department……..……..8

E. Why Does it Matter?…….…….10

F. Chapter Outlines…….....11

II. Chapter 2:Background I History, Policing, and the LAPD

A. Roots of Modern Police Practices…….……...……..13

B. Police Culture…… …23

C. Latinos in Law Enforcement…… …….28

D. State and Local……...……....31

E. Local Police Departments…..……33

F. Racial Composition of Los Angeles and the LAPD Today……...33

III. Chapter 3:Background II Minorities and the LAPD

A. Hispanic/Latinos and the LAPD…….……...35

B. The Early Period…….…...…….....36

C. Mexican Activism…….40

D. Deportations and Labor……..…….……..42

E. Mexican Americans & Mexican American Youth……..…...43

F. Sleepy Lagoon……...44

G. 1943 Los Angeles……..45

H. Bloody Christmas and Police Brutality……...……..47

I. LAPD,Social Movements, and an Escalating Tension……..51

J. Lawsuits, Professional Minority Recruiting, and an increase in Tension..57

K. Can't We All Just Get Along?.....59

L. California's Political Climate…...……...……...66

M. CRASHing Rampart …...……..67

N. 2007 MaCarthur Park……...……..69

O. The Dorner Incident……...……....69

IV. Chapter 4: Review of the Research Literature

A. Early Minority Officers……...……...72

B. Minority Experiences in Policing ...……...……...75

C. Why Research On Latino Police?.....85

D. Mexican American Officers……...……....91

V. Chapter 5:Theoretical Framework

A. Contemporary Race Theory……...94

B. Racial Formation Theory……...96

C. Racism……...……....98

D. Aren't All Minorities the Same?.....100

E. A Latino Threat Narrative……....103

F. Committing to the Narrative ……...108

VI. Chapter 6: Methodology

A. Recruitment……..111

B. Sample…….....114

C. Pre-Interview Procedures…….115

D. Building Rapport with Participants…...……...116

E. Interviews…….....120

F. Coding and Data……..123

VII. Chapter 7:Results

A. Self Identification…….……....125

B. Motivations for Becoming a Police Officer……...……..128

C. Academy Training…..……...140

D. Culture…….…143

E. Blue ID…….....146

F. Retaliation……....148

G. Race Based Effect……....152

H. Promotions……...156

I. Racism & Discrimination……....165

J. The Community……...171

VIII. Chapter 8: Analysis and Discussion

A. Self Identification……181

B. Motivations……..185

C. Culture……..190

D. Blue ID…….....193

E. Promotions……...195

F. Racism & Discrimination…….....198

G. The Community……...202

IX. Chapter 9: Conclusion & Future Directions

A. Conclusion……..…….....207

B. Interest Convergence……...213

C. Future Directions ……... 215

X. **Work Cited & Bibliography**……...……...217

CHAPTER 1:Introduction

Introduction

On August 9th 2014, a pair of unarmed African American teenagers were stopped by Officer Darren Wilson in possible connection with a local convenience store robbery. The officer was searching for two suspects who were accused of stealing cigarettes from the store earlier in the day. The teenagers were initially walking in the street as Officer Wilson approached in his vehicle. At a point in the interaction, a struggle ensued and shots were fired. While both teens ran, Wilson then encountered one of the juveniles with his weapon drawn. Officer Wilson proceeded to fire his weapon several times. That teen, Michael Brown, 18, was shot and killed by Officer Wilson on the streets of Ferguson, Missouri. What actually happened during the incident which ended with the death of Brown, was widely disputed by witnesses on the scene and Officer Wilson himself. In the official report of the incident, Wilson claimed that Brown reached for the officer's weapon when he approached him in the street. Where the initial shots rang out, the suspects ran, and Wilson took chase after Brown. According to Wilson, Brown stopped running, turned around and charged at him with malicious intent. Feeling he had no other choice, Wilson fired at Brown several times. The last of the 12 shots fired by Wilson proved to be the fatal shot. Brown was unarmed at the time (Department of Justice 2015).

Initial reports from eyewitnesses on the scene painted a different picture than what Wilson, and later, what the official report stated. Some witnesses stated that Brown did not charge at Wilson, but instead had his arms up when he was shot. The Department

of Justice concluded later that the witnesses who claimed that Brown had his hands up could not be considered 'credible' (This included the other teenager who ran from the scene). The other teenager at the scene painted a different picture than the official testimony and investigation. Dorian Johnson, a friend of Brown, gave his account of the incident. Johnson said the two were approached by Officer Brown as they were walking in the street. Wilson pulled up to them and said, "Get the fuck on the sidewalk?" They replied that they were almost to where they were going and that they would soon be out of the street. Wilson then blocked the young men with his vehicle and attempted to open the door but was hindered by Johnson and Brown, who were simply standing there. The door closed on the officer, and Wilson then proceeded to grab Brown from the neck through the window. Brown attempted to escape the grasp, all while never reaching for the officer's weapon. Wilson drew his firearm and said " I'll shoot you" and purposely discharged his weapon hitting Brown in the arm. Brown was able to free himself and the two teens attempted to flee. Wilson then shot at Brown as he was running away. Brown then stopped and turned around with hands up, but not completely because he had been hit. Johnson claimed Brown said "I don't have a gun" and tried to repeat the sentence but was shot several times. Johnson maintained that Brown never attempted to run at Officer Wilson (Department of Justice 2015).

The national media caught wind of the incident when the details of the shooting became public. The fact that Brown was unarmed, and that some witnesses claimed that he raised his hands to give up, and that the officer proceeded to shoot him, sparked

further outrage in the community as well as across the nation. Protest and marches began locally in Ferguson; then they spread across the country. This incident prompted questions regarding the use of deadly force by the officer. It also brought to the surface national attention about the possible impact that race had in the incident, and other similar incidents in Ferguson and across the country; Wilson is White, Brown *was* Black. What followed was media coverage of the incident questioning what actually happened, whether race was not only a factor in the incident, but also whether race itself is an institutional issue in law enforcement. Was race a factor in Brown's death? The death of Michael Brown expanded the dialogue regarding the role of race in society in general and especially regarding law enforcement. Because most Americans subscribe to a colorblind perspective (Lipsitz 2006), for the general public the Ferguson incident was a wake up call to the stark treatment faced by racial minorities in their encounters with law enforcement. This prompted many questions, that from the public usually went unasked. What role does race have in police officers' work? What role does race have in the use of force by police officers? Is law enforcement an institution inherently biased against racial minorities? If so, can anything really be done to limit or reduce this bias?

To many this was the first time that the issue of race was clearly manifested; for others it said nothing about the state of race relations. Unfortunately, for many others it was just regarded as another incident with minorities and law enforcement officer's authority. The only thing that was surprising or different about the Brown shooting is that it received any media coverage. Public opinion of the incident reveals a disconnect with

the perception of reality when it comes to law enforcement and police in general. A Pew Research Center Survey published days after the incident showed stark racial differences regarding the perception that the Brown shooting raised important issues about race. 80% of Blacks believed race played a role in the Ferguson incident, whereas only 37% of Whites believed the same (Pew Research Center August 18, 2014). Another poll in December of the same year revealed that most Blacks believed they didn't receive equal treatment by the criminal justice system or the police, where over 60% of Whites believed the police treated everyone the same (Gallup Poll December 12, 2014).

A spotlight by the media on the Ferguson police department and the city of Ferguson revealed a more detailed picture of race in the department and the department's relationship with its residents. Historically the town of Ferguson has been majority Black. At the time of the shooting, Ferguson was about 68 percent Black and 23 percent White (Department of Justice 2015). However, if one examines the demographics of the police department at the time of the incident, 94% of the officers were White (USA Today Aug 14, 2014). This was undeniably one of the reasons why the public examined the incident so closely; the possible impact of race on the police department's interactions with racial minorities. On September 5th, 2014 the Department of Justice began an investigation of the Ferguson police department to examine whether White officers exhibited or engaged in racial bias and profiling, as well as the disproportionate use of excessive force. The results of the investigation concluded that the officers in Ferguson constantly discriminated against Blacks, and violated many of their civil rights (Department of

Justice 2015). The recommendations offered in the report deemed necessary to improve the department and its relations with the community, however, there was no mention of increasing the number of minority officers in the department. The investigation only recommended that the department adhere to federal laws on fair hiring practices, but no explicit measure to increase minority representation was recommended (Department of Justice 2015).

Examining the demographics of law enforcement departments around the country, the Ferguson police department demographics of being disproportionately unrepresentative of the population of jurisdiction is not uncommon. As late as 2007, a Department of Justice survey of local police departments across the country revealed that on the average local police departments were 75 percent White (Reaves 2011). As of 2013, minorities comprised 27% of law enforcement officers, double its percentage from 1987 (Department of Justice May 14, 2015). On first examination this is a good sign, if we determine minority representation is increasing, along with increasing populations of minorities in the United States [about 23%] (Colby & Ortman 2015). African Americans made up about 12 percent of local police officers and an estimated 12 percent of officers were Hispanic or Latino in 2013, up from 5% in 1987 (Department of Justice May 14, 2015). Both of those demographic group are still, however, underrepresented, as Hispanics/ Latinos composed about 18% and African Americans composed about 13% of the United States population (Colby & Ortman 2015). However, when other agencies are included in law enforcement demographics, such as state and federal officers, the

numbers dramatically decrease in proportion to the minority population, and the underrepresentation of minorities in all facets of law at each level becomes more apparent, especially for Hispanic/Latinos (Reaves & Maskaly 2015) (examined in depth in Chapter 2). The question then remains, would departments benefit from having more minority representation? Would community relations be better? Could incidents like the one in Ferguson, MO, and others around the country be avoided, if law enforcement demographics were more representative of jurisdictions' constituents?

The Thin Blue Line: Us vs. Us?

Scholars often focus on the relation between officers and the community, especially given the recent racial and political climate, but what about relations between the officers themselves? What if the officers defending minority rights in demonstrations or other outlets were racial/ethnic minorities, would they have been criticized by other officers? Why weren't more minorities out in the front supporting other officers or their positions? Is there a reason why minority officers were not outspoken about the racial issues? While the targets of scrutiny include White police officers, the institutional factors and ideology that led to many of the noted events involve not only White officers but also complete departments as well (which presumably include some minority officers). The question then is, "What about racial/ethnic minority officers?"

What is their experience as minority officers? What about interactions with other-race officers? Are minority officers treated differently or believe they are treated differently by majority members of law enforcement? How are they treated by members

of their community? How do they view themselves as an officer of the law, and as a minority person? These and many other questions serve as the basis for the research at hand. As such, in general there have been examinations of various law enforcement entities and the culture/ideology that exists within the police force (Crank 2010; Cockcroft 2012). Previous studies have also examined the practices of law enforcement on minority suspects/victims (Holmes & Smith 2008; Lamberth 1998). However, significantly less research exists on minority law enforcement officers. As such, this study examines the effect of race on racial minority law enforcement officers' ideology and experiences.

What Do We Know About Minority Officers in Policing?

The available research literature on minority police officers yields some information on relations between White and African American officers, and about the experience and ideology of African American police officers. However, there is little literature on Hispanic/Latinos in law enforcement (Martinez 2007; Urbina & Alvarez 2015). While focusing on the experiences of minority officers, this study will attempt to shed light on the experiences and ideology of Hispanic/Latino officers in a large metropolitan department. Extensive research has examined the effect of race in police-citizen interactions (historically and currently); however, significantly less research has been dedicated to examining the impact of race on police-police relations. This topic is of great significance today, as historically excluded minority populations are now increasing in numbers, both in the population at large and in police departments. The

profile of the classic officer (i.e., White, male, working class, military experienced, high school educated) (Van Maanen, 1974) is changing. Departments are now represented by more racial minorities, women, and people with higher education (Walker 1999). However, even with the increases in previously excluded populations, the outstanding majority of police departments around the country remain disproportionately White. For example, the two largest police departments in the U.S., Chicago and New York, have a disproportionately White majority police force. The 3rd largest department in the U.S., the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) is the target of the present study. Although its officer make up is still not proportional to the population of its jurisdiction (Urbina & Alvarez 2015), it will nonetheless provide a unique case for this study because of the unique demographics of the department. As such, a study of officer race in the LAPD, as a minority-majority department, will have potential broad implications for the future of policing in the city, state, and across the country.

Minorities in a Minority-Majority Department

This study focuses on the effect of race on Hispanic/Latino law enforcement officers' ideology and experiences in the LAPD. Specifically, the study will focus on Mexican American officers in the LAPD. Previous studies have focused on the issue of race within a municipal police department; however, these studies have generally not included Hispanic/Latino officers. Most research has solely focused on the effect of race on White and Black officers, with studies additionally not thoroughly examining race from the perspective of the minority officers themselves (Haarr 1997). Previous research

suggests that in a White majority department, racial minorities (African Americans) on the force face many racist attitudes, discrimination, and exclusion from informal interactions and cultures. For example, White officers are more likely to support a colorblind ideology, rooted in beliefs about "reverse discrimination" and "unfair" promotion practices, while African American officer's ideology focuses on promoting minorities in order to boost more equality, and less White officer hegemony (Haarr 1997). However, the effect of race on Hispanic/Latinos officers is relatively unknown; their story and experience yet to be fully understood or even amply examined.

The importance of examining the experience of Mexican-American officers in the LAPD lies in several key points. First, as stated, very few studies have focused on Hispanic/Latinos and their experience as police officers in the U.S. (Martinez 2007; Urbina and Alvarez 2015). Second, no study has examined the ideology and experiences of Hispanic/Latino officers within the LAPD itself. Previous studies examining race (focusing on Black and White) have focused on smaller, less diverse departments and citizen populations (i.e., Milwaukee, Phoenix) and cannot be representative of larger, more diverse departments such as the LAPD. The LAPD is important because it is the third largest department in the US, and the largest department with a *Non-White* majority. Hispanic/Latinos compose 43% percent of the sworn personnel, followed by 35% White, 12% African American, and 7% Asian (LAPD SPRGE Report). The LAPD does not fit the mold of many of the departments across the country, with its *Non-White* majority. Hence, the experience of Hispanic/Latino officers can be expected to vary from other

smaller and less diverse departments, given the LAPD's demographics and the possible impact that it may have on race/ethnic relations.

Why Does it Matter?

As departments change to match citizen demographics (willfully or in the case of the LAPD because of the action taken by the Department of Justice), one would expect that the number of minority officers, especially Hispanic/Latino officers would increase. These changing demographics become of critical importance when one examines the possible effect of the racial diversity of law enforcement officers on the development and change of police culture and racial/ethnic relations within a department. The introduction of previously excluded minority groups could affect how officers socialize (Haarr 1997; Hassell & Brandl 2009). Additionally, the inclusion of minorities with different perspectives, based on different life experiences, could change the way officers interpret their professions and their environment.

The study can also have specific policy implications regarding the experiences of Hispanic/Latino officers in the LAPD. The literature has overlooked the examination of the ideology and experience of the large growing population of the Hispanic/Latino officers. Given the changing demographics of the country and state of California (Clemetson 2003). Given that Hispanics/Latinos are the second largest (and growing) racial/ethnic population in the U.S., the LAPD can serve as a case study of the effect of racial diversity in police departments. It can also provide a glimpse into the future of police demographics and police-police relations in the country/state. As of now, with the

lack of research, it is unknown how race affects the Hispanic/Latino officers experience and ideology. Does their ideology align more with the research on African American officer ideology and experience, or with the experiences of the historically majority White officers? The value of this information is paramount: If the Hispanic/Latino experience and ideology align more with African American officer experience, then as the Hispanic/Latino population increases, the positive changes in departments that are *assumed* to happen because of the increase in ethnic/racial diversity within the departments, seem more likely to manifest. However, if Hispanic/Latino experiences align more with the White experience, then it seems likely that even though there is racial diversity in-house, ideologically nothing really changes and hegemonic police culture continues to be reproduced. In either case, increasing racial and ethnic diversity in police departments can only be a start if reform within departments is the goal.

Chapter Outlines

Chapter 2 introduces the conceptual framework of the study and provides an overview of the background information necessary for establishing the research problem. This includes a historical analysis of the racial origins of modern policing, as well as race within the LAPD. This chapter also included a discussion of police culture, police demographics, and race in policing. Chapter 3 focuses specifically on the Los Angeles Police Department and minorities, with a specific emphasis on Hispanic/Latinos, Mexicans, and Mexican Americans. Chapter 4 outlines the theoretical context used in the study to examine race relations between officers. This includes a narrative understanding

of Latinos, specifically Mexican Americans, not only in American society, but how this is extended into modern police forces. Chapter 5 reviews the literature regarding minorities in law enforcement. This will include studies on minority officers which compares African American and White officers. This also chapter includes a review of the literature regarding Hispanic/Latino police officers. Chapter 6 is a discussion of the research strategy and methods undertaken to conduct the study. Chapter 7 contains the data analysis. Chapter 8 is a discussion of the study's results. Chapter 9 summarizes the study's results, the possible implications, and how they serve as a framework for future research.

CHAPTER 2: Background I: History, Policing, and the LAPD

In order to examine the association between race and law enforcement, one must include the history and dynamics within an organization, such as the Los Angeles Police Department. Also the association between race, police, and departments cannot be examined without understanding the history of the associations and how they created a context with which to understand the experience of the Mexican American officer in the Los Angeles Police Department. This section examines the key background necessary for understanding the context of law enforcement, Hispanic/Latino officers, policing practices in general, and how that came together in the LAPD.

Roots of Modern Police Practices

Before examining the race relations within police departments, it is important to review the roots of modern policing in the U.S., and why it's important for modern race relations within police departments around the country today. To create a general understanding and interpretation of police history is a difficult task to achieve. Different scholars have tried to analytically describe eras in police change, but the geographical spread and decentralization of local police departments across the country make this a difficult task to undertake (Kelling and Moore 1988). This section consists of two different interpretations of police practices. The first analysis is more in line with what has historically been generally understood to be the prevailing historical analysis of the 'evolutionary' change in policing. The notion of an evolutionary change is essentially a color-blind understanding of policing and police change, generally void of the impact of

race and race relations. This examination is described as more of an evolutionary understanding of policing, in which the changes in policing over the years are understood to be a natural progression within departments, through their own volition, and not through the many struggles with populations that were negatively affected by policing and the criminal justice system (Kelling & Moore 1988). The second notion examines the history and change within departments from a more critical perspective, and distinctly places race at the center of change (not a natural evolution) of police departments, but also argues that race is the fundamental reason the institution exists in its early and now contemporary form (William & Murphy 1990).

Kelling and Moore (1988), in examining the history of policing in the United States, found it useful to analyze policing through three general eras. In general, scholars usually agree with the historical existence of generally similar eras of policing (Barlow & Barlow 2002; Escobar 1999). These three eras are distinguished from one another by the dominance of a particular strategy of policing. As Kelling & Moore state,

> "The political era, so named because of the close ties between police and politics, dated from the introduction of police into municipalities during the 1840's, continued through the progressive period, and ended during the early 1900's. The reform era developed in reaction to the political era. It took hold during the 1930's, thrived during the 1950's and 1960's, began to erode during the late 1970's. The reform era now seems to be giving way to an era emphasizing community problem solving (Kelling & Moore 1988:2)."

The appropriately named political era, had close interrelated ties between the local police and local political officials. As Kelling and Moore state, "The relationship was often reciprocal: political machines recruited and maintained police in office and on the

beat, while police helped political leaders maintain their political offices by encouraging citizens to vote for certain candidates, discouraging them from voting for others, and, at times, by assisting in rigging elections (Kelling & Moore 1988:3)." Additionally, officers were used for personal gain beyond political means. The authority and to a lesser extent the legitimacy of the early departments came from political means. The focus of the departments was on crime control, order maintenance, and some broader social services. The bulk of the work was officers walking beats through neighborhoods.

When discussing the effectiveness, as well as the benefits and downfalls of the political era, The first point of interest was that police were integrated into neighborhoods and that they enjoyed support from its citizens. However, Kelling and Moore (1988) acknowledge that citizens were actually in support of the dominant political interest of the era. In general, the authors focus on a more hegemonic view of police relations; that is, if you are not part of the dominant group there was less support for the police. Additionally, the authors also focused on the fact that police provided useful services to communities. For example, they note that the police helped immigrants (primarily English and Dutch immigrants) in establishing themselves and their communities, and in finding jobs. This might not have been necessarily the case completely around the country, where immigrants might have been treated differently by police (Mirande 1987). Another service to the community they note, was that police were used to contain riots. However, the authors fail to mention what the riots were about, who was part of the riots, and the social conditions that caused the riots.

The biggest weakness during this era was the corruption between officers, politicians, and powerful citizens. The decentralized nature of police at this time did not help as officers were loosely supervised; police faced fewer repercussions about their actions or affiliations, because there was very little oversight. There was bribery between officers and citizens in order to not enforce certain laws, and police had an influence in elections, including the protection of political forces. Kelling and Moore (1988) note that minority groups were not part of the dominant group that received the services. As the authors describe,

"Often this would lead towards violence toward minorities, close identification of police with neighborhoods and neighborhood norms often resulted in discrimination against strangers and others who violated those norms, especially minority ethnic and racial groups. Often ruling their beats with the 'ends of their nightsticks,' police regularly targeted outsiders and strangers for roasting and 'curbstone justice (Kelling & Moore 1988:3).' "

During the political era, and because of the close link between police, politics and political leaders, Kelling and Moore argue that citizens and other external pressures were put as overseers of departments in order to reform them. Many of the early efforts were generally ineffective. However, the authors note that a combination of internal and external forces did succeed in ending the political era, and introduced the reform era of policing, also commonly referred to as the professionalism movement, which generally lasted from the early 20th century, to policing throughout the 1970's. Specifically the authors identify Hoover, and the reformation of what would become the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as being tangentially influential in the reformation of policing. The FBI

reformed itself as an organization towards professionalism and used the bureaucratic form as a useful tool. As a result, the legitimacy and authority of departments changed from political means to the more current form of legitimacy from the state. For police reformers, politics and political involvement were the problems in American policing. Police reformers allied themselves with Progressives to end the close ties with politicians and police. Some states even gave control of the police to state governments, and in other large cities reforms also made the chief of police more accountable to the public. These strategies were overall effective as Kelling and Moore state, "So persuasive was the argument of reformers to remove political influences from policing, that police departments became one of the most autonomous public organizations in urban government (1988:5)."

With the centralization of police departments, the increase of bureaucratic structuring became apparent as the discretion that was given to officers in the political era, which was also seen as an influence of corruption, led to patrol officers having little discretion over their work in the reform era. This had the positive effect of limiting corruption and influence, but it also created a further disconnect between police and citizens. The officer was there to enforce the law and prevent crime, not to do social work. As Kelling and Moore (1988) state, "Police had been intimately linked to citizens. During the era of reform policing, the new model demanded an impartial law enforcer who related to citizens in professionally neutral and distant terms (Kelling & Moore 1988:5)."

Overall, Kelling and Moore argue that the reform era was a response to the political era, as an attempt to clean up departments and limit corruption by centralizing departments with legitimate authority and new oversight. However, there were many problems with the reform era. As with the political era, Kelling and Moore acknowledge that minority citizens may not have received many of the same benefits awarded to others in the reform era. They briefly focus on the topic as they state,

> "Despite attempts by police departments to create equitable police allocation systems and to provide impartial policing to all citizens, many minority citizens, especially Blacks during the 1960's and 1970's, did not perceive [sic] their treatment as equitable or adequate. They protested not only police mistreatment, but lack of treatment-inadequate or insufficient services-as well (Kelling & Moore 1988:6)."

The authors also argued that the civil rights movement and other anti-war movements challenged the police and their legitimacy. Their legitimacy was also questioned because of under representation and discriminatory practices in departments, claimed by racial minorities and women.

The community problem solving era, otherwise known as the community policing model, sought to improve on the professionalism introduced in the reform era, and to improve relations that were lost with the community in the political era. While the political era did have corruption, it also had officers within communities who were able to know members of the community, to better serve them. The community approach, as the title implies, focuses more on a return to a community oriented approach to policing, while still holding to the professional gains in the reform era. This would include aspects such as patrolling (especially foot patrols), to create a more intimate relationship between

officers and the community, long term assignments of officers to areas, and as Kelling and Moore state,

> "Programs that emphasize familiarity between citizens and police ie. police knocking on doors, consultations, crime control meetings for police and citizens, assignment to officers of "caseloads" of households with ongoing problems, problem solving, etc., revitalization or development of Police Athletic League programs, educational programs in grade and high schools, and other programs. Moreover, police are encouraged to respond to the feelings and fears of citizens that result from a variety of social problems or from victimization (1988: 10)."

In general Kelling and Moore's history of policing in the United States is incomplete. When they describe the eras of policing they generally omit a discussion of race and ethnic relations in policing. In areas where minorities are significant to history, the authors gloss over them as a footnote, not central to the history of policing or relegated to a 'perception', not as a given reality minorities experienced. What Kelling and Moore provide is an analysis that does not include the minority experience by providing an evolutionary view of policing that makes it seem as if each era was just a natural progression and the rational improvement in law enforcement strategies.

Other scholars disagree with Kelling and Moore's account of the general history of policing. Specifically Williams and Murphy (1990) argue that unlike Kelling and Moore's analysis, which barely addresses the topic of race or the effect of police action on racial minorities, they argue that race is central to understanding the origin and changes within policing in general, and by extension modern policing today. Williams and Murphy argue that Kelling and Moore, and by extension the predominant ideology behind historical and contemporary policing, fail to take into account the racial history of

the United States in their analysis. In addition, Williams and Murphy focus on how slavery, segregation, discrimination, and racism have impacted police relations within communities. Also, they argue that Kelling and Moore are silent on the importance that minorities have played in the past when it comes to policing in the United States in general. It diminishes the accuracy of their account of policing in the United States, and as Williams and Murphy note, makes it less useful than it otherwise could be in understanding the past and predicting the future of American policing. Focusing less on a hegemonic approach to reform and change in policing, Williams and Murphy see the changes in police as a result of social forces and climates, including the history of race relations. As they state, "They see police departments as largely autonomous; we see them as barometers of the society in which they operate (Williams & Murphy 1990:1)."

Williams and Murphy (1990) argue that policing in the United States usually ignores the history of slavery in the United States in the South (political era). Williams and Murphy (1990) argue the importance of this, because the modern style of policing actually developed in the South. This was done to prevent the possibility of slave revolts and prevented slaves from congregating together. As they state,

"Their analysis omits several crucial parts of the story of policing in America: the role of 'slave patrols' and other police instruments of racial oppression; the role of the police in imposing racially biased laws; and the importance of racial and social turmoil in the creation of the first versions of America's 'new police'(1990:1).''

The authors explain that these patrols had full police power to return slaves, and prevent revolts. This is a topic that contemporary ideas of history of policing in the United States

generally ignore. Continuing further into the "political era," scholars fail to account for many of the reasons for the creation of police departments in cities that targeted the influx of immigrants, a rapidly growing population, and major changes in industrialization (Williams & Murphy 1990). For those with political power, the era provided many benefits, but to those without, such as racial minorities, they were subjected to racist and discriminatory laws, and the general status quo that was upheld by local police departments (both in the South, Northeast, and later as described in the Southwest).

Continuing with the reform era, Williams and Murphy argue that Kelling and Moore again ignore the racial history and context in which these changes occurred. As the authors state,

"According to Kelling and Moore's interpretation, the basic police strategy began to change during the early 1900's. By the 1930's, they argue, the reform era of policing was in full sway. Strikingly, their discussion completely overlooks the momentous events of the Civil War and Reconstruction, a time of great change in the legal and political status of minorities (1990:2)."

While Kelling and Moore do acknowledge that many reforms did not positively affect minorities, they also fail to focus on the effect of the reforms on minorities who were or sought employment in policing. Even those reforms seemed not to benefit minorities; as the authors state,

"Many of the most notable advances in policing brought about by the advent of the 'reform era' proved to be elusive, if not counterproductive, for minorities. Several of the hiring and promotional standards, although implemented as antidotes to the rampant nepotism and political favoritism that had characterized policing during the 'political era' proved to be detrimental to Blacks-just at the time when, to a limited extent, because of

their increasing political power, they were beginning to acquire the credentials that would have allowed them to qualify by the old standards (1990:2)."

There was some reform later under the professionalism movement which saw increases in the number of minority officers in different locations. However, within the department cultural ideology did not change or changed very slowly if it did; the people that the officers were there to initially control were now slowly becoming part of their police force. Williams and Murphy also note that the changes that occurred for the populations that were actually being policed, seemed like great changes, however for minorities and those without power, the transition of the reform era was pretty much unnoticed (Williams & Murphy 1990).

Williams & Murphy also state that minorities played a very large roll in the advancing of the community policing model. As the authors state,

"It was the riots of the late 1960's-and the election of many Black and White progressive mayors, who appointed like minded police chiefs-that stimulated broad social investments in police agencies, therefore putting the issue of police-community relations inescapably on the minds of police executives and the mayors who appointed them (1990:2)."

Additionally the riots of the 1960's, which spawned the National Advisory commision on civil disorder appointed by President Johnson in 1967, found that much of the riots were actually caused by police and the relationship with the communities. As the authors state "The Kerner Commission found that many of the riots had been precipitated by police actions, often cases of insensitivity, sometimes incidents of outright brutality. They saw an atmosphere of hostility and cynicism reinforced by a

widespread belief among many Blacks in a double standard of justice and protection (1990:11)." More generally, they concluded that: "In many ways the policeman only symbolizes much deeper problems (1990:11)."

While Williams and Murphy do interject and include the minority experience and influence that they had on policing strategy and history, as with many scholars in the field they also focus almost strictly on the history of race in policing using the Black/White binary. They inadvertently commit the same theoretical faux pas as Kelling and Moore by recounting the history of policing from only one perspective by claiming it as inclusive of the minority experience. They do in passing reference "and other minorities," but this in itself denigrates and homogenizes the minority experience as singular. They do not include the history of Latinos and specifically Mexican-Americans in policing history. However, Williams and Murphy do understand that the history of police strategy cannot be separated from the history of the nation as a whole as many have done. As they state,

> "The fact that the legal order not only countenanced but sustained slavery, segregation, and discrimination for most of our nation's history-and the fact that the police were bound to uphold that order-set a pattern for police behavior and attitudes toward minority communities that has persisted until the present day (1990:2)."

Police Culture

Presently, the topic of police culture has been at the forefront of public and political interest. Specifically there have been several high profile acts of violence toward minority victims by police officers around the country. The death of Philando Castile, an African American male who was shot and killed while he was cooperative during a traffic

stop, and the death of Alton Sterling in Baton Rouge, who was shot by officers as they were holding him down on the ground spawned protests and demonstrations around the country. In Dallas, during one of the demonstrations, on July 7, 2016 Micah Johnson who was reportedly angry about the police killings of African Americans, fired upon several officers killing 5 Dallas police officers and injuring nine others. Police later used a bomb attached to a robot to kill Johnson. The following section examines police culture and its impact on policing and its impact on the ideology and actions of police officers.

Culture, in general, consists of symbols, language, customs, and norms that help a group function. Culture within a specific industry or occupation consists of "...socially transmitted attitudes and values that help members of a group cope with strains and problems they confront (Paoline 2001:1)." Occupational culture is usually a part of a group that is needed for some type of social cohesion. Classic examples of the study of culture within these industries include the military and especially police. Culture within police departments is said to have developed over time for several reasons including environmental factors, the danger associated with the occupation, and the homogeneity of the officer population (Crank 2010; Paoline 2001). In particular, police culture is seen as developing through the homogeneity of the population of police officers themselves. Historically, minorities, women, and other groups have been excluded from service as police officers, or if able to serve they did so in a token fashion with several reduced policing powers (Barlow & Barlow 2000).

While there are positive aspects of police culture, such as helping with the stress and strain of the position, most of the common associations with classic police culture are historically negative. For example, scholars have stated that police culture is a hindrance to any major police reform (Goldsmith 1990; Dean 1995). Others have stated that the culture is a factor in citizen rights and police authority abuses (Brown 1988; Kappler, Sluder & Alpert, 1998; McElvain 2006). Researchers have also found that culture has hindered internal reporting of officer wrongdoing (Heck 1992). Police culture not only affects relations between citizens and police, it can also affect police-police interaction and the environment within the departments. For example, Brown (1988) found that police culture dictates that established members treat new members with suspicion. This is based on the perspective that new officers are considered as not completely part of the established ingroup. New officers are expected to display their loyalty before they are accepted by veteran officers. Only then will they receive the same protection, loyalty, and privileges of the other members. This includes backing other officers, but also willing to use force, sometimes excessive, on suspects to prove their loyalty (McElvain 2006).

While police culture is presented as an all encompassing unitary culture, some researchers have noted important differences and changes that could be expected to affect a singular police culture over time (Farackas and Manning 1997;Manning 1995; Paoline 2001). Manning (1995) believes that culture varies by officer rank. He differentiates officer ranks into three types: the lower participants (patrol and street sergeants), middle managers (some sergeants up to department brass), and top command (brass

commanders, superintendents, deputy chiefs, and chiefs). Manning asserts that different ranks are associated with different, norms, expectations, goals, etc., which can have a effect on their actions/ ideology and culture. Additionally, the general social changes that have taken place in society as well as in departments over the last several decades could also be expected to have an impact on the police culture. The singular hegemonic police culture is assumed to change with the hiring of more minority and female officers. The demographics of the traditional officer (i.e., White, male, working class, military experienced, high school educated) (Van Maanen, 1974) is no longer as prominent as it once was (depending on geographic location). Departments are represented by more racial minorities, women, and those with more education (Walker 1999).

Scholars posit that demographic diversity in the department can affect culture in 2 ways. First, the inclusion of minorities and other populations, with a different perspectives based on different life experiences, could change the way traditional officers interpret their profession and environment. Secondly, the introduction of previously excluded groups could affect how officers socialize and share social space (Haarr 1997; Hassell & Brandl 2009). While this might not result in more positive relationships, it could result in police culture segmentation, as minority officers may question or reject the traditional occupational culture (Haarr 1997).

Haarr (1997) focuses on the perception of police culture. Like other scholars she theorizes that there is no uniform assessment of police culture (Manning 1995). She proposes that, "Officers will alter their behavior and adjust their actions and interactions

in accordance with their reading of social and political situations, their personal interests, and their varying experiences in the organization (1997:53)." Hence police culture is more fully available to some groups in the organization than to others. Haarr (1997) focuses on the reality that many researchers have found that racial minorities in the force face racist attitudes, discrimination, and exclusion from informal interactions and cultures. Using qualitative research methods in a small midwestern town, where White officers are the majority, she finds a lack of informal socialization between different races in the department, revealing a segregation of sharing social space, and that the increased diversity has not helped racial interaction. She finds that the belief exists among White officers that minority cops have advantages in the department. For example, more than two-thirds (70 percent) of all White male interviewees perceived that Black officers had an unfair advantage over white officers in hiring and promotion. This perception has great consequences, as Haarr states,

> "The most important consequence of this conviction is the assumption that Blacks who are promoted must be incompetent, because if they were competent they would have been hired without the help of affirmative action. This reasoning requires a denial of the reality of racial discrimination. Further, field observations and conversational data revealed that white officers were skeptical about Black supervisors. They regularly watched for mistakes made by Black ranking officers, especially immediate supervisors, that could help them to rationalize and reaffirm their contentions that Blacks are less intelligent than whites, and less qualified to hold position of rank in the department (1997:69)."

This present study expands on Haarr's study by expanding the scope from a small midwestern department to a large western city department, and from a White majority department to a racially/ethnically diverse department. This dissertation also serves to

examine the police-police interactions in the current era, almost 20 years after Haarr's work, also including Latinos. It examines the impact of the current police culture in the LAPD on Latino officers.

Latinos in Law Enforcement

Before proceeding with an examination of the demographics and racial history of the Los Angeles Police Department, it is important to examine the status of Hispanics/Latinos in law enforcement. As of 2015, about 18 percent of US citizens were considered Hispanic/Latino (Colby & Ortman 2015). Given these numbers and the continuing growth of Hispanic/Latinos in general, and also in law enforcement, it becomes important to track their representation at all levels of law enforcement; federal, state, and local. It is not surprising that many agencies on every level have had issues in recruiting, hiring, and retaining Hispanic/Latinos. However, targeting Hispanic/Latinos for recruitment has also not been a priority for many police departments until fairly recently, given the disproportionate lack of minority officers, court mandated hirings, and suggested recruiting because of the lack of proportional representation across the country. Reaves and Maskaly (2015) examine these exact changes in the demographics of officers over time using different sources of data. They use the Bureau of Justices statistics from the U.S. department of Justice as part of its census of federal law enforcement officers (FLEO). This census has been collected every three to four years from 1987 to 2007. While there are limitations to the data, this is the best available source for examining national trends in the hiring of Hispanic/Latino officers at the levels discussed. The latest

data from the LEMAS 2013 was also used to create a more accurate representation of Hispanics/Latinos in law enforcement today.

Beginning with national trends, Reaves and Maskaly (2015) estimate that between 1997 and 2007 the number of federal, state, and local law enforcement officers of Hispanic/Latino origin increased by 54% from 57,000 in 1997 to 88,000 officers in 2007. The number of federal law enforcement officers more than doubled in this time frame from 11,000 to 22,500. State and local law enforcement officers of Hispanic/Latino origin increased 42% over this same period from 46,100 to 65,200 officers (Reaves and Maskaly 2015). These numbers have to be examined in context, including where the officers are located, their rank, and the changing demographics of the country. Hence, a thorough breakdown of the three levels, with more emphasis on the local level is provided for the purposes of this dissertation.

Reaves and Maskaly (2015) examined the 12 year period of the FLEO data collection and found that federal agencies as a whole have kept pace with the growth of the Hispanic/Latino population nationwide. In 1996 13% of full-time federal law enforcement officers employed nationwide were of Hispanic/Latino origin compared to 10.6% of the US population overall, so that Hispanic/Latinos actually were over-represented by about 24%. By 2008, the number of full-time Latino federal officers increased to about 19.8%, with Latinos being over-represented in federal law enforcement agencies by about 29% or approximately 6000 officers (Reaves & Maskaly 2015). As the authors suggest, on the surface it appears that the representativeness of

Hispanic/Latino officers appears exemplary, as agencies have accomplished over representation and have steadily grown in proportion with the change in demographics across the country. However, when examining where these officers actually are employed, the picture is unclear. For example, the two largest employers of Latino federal officers is US Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and US Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). About 14,000 of the officers of the 24,000 Hispanic/Latinos officers on the federal level in 2008 were employed by Customs and Border Protection. This is followed by US immigration and Custom Custom enforcement with just over three thousand officers. These two federal agencies account for nearly 60% of all Hispanic/Latino federal officers (Reaves and Maskaly 2015). If we further examine Hispanic/Latinos at the federal level, as a percentage of their agencies, for CBP Latinos compose 38% of officers, and for ICE, 24.3% of officers are Latino. However, while these percentages are above the demographics of the population, this is not the case with other federal agencies. For example if we examine the 5 major Department of Justice agencies: the Bureau of Prisons (12.9%), FBI (8.1%), DEA (9.3%), Marshall Service (9.6%), and ATF (5.8%), Latinos were greatly underrepresented, needing over an additional 2,000 officers to reach proportional representation (Reaves and Maskaly 2015).

State and Local Demographics

Examining state and local levels of law enforcement agencies in the initial year of the LEMAS survey (1987), 4.4% of state and local law enforcement officers employed nationwide were Hispanic/Latino. This was below the 9% national Latino representation of the 1990 census (Reaves and Maskaly 2015). Specific agencies did not fare much better during this time: Local police departments were at 4.5% Latino representation, sheriff offices at 4.3% Latino representation, and state police & Highway Patrol agencies at 3.8% Latino representation during this time frame (Reaves and Maskaly 2015). By 2007 Latinos in local and state departments had increased to about 9.4% representation. Representation of Latinos also increased in all three types of agencies; local police increased to 10.3%, sheriffs to 8%, and state agencies at 6.2% Latino representation. While there was an increase in the number of Latinos officers, the increases were not on pace with the proportion of Latinos in the US during the same period. From 1987 to 2007 the percentage of Latino residents increased from 8.2% to 15.1% (Reaves and Maskaly 2015).

Reaves & Maskaly (2015) also created a representation index to provide a measure of how well the ethnic/racial diversity of the officers employed by a state or local law enforcement agency represents a jurisdiction served. Very similar to the Gini coefficient of measuring inequality, a representation index of 1 would mean Latinos living in the community are fully represented on the police force. An index score greater than 1, means over representation, where a score under 1 would mean under

representation. As of 2007 the largest state enforcement agency, the California Highway Patrol, was also the largest employer of Latino officers. The representation index for California state law enforcement agencies was RI=.55, with 1,167 additional officers needed to reach proportional representation. For comparison, New York, at a distant second of total number of state officers required for representation required just over five hundred officers needed to have full representation [RI=.38] (Reaves and Maskaly 2015). There were also several states in 2007 that had very low representation index scores. Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, North Carolina, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wyoming had a representation index below .08, with many of those states having a representation index of 0. Ohio was the only state that had a proportional or over representation of Latino officers at the state level with an index score of 1.31(Reaves & Maskaly, 2015).

At the county level, in 2007 8% of officers were Latino. In examining the largest sheriff's department in the country, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's department was also the largest employer of Latino officers at the county level. In 2007, 29.6% of Sheriff in Los Angeles County were Latino. However, during this time 47.3% of the residents of Los Angeles County were Latino. This leads to a representation index value of .63 for the Los Angeles Sheriff's department. The Sheriff's department would have to hire an additional 1,346 Hispanic/Latino officers to reach Latino resident proportionality (Reaves and Maskaly 2015).

Local Police Departments

At the local level, among full time sworn personnel in local police departments across the country, 10.3% of officers were Latino (2007). Although the larger police agencies tended to have higher percentages of Latino officers, just 5 of the 50 largest local departments had a representation index of .90 or higher. In these 50 largest departments the percentages of Latino representation is about 18% (Reaves & Maskaly, 2015). For the largest 50 departments, the representation index for those departments combined was .72. These agencies would still need to hire nearly 11,000 Latino officers to achieve full representation. Examining the three largest departments in the country, the NYPD has the greatest representation index at .90, followed by the LAPD (.81), and Chicago PD with a .66 representation index. Combined these three departments have a representation index of .826. The LAPD specifically would need an additional 878 officers to reach proportional Latino representation (Reaves & Maskaly 2015).

Racial Composition of Los Angeles and the LAPD Today

Examining the demographics of the Los Angeles reveals no group that comprises greater than 50% of the population (Census 2010). The largest percentage of the population is comprised by Hispanics at 48.5%, followed by Whites at 28.70%, Asians at 11.3%, and African Americans at 9.6% of the population. Currently it is expected that large police departments, such as the LAPD, attempt to match the demographics of their populations. As described, the two largest departments in the country, the NYPD and Chicago PD, come close to matching their demographics of jurisdiction.

In the city of Los Angeles minorities comprise almost 75% of the population. Similarly, for sworn personnel in the LAPD, there is no majority in the department, as minorities compose about 67% of the personnel. Focusing on specific ethnic/ racial demographics, Hispanics/Latinos comprise the largest percentage of personnel at about 46%. This is followed by Whites who compose 33.19% of the personnel, followed by Blacks at 10.66%, and Asians at 7.48% (LAPD SPRGE Report 2015). However, ethnic/racial proportionality decreases substantially when separated by rank. Minorities make up about 51% of command staff and Whites compose 49% of command staff. Specifically, Hispanics/Latinos are represented at about 27% of command staff, Blacks at 15.45%, and Asians at 7.27% of command staff. Focusing on Lieutenants and below the percentage of minority sworn personnel is almost 67%, with Whites composing 33%. For lower ranking personnel, Hispanics/Latinos compose 45.95%, African Americans compose 10.6%, and Asians represent 7.49%.

CHAPTER 3: Background II Minorities and the LAPD

There is an extensive documented history of the LAPD and racial/ethnic minorities. The LAPD has a negative track record of relations between the police and minorities (Davis 2006;Lasley 2012). The section will focus on the relationship between the LAPD and the Hispanic/Latino community, and how that relationship has developed and changed over time to create the context necessary for the study. The extensive background will also include specific events involving police and Non-Latino minorities that are of relevance in establishing the context for minorities in that era (i.e., Watts riots, Rodney King riots).

Hispanic/Latinos and the LAPD

While most of the incidents involving the LAPD and minorities have focused on African Americans, there is a long history between the LAPD and the Hispanic/Latino (and more specifically the Mexican) community. It is important to understand how the LAPD has interacted with the Hispanic/Latino community in relation to other racial minority populations in the city over the years. It is also important to understand how that history impacts modern day relations between the Hispanic/Latino community and the police department, including Mexican American officers. Escobar (1999), specifically focuses on the Hispanic/Latino community and the LAPD since the inception of the department in the 1800's, until the era of hostility between officers and the Mexican American community in the 1940's. Escobar's argument is that over the course of several decades, the relationship between the LAPD and the Hispanic/Latino community has

gradually increased in hostility which resulted in several clashes between them. Additionally, Escobar argues that the nature and level of conflict between law enforcement and the community is not a new phenomena, but actually began in the first half of the 20th century. Escobar (1999) believes that the relationship between the Mexican community and the LAPD did not necessarily begin on hostile grounds. However, the relationship between the LAPD and the Mexican community soon evolved with the demographic, economic, political, and overall social changes in the city.

The Early Period

The legacy of the 19th century Mexican experience in the US and their status as an inferior racial group within society had an effect on relations between the community and law enforcement, specifically the LAPD. During this early period in the first decades of the 20th century, there was much violence in the city of Los Angeles, with much of the violence having a to do with race (Escobar 1999). During this era, the early years of the LAPD were similar to other large police departments in the country, specifically when it came to the influence of political power on the actions and control of the department (Escobar 2003).

The LAPD soon gained the reputation of being one of the most corrupt police forces in the nation. An example of such political interference was the LAPD's ongoing suppression of organized labor. In the very early 1900's, it was in this form that the LAPD most often came into conflict with the ever expanding Mexican community of Los Angeles. Most Mexicans found themselves in low paying lowly jobs that required little

skill. While in these lowly occupations the Mexican community often became involved in union activity, which the LAPD suppressed. Escobar (2003) argues that while the LAPD probably expended no more effort in suppressing Mexican labor unions than it did in suppressing White unions, this suppression had a greater effect in the Mexican community since it maintained the subordination of Mexican labor.

The LAPD serving as an enforcer clearly created hostility with the Mexican community. However, during this stage in Los Angeles history, there is little indication that the LAPD viewed the Mexican population as posing any particularly serious crime problem. The department did hire a handful of Mexican American officers to patrol Mexican communities, but the department consequently had no specific policy for handling Mexican crime (Escobar 1999). Nevertheless, the hiring of Hispanic/Latino officers for the specific reason of patrolling their own neighborhoods was a tactic that was utilized by the department. While the LAPD paid no special attention to Mexican crime at this time, the department occasionally exploited public fears. This included news stories in which officers expressed concern over increased numbers of assaults and homicides in the Mexican sections of the city and the perceived lack of cooperation from the Mexican community (Escobar 1999;2003).

Between 1910 and 1920, the media began playing a larger role in the relationship between the LAPD and the Mexican community by paying more attention to crimes in which Mexicans were the perpetrators, especially when the victims were not Mexican. Beginning in 1912, newspapers started more frequently publishing stories about

Mexicans who endangered White store owners and White citizens in downtown (Escobar 2003). Additionally, there were stories published of conflict between Mexicans and the LAPD. These stories were of conflicts mostly while suspects were resisting arrest. There were occasions in which Mexicans clashed with police attempting to prevent the police from arresting other Mexicans. These events would sometimes result in larger incidents. For example, in May 1914, one hundred Mexicans rioted at La Plaza, a traditional gathering place for Los Angeles Mexicans, to prevent one of their countrymen from being arrested (Escobar 2003).

The relationship between the Mexican community and the criminal justice system (including the LAPD) in Southern California was also not on the best terms during this time. As described by scholars (Kelling & Moore 1988; Williams & Murray 1990), those who were not part of the eminent population did not benefit as widely during the political era. For the Mexicans in Los Angeles, there was a belief that Mexicans could not get fair treatment from police and the criminal justice system in general. Because of this, the Mexican government intervened on behalf of many of the residents in Los Angeles. Escobar (1999) argues that while the intervention of the Mexican government resulted from the belief that Mexicans did not receive equal treatment from criminal justice system, Mexicans in fact had more to fear from police officers. Throughout the 20th century, Mexicans have accused the LAPD of brutality and other forms of misconduct, with most of the behavior by the officers going relatively unpunished (Escobar 1999;2003). Between 1900 and 1919, seventeen charges of police misconduct were

brought before the police commission either by or on behalf of Mexicans, with many more unknown that were not reported. The commission exonerated the accused officer in all but three of the cases (Escobar 1999).

As mentioned, the most spectacular confrontations in the early part of the century occurred when Mexicans acted to improve their economic status, participating in labor activities. Many of these unions were nationalistic in nature, which allowed the LAPD to justify police coercion to suppress the union activity (Escobar 1999). The first twentieth-century confrontation between Mexican workers and the LAPD came in 1903, when Mexican track layers organized the Unión Federal Mexicanos (UFM) and went on strike at Henry E. Huntington's Pacific Electric Railway Company. Through the use of violence, the LAPD ensured that the organized tactics failed (Escobar 1999).

There was also the Christmas riot of 1913, where according to police, 6 officers attempted to enforce a law that prohibited speeches in public parks without a permit. During the incident one of the officers shot and killed a Mexican man in the crowd. Witnesses stated that when the police arrived at the Plaza, the main speaker stood on a chair, on top of a table. The officers quickly proceeded to pull out the chair under him. One man protested the officers actions against the speaker and was hit with a club on the forehead, which opened a gash. After officers attacked the speaker, officers fought through the crowd hitting people with their clubs. Officers then chased people into the street to continue the beatings. The crowd soon focused their efforts on the main officer who pulled the chair from the speaker. The officer emerged bleeding from the head.

Other witnesses added that the police fired indiscriminately into the crowd. Later that night the LAPD entered Mexican establishments and arrested anyone who police thought might have been in the crowd or involved in the demonstrations. In total, the LAPD arrested 73 men; 56 were Mexican (Escobar 1999).

Mexican Activism

Like anti-labor activities, the LAPD attempted to suppress political activism that was related to events in Mexico. Most political activism by Los Angeles Mexicans was related to events in Mexico (the Mexican Revolution,1910–1920). Prior to 1910, most of the activity was aimed at removing Mexican dictator Porfirio Díaz from power. The LAPD responded to political activism related to the revolution in distinct ways. First, before 1910, the LAPD attempted to stop any political activity in Los Angeles that might undermine Díaz. This response reflected the general attitude of the city's White majority and also the pro-Diaz capitalists with ventures in Mexico (Escobar 1999). Using illegal tactics and even acting as paid agents of the Mexican government, members of the LAPD harassed and intimidated Mexican political activists in Los Angeles. Despite the LAPD's illegal tactics, city officials never disciplined the policemen involved in these activities (Escobar 1999).

It was during this time that Mexican officers were used to specifically target and arrest members of organizations who were anti-Diaz. There were specifically three Mexican LAPD officers who were notorious for harassing Mexican activists. Not surprisingly this additionally increase tension and worsened the relationship between the

Mexican community and the LAPD. It wasn't until the fall of 1910 that the new police chief felt he had sufficient evidence against the three officers to charge them with corruption. The three officers were demoted and then later suspended. However, despite specific evidence against the three detectives, the commission dismissed all charges against two of the officers and later charges against all three Mexican officers were cleared (Escobar 1999).

The relationship between the LAPD and the Mexican community also changed during this time because Whites came to see Mexicans as a threat to the nation (Escobar 1999). The activities of the LAPD at this time has been labeled the Brown Scare (Escobar 1999). The LAPD Chief of Police at the time increased the number of patrolmen on duty in Mexican communities, ordered the arbitrary searches for weapons, and held without charge several Mexicans for fear that they might make incendiary speeches. The LAPD's activities during the Brown Scare had important consequences for the future. This was the first time in the twentieth century that a local law-enforcement agency had developed a set of practices for controlling the Mexican community (Escobar 1999). The LAPD systematically violated the civil rights of Mexicans simply because they were Mexicans; this set a precedent for how the police would react during other periods of tension between Mexicans (and later Mexican- Americans) and Whites in Los Angeles (Escobar 1999).

Deportations and Labor

During the early 1930's Mexicans were used as scapegoats for the economic and social problems of the country and Los Angeles. Following federal ideology, Los Angeles officials launched a campaign to terrorize the city's population into leaving the area, where both citizens and non-citizens were affected. One way was through deportation and the fear of deportation. The deportation sweeps began on February 3, 1931 when federal agents along with LAPD and the sheriff's department, stopped individuals suspected of being deportable. By Saturday, February 7, immigration officials had arrested a total of thirty-five people considered deportable (Escobar 1999). The raids continued for several weeks, with the most dramatic incident occurring on February 26, 1931. At about three in the afternoon, federal immigration agents supported by police officers raided La Plaza, the traditional gathering place for the Mexican community. The wide publicity that the raids received caused many Mexicans to panic, stay in their homes and avoid public places (Escobar 1999). Chief Steckel justified the actions of the LAPD on his belief that immigrants and non-citizens were responsible for most of the city's crimes. Chief Steckel also made a statement that when his officers arrested a suspected deportable, attention would be paid to all members of their family as well (Escobar 1999). Nevertheless, as Escobar (1999) argues, the Depression-era deportations and the proceeding repatriation campaign that followed had a profound impact on Los Angeles Mexicans.

Mexican Americans & Mexican American Youth

Not only did the Mexican-American population grow between 1930 and 1940, it changed from being primarily an immigrant population to being American born. With the 1930's came the age of Mexican Americans determined to end discriminatory practices against their people (Garcia 1984). In the 1930's Mexican-American youth were becoming increasingly vocal about abusive police practices (Escobar 1999). Large numbers of Mexican American youths found themselves arrested for no other reason than they were of Mexican descent. This contributed to the development of a combative relationship between law enforcement and the Mexican American community, and the perception of Mexican American youth rebellion and hostility (Escobar 1999).

Mexican American officers specifically during this time seemed to be particularly cruel in their treatment of Mexican American youth. One example comes from the experience of an army private home on leave. On his way to the store he was stopped and questioned by two officers, one of them Mexican American. On his way back home from the store, the same two officers again stopped him and demanded to see his papers again. This time the private refused, and he received a beating at the hands of the Mexican American officer which resulted in a fractured skull and he had to be discharged from the army (Escobar 1999).

Sleepy Lagoon

On Sunday, August 2, 1942, José Díaz was found dying by a dirt road near Sleepy Lagoon, Commerce, CA. The night before, he attended a party where he and others were a part of a large fight. When found, he was taken to a local hospital, where he died later that day of the head injuries he sustained the night before. The media attributed the death to Mexican gangs (Endore 1944). Police officers quickly arrested more than twenty Mexican Americans, who were believed to be members of the 38th Street Gang, who were believed to be involved in the fighting that night. Police beat several of them in attempts to gain a confession about the alleged killing. The actual circumstances of Diaz's death were never determined (Pagan 2003). There were no witnesses or any physical evidence linking Diaz's death to anyone at the party that he attended earlier (Endore 1944). No proof even existed that anyone actually killed Diaz. Nevertheless, within a week prosecutors obtained first-degree murder indictments against twenty-two boys from the 38th Street neighborhood. Later, police also arrested three Mexican American girls who had accompanied the boys that night, and held them as material witnesses (Escobar 1999).

Police arrested an additional 34 Mexican American youth in connection with Jose Diaz death. The following weekend LAPD, and other law enforcement agencies conducted massive sweeps of Mexican American neighborhoods, taking in over 600 youth (Escobar 1999). In all, seventeen Mexican youth were indicted for the Jose Diaz

murder. The resulting trial lacked the fundamental requirements of due process (Endore 1944). The judge in the trial also permitted the Chief of the Foreign Relations Bureau of the Los Angeles sheriff's office, E. Duran Ayres, to testify that Mexicans were "blood thirsty," with a biological predisposition to criminality citing Aztec sacrifice rituals as evidence (Endore 1944; Escobar 1999).

1943 Los Angeles

Throughout the rest of the spring the anti-Mexican hysteria continued. The best example of which were the "Zoot Suit[1]" riots that transpired between June 3rd and June 10th, 1943. The catalyst for the riots began on May 30th when a group of zoot suiters fought with 11 sailors as they walked through the Mexican American community of Alpine. Fourteen off-duty LAPD officers descended on Alpine to discipline the zoot suiters. After the events on May 30th, servicemen scouted locations in which zoot suiters gathered in preparation for an organized attack (Escobar 1999). On June 3rd, a large group of sailors went through Alpine beating every zoot suiter they found. On Friday June 4th, two hundred sailors, drove through East Los Angeles, beating twenty or so zoot suiters (Pagan 2003). The LAPD arrested some sailors on their bases, however no charges were filed (Hillstrom 2014). The riots continued, and on June 5th, more servicemen descended on downtown Los Angeles looking for Mexican American youth.

On Sunday evening despite the presence of an additional 300 LAPD and Sheriff's department officers on the streets, the attacks by the sailors continued on any zoot suiters

[1] The symbols of this youthful rebellion were the "zoot suits" worn by many of the youths along with the slang language, and the general attitude of distaste for White hegemonic society (Escobar 1999)

they found. The LAPD continued to allow the violence against the Mexican youth to continue. The LAPD followed the servicemen, waited until the beatings were over, then arrested the Mexican American victims (Escobar 1999). On June 7, thousands of servicemen and civilians converged in downtown Los Angeles. The crowds dragged out unsuspecting Mexican American boys out of nearby establishments, beating them and ripping off their clothing. On June 8, military officials declared downtown out of bounds for military personnel (Pagan 2003). As the riots subsided, The Mcgucken Committee, appointed by the governor to investigate the riots, determined racism to be a central cause of the riots (Pagan 2003).

After, the LAPD made efforts to improve relations with the Mexican community. The reforms that the LAPD undertook came from the recommendations made by Governor Warren's Citizens Committee. Those recommendations included diminishing race as a factor in making arrests, along with increased training for officers in citizen equality (Escobar 1999). It should be noted that these responses were not a progressive at will action, but came only as a necessary response to the problems that erupted from existing policies and officer actions. The zoot suit riots also increased the call for more Mexican American law enforcement officers. However, the Chief of police responded by stating that not enough Mexican Americans took the necessary exam to become a police officer (Escobar 1999). The Chief also claimed that Mexican Americans additionally were unable to pass the examinations. After the war, the LAPD increased its Mexican American demographics by attracting returning veterans (Escobar 1999).

Bloody Christmas and Police Brutality

During the late 1940's the LAPD began to reform itself in the image of the new professionalism standard of policing. This meant removing corrupt officers, new training and procedures, better equipment, new hiring standards, and an overall more bureaucratic form (see Background I). This professionalism was further advanced with the implementation of Chief William Parker in August of 1950, who is considered one of the main contributors to the LAPD's professionalization. By the 1950's the LAPD had become the standard for professional model of policing (Escobar 2003). Unfortunately, it was this same professionalization that may have hindered justice for the victims of the event that came to be known as Bloody Christmas (Escobar 2003).

On Christmas Eve 1951, officers Julius Trojanowski and Nelson Browson of the LAPD responded to a report that minors were drinking at a local bar in the northeast section of downtown. When the two officers arrived they found seven young men at the bar. Five were Latino, two were White. The officers demanded that they leave the bar, the men refused which led to the officers using force to remove the men from the bar. This led to a fight between the young men and the officers. One officer received a black eye while the other officer received a cut on his head that required stitches. No arrests occurred at the scene, however several hours later LAPD officers arrested the seven men at their homes. All of the suspects except for one, were immediately taken to Los Angeles Central City Jail. The suspect who was not immediately taken to jail was

dragged to the squad car by his hair, was driven to Elysian Park where he was savagely beaten by several officers (Burt 2001).

On Christmas morning, a large number of officers were attending the department Christmas eve party. A rumor was spread at the party about the incident at the bar earlier in the day, that officer Trojanowski lost an eye in the fight, which was completely inaccurate. The drunken officers decided to punish the prisoners. As Escobar (2003) describes, "The effects of the liquor, the desire to avenge a brother officer, and the knowledge that the prisoners were relatively powerless Mexican Americans produced an atmosphere conducive to brutality (2003:184)." As many as fifty officers proceeded to beat the prisoners for over an hour and a half. At least 100 people knew of or witnessed the beatings. The men sustained serious injuries that included punctured bladders and kidneys and broken bones. One victim was kicked so hard in the temple that his head was temporarily paralyzed (Escobar 2003). Even with all the witnesses, department officials managed to keep the case from the public eye for over two months.

It wasn't until February of 1952, that another incident brought police brutality against the Mexican community to the forefront. The incident was a violent confrontation between Anthony Rios, chairman of the Community Service Organization and two LAPD officers. Rios and his friend Alfred Ulloa, saw two men who they believed to be drunk, beating another man in the parking lot of a cafe in East Los Angeles. Rios and Ulloa, voiced their concerns about the beating to the two assailants, not knowing that the two men were plainclothes police officers. When the two men, Officers Najera and

Kellenberger, identified themselves as LAPD, Rios demanded to know their badge numbers. The two officers did not comply and instead drew their guns and threatened to kill both Rios and Ulloa (Escobar 2003). Rios and Ulloa were then arrested on charges of interfering with an officer (Burt 2001). Both men claimed that at the jail both officers stripped them of their clothing and proceeded to beat them. Rios and Ulloa then filed an official complaint. This is where further accusations of police brutality against Mexican Americans was brought to Chief Parker's attention. Parker claimed the charges were wrecking the police department (Escobar 2003).

It was the trial of Rios and Ulloa that further sparked interest in police misconduct and abuse. The jury found both Rios and Ulloa not guilty of the charges, and equally as important legitimized the accusations of police brutality on the minority community. It was during the Rios trial that the events of Bloody Christmas finally came to the public's attention. The jury unfortunately did not agree with the defendant's side of the incident and found the defendant's guilty of battery and disturbing the peace. The judge for the trial of the seven young men however was not pleased with the testimony given by the defendant's about the actions taken by the LAPD, and called for an independent investigation into the alleged beatings.

As expected, the LAPD fought back on the accusations of misconduct. Chief Parker himself claimed that the accusers were lying, and claimed that criticizing the LAPD damaged law enforcement efforts in Los Angeles (Escobar 2003). Parker stated that violence was sometimes necessary in a violent society, and that only he and the

LAPD stood between the people and anarchy (this was later coined as "the thin blue line" by Parker). Equally damaging was the fact that police officials hindered the investigation into the beatings. Officers perjured themselves by giving answers about the incident to internal affairs, however stated that they could not remember details when under oath (Escobar 2003). The grand jury indicted eight officers for assault. In the end only five of the eight were convicted, with only one of the officers receiving more than a year in prison (Escobar 2003).

Escobar (2003) argues the events and handling of the Bloody Christmas beatings, set the organizational tone and culture that would dominate the LAPD for the next 50 years. How Bloody Christmas was handled also set precedent for how the department and Parker himself would deal with outside criticism. As Escobar (2003) describes,

"Henceforth, police officials would work hand in hand with other government officials to limit the scope of investigations, demonize critics, and, if all else failed, engage the blue code of silence to make it all but impossible for a citizen to prosecute a complaint against an officer successfully for excessive use of force or other forms of anti-citizen police misconduct. What made all this possible was the department's adoption of the thin blue line as its controlling metaphor. As the self-proclaimed guardians of civilization, the LAPD had the right, indeed the responsibility, to attack its critics, who, of course, could only be the forces of barbarism (2003:198)."

Escobar (2003) also argues that because of this isolation and independence of the LAPD, it created a culture where acts of misconduct on Mexican Americans and African Americans could be ignored or largely go unpunished. As Escobar states,

"What resulted was a culture within the LAPD that prized highly aggressive, even illegal, tactics in minority communities; that protected officers who stepped over the legal limit; and that lashed back at anyone who criticized or otherwise tried to constrain the department. The logical outcomes of such a culture were the Rodney King beating and the Rampart scandal in which LAPD officers committed perjury, planted evidence, and

even shot people, all in the name of ridding the community of Latino youth gangs (2003:198)."

LAPD, Social Movements, and an Escalating Tension

The tension that existed between the LAPD and the Mexican American community continued to increase. Relations between the two were further deteriorated when in February of 1960, Chief Parker made a racist public statement about Mexican Americans in Los Angeles. In front of the US Commission on Civil Rights, Chief Parker stated, "Some of these people (Mexican-Americans and Latin Americans) have been here before we were, but some of them are not far removed from the wild tribes of Mexico (Buntin 2001:271)." This was echoing statements he made in January stating that one could not "throw genes out of the question when you discuss behavior patterns of people (Mexicans) (Lopez 2009:138)." Statements by the Chief of Police set the tone, demonstrating and reinforcing the informal racist attitudes of not only Parker, but of the LAPD over the previous decades. Very few Mexican Americans were also on the police force at this time. In fact in 1967, at the only Mexican American LAPD Community Conference, a recommendation was made to reduce the height requirement by one inch to comply more with the average height of Mexican Americans. The recommendation was rejected by then Chief Tom Reddin, citing officer safety issues (Morales 1972). Only through litigation did this biased standard change, almost a decade and a half later.

The misconduct and treatment of the Latino community by the LAPD continued into the mid 1960's. However, the most notable event in Los Angeles involving

minorities and police during this time was the Watts riots of 1965. The McCone commission, formed by the governor to examine the causes of the riots, focused more on the individual inadequacies of African Americans and the minority community, without focusing on the structural and institutional issues that gave rise to those perceived inadequacies. The commission argued that the solution to the problem of riots was for police to gain a better understanding of the African American community and African Americans in general. The commission report also recommended that more African Americans and Mexican Americans be recruited. As we see later in the history of the LAPD, similar trigger events, including the Rodney King Riots of 1992, led to similar suggestions to be made.

Scholars have generally concluded the social circumstances experienced by African Americans, including treatment by police, had a huge influence on the reaction of the community. While there are no confirmed cases of Latinos participating in the initial incident, Latinos and the Mexican community was also subjected to similar social circumstances that lead to the riots.To demonstrate this similarity, almost a year before the Watts incident, on April 16, 1964, a local East Los Angeles paper commenting on the relationship between the police and the Latino community stated,

> "In East Los Angeles, it has been rather noticeable lately that police officers have taken it upon themselves to search individuals without first obtaining a search warrant. Citizens of East Los Angeles are being pushed to the point of rebellion. This may be evidenced by the several incidents that have occurred where citizens have chosen to involve themselves in fights with police officers (Morales 1972:23)."

Other notable events of police brutality and tactics demonstrate the relationship between the Mexican community and law enforcement at the time. In 1964, over 50 officers from the CHP, LAPD and LA Sheriff, were called to arrest one man, Max Medina (Morales 1972). In May 1966, one hundred residents in East Los Angeles came to the scene after police tried to make an arrest. Here trying to avoid another riot, twenty five officers were called to the scene, where warning shots were used to disperse the crowd. This sent relations between the Mexican American community and the police to a new low (Morales 1972). In another notable event in February of 1967, police beat a Latino man after he fled from a domestic disturbance call. The man pleaded to go to the hospital but officers declined. The man was further kicked once he exited the squad car. The man was later taken to the hospital where he died of his injuries (Morales 1972).

Additionally, law enforcement in general during the 1960's was very hostile to the social movements that sprung up during the decade. Police during this time expanded their tactics to attempt to subvert and control the movements. During the mid to late 1960's, into the forthcoming decades, Chicano and other Latino movements in Los Angeles were subjected to the same strategies and tactics. This included counterintelligence programs by the LAPD which sent officers into Chicano organizations to gather intelligence and disrupt the organization, even through illegal means. For example, one officer who infiltrated the Brown Berets, claimed two members started a fire at a local hotel in 1969, however it was the officer who actually started the fire; the two Brown Beret members were acquitted at trial (Morales 1972). However, the

largest clashes came when demonstrators for these movements collided with the LAPD. The LAPD in regarding rallies and demonstrations as potential sources of riots, used violence and intimidation to quickly suppress protests and demonstrations.

In March 1968, organized by the Brown Berets and other activists, thousands of Chicano students walked out of their predominantly Chicano high schools to protest the inferior facilities and resources they received, as well as the lack of Mexican Americans among the teaching staff. Police responded with intimidation and violence in order to stop the demonstrations. The walkouts also increased the tension with the Mexican American community and the LAPD. In response to the increase in aggression by the LAPD, Chicano activists held a rally at the Hollenbeck division headquarters specifically focusing on community awareness of the systematic harassment of Chicanos by police (Morales 1972).

The 1970's continued with many of the same tactics and instances of violence against the Mexican community. During this time the LAPD's composition was about 86.4% White, in an ever growing city of minorities, including Hispanic/Latinos (Morales 1972). As with the 1960's, the 1970's was full of movements and demonstrations in which Latinos and Mexicans were seeking equal rights. There were unfortunately many examples of the LAPD, along with other law enforcement agencies, becoming physically involved with demonstrators. The first demonstration and riot erupted on New Year's Day January 1st, 1970. Held in East Los Angeles, the crowd consisted of mostly 5,000 Mexican Americans. Forty two storefronts were damaged and eleven people were

arrested (Morales 1972). Following, on August 29, 1970, the National Chicano Moratorium demonstration was focused on the large numbers of Chicano casualties in the Vietnam War. Sheriffs proclaimed the gathering was illegal after teenagers stole drinks from the nearby store and ran into the rally. Sheriffs attempted to disperse the demonstration with their batons and tear gassed the crowd (which included children). The LAPD arrived to backup the sheriffs. The protesters retaliated and set buildings on fire among other actions. Forty officers were injured and 25 cars were damaged. The exact number of injuries were unknown, but arrests exceeded over 400 people. Protesters reported being beaten over the head, kicked in the stomach and chest, and dragged to vehicles (Morales 1972). As a local paper put it, " After an hour or two of fighting, the Metropolitan police from Los Angeles City reinforced the sheriff's, the Metro police are trained to deal with demonstrations. They hit first and ask questions later (Morales 1972;103)". Unfortunately there were three casualties in the riot, the most prominent was Ruben Salazar. The circumstances of Ruben Salazar's death were quite troublesome. Salazar was hit in the head by a fired tear gas canister from a sheriff, fired through an open window. Ruben was a columnist from the Los Angeles Times and a news director for spanish language television. He gave voice to the Chicano protesters and demonstrators claims of police brutality and oppression through his writing. An inquest jury found that a criminal investigation was necessary, however District Attorney Younger refused to proceed with the inquiry (Morales 1972).

On September 16th 1970, Mexican Independence day, a parade was held in Los Angeles. An estimated 150,000 people came to and participated in the parade. Later that night, right before the parade actually ended the last marching group composed of mostly teenagers reportedly began throwing rocks and eggs at deputies who were riding motorcycles policing the end of the parade. Initially it was Monterey Park police that was monitoring the parade along with the Sheriff's Department. When signs of trouble came, the LAPD was called in for reinforcements to stop the potential riot. Still, 100 people were injured, 3 people were shot, and 60 people were arrested (Morales 1972). There was another riot on January 9th, 1971. The LAPD dispersed the crowd of about 1000 Chicano Moratorium demonstrators at the Departments Parker Center headquarters. They were protesting the brutality of the police in their interactions with residents in the community. There were injuries, with forty two people being arrested. LAPD Chief Davis blamed the incident on Communists and the Brown Berets (Morales 1972). On January 31st, 1971 another riot resulted in $200,000 in damages. Eleven Sheriff deputies were injured and thirty five Mexican Americans wounded by police fire, ending with one fatality (Morales 1972).

Morales (1972) in an examination of the 1970's protests found that the riots and their the root causes lay in circumstances that were similar to those found in the other US riots in the 1960's. The riots had a racial disposition, in which demonstrators had to deal with police action and brutality. The September 16th disturbance was particularly notable as most of the violence was directed at the police. To sum up the feeling of the Mexican

community at the time, after the January 9th riot the Chicano Moratorium Committee submitted a letter to the Los Angeles times,

> "...it is not only the day-to-day police brutality that we have experienced for numerous decades that gravely concerns us, but rather a far more severe problem that our society isn't even aware of, and that is that the police are increasingly becoming a more powerful, political force in our increasingly less, free democratic society. Rather than calling off our protests and return to a life of fear under police totalitarian aggression, we have to continue to protest for survival purposes. If Chicanos lose their right to protest in society because of police political violence, you likewise are losing your freedom in America. In this respect our insistence of the right to protest guarantees the right of all people in America to protest. If we allow police violence to intimidate us it is really the broader society that is victimized (Morales 1972:118)."

Lawsuits, Professional Minority Recruiting, and an Increase in Tensions

In 1973, Fanchon Blake, a female officer in the LAPD filed a lawsuit against the LAPD claiming discrimination and biased policies against women. The LAPD was initially victorious in 1977, however two years later the 9th circuit court of appeals reversed the ruling, and that decision was later upheld by the state supreme court. This led to the Blake Consent decree. The Blake Consent decree went into full effect in 1981. It was one of the most sweeping changes in the department's history. The decree required that the LAPD recruit and hire more women and minority police officers, and remove impediments to promotion that disproportionately targeted minorities and women. Specifically, it required that African Americans and Hispanic/Latinos be actively recruited. The goal was the appointment of African American and Hispanics/Latinos to at least forty five percent of all entry level position until they reached the percentage of proportionality to the Los Angeles labor force. Additional steps included lowering the

height minimum to 5 feet. The LAPD did actively try to recruit Latinos by advertising in different languages. However, not surprisingly a study in 1993 showed that there had been resistance to fully implementing the decree (Felkenes et al 1993).

In Chief Daryl Gates becoming the new Chief of Police in 1978, he not only continued the professional model of policing, but as with Chief Parker, he also had a negative view of minorities and Hispanic/Latinos. In 1982, when commenting on the deadly use of the chokehold which Chief Gates reinstituted in the department early on in his tenure, stated that African Americans were more susceptible to being injured or killed as a result of the hold, because their arteries don't reopen like "normal people do." Gates racist comments did not stop with the minority communities themselves, but also included his own officers. Gates when commenting about why there were not more Latinos in positions of authority in 1978, in the department, said that Latinos specifically were "lazy" (Hangartner 1994).

The 1980's not only continued with the repressing tactics and misconduct against the Mexican American community, but there was further emphasis on cleaning the streets of gangs and related activity, that disproportionately affect minorities. This was what Chief Gates perceived as his most serious crime control challenge (Lasley 2012). To achieve his goal, the Community Resources Against Street Hoodlums (CRASH) initiative began in April of 1979. As the name suggests, its goal was to combat gang related crime. Its most infamous component of the initiative was Operation Hammer which began in April 1987. The Operation was carried out usually on weekend nights and involved

officers making mass arrests of hundreds suspected gang members (Lasley 2012). At the height of the operation in April 1988, almost 1,500 people were arrested by one thousand officers in a single weekend. Almost half of those arrested had no gang affiliation (Dodge & Schiesl 2006).

In August 1988 as part of Operation Hammer, SWAT raided four apartments on 39th and Dalton ave. Police detained 37 people only making seven arrests. They found only six ounces of marijuana and a small amount of cocaine. No one was eventually charged with a crime. The apartments however were left destroyed. The city settled the actions of the officers for 4 million dollars. This severely increased tension within both the African American and Hispanic/Latino community. This was the beginning of the "us v them" strategy and mentality that, "drove a permanent wedge between the LAPD and the public, causing the the latter to believe that they were no longer being protected and served by the department (Lasley 2012:17)." The CRASH initiative lasted until the year 2000, when the Rampart scandal claimed it as a victim as well.

Can't We All Just Get Along?

The Rodney King incident is one of the most historically important cases of police misconduct in the history of not only the LAPD, but policing in the United States. It was not just the incident itself that is historically relevant, as there has been many minorities, both African American and Hispanic/Latino that have been at the end of a police beating. However, the national notoriety of the incident provided the opportunity to bring to the surface the reality of race and policing in America. The following section

will follow the events and relevancy of the Rodney King incident, given its historical relevance for policing and race in America, not only for African Americans, but for Hispanic/Latinos.

On March 3, 1991, Rodney King and two others were driving through the Lake Terrace area of Los Angeles. California Highway Patrol attempted to stop King's vehicle, which then escalated into a high speed chase. The LAPD was called in to help. Once the chase ended, the officers believed King was resisting and proceeded to beat him. A local resident, George Holliday, saw the chase end and proceeded to get his video camera to document the incident. What followed was that King was beaten severely by five officers, as over 20 officers stood and watched. In the recording, King was struck with 56 baton blows and 6 kicks. Following the severe beating, Rodney King was arrested for evading arrest and held for four days. He was later released by prosecutors because of insufficient evidence to prosecute him. Barlow and Barlow (2000) provide the context for beginning of what was to come in the following days,

"On Monday morning March 4th 1991 Non-Black America awoke to the nightmare all too real and familiar to America's Black and Hispanic citizens, the spectacle of a Non White male being brutalized by police. While White middle-class Americans have a difficult time reconciling their image of their friends in blue with the images on the videotape, African-Americans and other people of color in the United States easily identify with the behavior captured on tape. We have experienced such behavior first hand or have heard of similar police behavior through their family members, friends and neighbors. The images on the videotape were not 'shocking'; they were confirmation of personal experiences (2000:186)."

What is usually forgotten about the events that transpired is that Rodney King's brother, as well as George Holiday, the man who videotaped the King beating attempted

to report the abuse that was sustained by King. The police did not take their written complaints and no effort was made to investigate the incident. Nor did any of the 20 plus officers report any excessive force or anything out of the ordinary (Barlow & Barlow 2000). Also not one of the 17 LAPD officers who were at the scene were later charged with any crime. It was not until the videotape aired on the local news that events within the department began to transpire. Shortly after, the five officers who actually conducted the beating were indicted. One officer was fired because he was still a probationary employee (Barlow & Barlow 2000).

The incident and how it was handled suggested this was not an aberration and a lack of judgement from a few officers (as the Christopher Commission examined), but that it was common experience. Residents of Los Angeles agreed; a survey conducted by the Los Angeles times a few days after the video was released, sheds some light on the context and perception of the LAPD. The survey asked whether police brutality was common in the Los Angeles Police Department. 63% of the respondents reported that police brutality was common or very common (Barlow & Barlow 2000). Racially there was a disparity in the perception of the LAPD. Only 19% of Whites believed that police brutality was common or very common in Los Angeles, versus 33% of Latinos, and 48% of African Americans. Additionally, 47% of the total respondents claimed that street justice by the police had increased during the last ten years prior (Rohrlich 1991).

On April 1, 1991 a commission was formed by the mayor, chaired by Warren Christopher in order to examine the LAPD and what might have led to the King incident,

as well as present recommendations for improvement. The Commission found that there was a significant number of officers in the department who repetitively used excessive force against the public. The Commission also found there was a management issue that failed to control those officers, and it failed to monitor excessive use of force properly, and lastly that the system of citizen complaints was highly skewed. The Commission also shed light on some of the ideology and common racial activities within the LAPD. The Commission cited racism as a large component of the problems within the LAPD (Christopher 1991). The racism and bias toward citizens was very apparent by the Commission. The Commission cited racial profiling of African Americans and Latinos as being a problem. A key piece of evidence was the racism and bias that was uncovered by the mobile digital transmissions (MDT). These transmissions were short transmissions between officers that were able to be monitored by their supervisors. However, knowing that possibility, the officers still used racist language and openly talked about beatings. Transmissions were examined on the night of the King beating but also some time prior. The Commission found evidence of racial remarks towards citizens, on many occasions referring to citizens as animals, and as subhuman (Christopher 1991). While the report was focused on African Americans, there were references to Hispanic/Latinos, such as an officer transmitting "I almost got me a Mexican last night but he dropped the damn gun to quick, lots of wit (sic) (Christopher 1991:xii)" When describing this racism and bias the commission stated,

"Within minority communities of LA there is a widely held view that police misconduct is commonplace. The King beating refocused public attention on long standing

complaints by African Americans, Latinos, and Asians that LAPD officers frequently treat minorities differently from Whites more often using disrespectful and abusive language, employing unnecessarily intrusive practices such as the prone out and engaging in use of excessive force when dealing with minorities (Christopher 1991:70)."

While not surprising that the residents of Los Angeles perceive the LAPD as being prone to violence and police brutality, the LAPD also examined the knowledge of such tactics and racial bias within the department. The department did this by creating a survey about how officers perceive other officers in their interactions with racial minorities. The LAPD found that 24.5% of the 650 officers responding to the survey, agreed that racial bias (prejudice) on part of officers toward minority citizens currently exists and contributes to a negative interaction between police and the community (55.4 disagreed). Additionally, 27.6% agreed that an officer's prejudice toward the suspects race may lead to the use of excessive force. It is important to note that demographically, in 1990 the LAPD was about 61% White, and 39% Non-White (Christopher 1991).

Additionally, the Commission found that officers of different races were subjected to racial slurs (even in the MDT messages) and discriminatory treatment within the department, with the failure of supervisors to say anything about the harassment. The Commission did not state which racial groups specifically were targeted the most. Minority officers also commented on the common practice of racial profiling of citizens and other officers. The report also cited two issues when it came to race. First, was a lack of sensitivity among supervisors to race and ethnic biases, as officers feared retaliation. One officer spoke about finding a noose after talking to the Commission, yet he did not

report anything to the supervisor because of the idea that nothing would be done (Christopher 1991). Secondly, there was no enforcement of the racial rules. This was evident in the racial nature of the MDT transcripts, actions during roll call, cartoons and other posts on the bulletin boards and locker rooms. Officers also spoke of racially based nicknames. Officers stated that they did not report the harassment so that they would not be labeled as thin skinned or sensitive (Christopher 1991).

The Commission also cited a survey of perception of bias by minority police officers in 1987. The survey found that 45% of African Americans and 31% of Hispanic/Latinos said that they have encountered some type of discrimination based on race. 27% of Hispanic/Latino males said they had encountered racial slurs by supervisors, peers, or both. The lack of minority representation during this time was also paramount to the issues within the department, especially the lack of minorities in managerial positions. Most racial minorities were in the entry level positions in the department. In 1991, 82% of African Americans were in the P1-P3 ranking, 80% of Latinos and Asians were in this rank bracket, yet only 61% of Whites were in the same ranking. From 1980 to 1990, African Americans in managerial positions in the department went from 5.3 to 8 percent. For Latinos, the managerial percentage rose from 4.9 to 10.4 percent. In the higher rankings, out of 300 of rank of lieutenant and captains, only 46 were African American or Hispanic/Latino. Minority officers also stated that Whites get the best positions, and that minorities didn't get those same positions because they were not based on service. The

1990 Coveted Position Report confirmed that minorities were underrepresented in those coveted positions (Christopher 1991).

The riots themselves were framed as a race riot by African Americans, but this was an oversimplification. Latinos and specifically Mexican Americans have also for decades faced circumstances and abuses similar to those faced by the African American community. Like most of the African American residents they were isolated from employment opportunities, could only find menial jobs, and were unable to maintain reasonable living standards (Dodge & Schiesl 2006). Latinos also participated in the riots with many of the same grievances as African Americans; in fact when one examines arrests during the riots, over half of those arrested were Latino, not African American (Barlow & Barlow 2000). However, after the events of the riots, this did not create a department that further emphasized the concerns of minorities. Instead further abuses were inflicted on African American and Hispanic/Latinos (Chambliss 1994; Kraska & Kappeler 1997).

The hiring quotas began to change during the 1980's but it wasn't until the Christopher Commission reforms and a new consent decree, that substantial number of minority officers began to be hired by the LAPD. In October of 1988, John Hunter, an African American officer in the LAPD filed a complaint with the California State Department of Fair Employment claiming employment discrimination. This complaint would turn into a lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles. In November of 1991, 8 months after the Rodney King beating and the riots that ensued, a settlement was

approved by the Los Angeles City Council. The settlement resulted in the Hunter-LALEY Consent Decree to settle the employment discrimination lawsuit. The decree included an affirmative action plan providing goals and special programs designed to address the underrepresentation of minority officers in promotions and other forms of advancement within the LAPD. The Hunter-LALEY Consent decree went in effect on August 25th, 1992. It was initially scheduled for a fifteen year period. As with the Blake Consent Decree, there was pushback by officers and the department in adhering to the decree. In 2002, The Latin American Law Enforcement Association (LALEY) won a court order that required the city to take steps to be in full compliance of the Hunter-LALEY consent decree. The decree seemed to have a great effect as the number of minority officers in the department increased and changed in proportionality to the current demographics of the department with a minority as majority representation (See Background I). However, the consent decree was terminated in 2010, because it was viewed as being no longer necessary.

California's Political Climate

The socio-political context for Latinos and Mexican Americans in the mid 1990's increased the tension against the Latino community. It was during this time that several state propositions were voted on and passed. These not only potentially affected the minority citizens and residents of the state, but also the police departments, including the LAPD. The first of these initiatives was California Proposition 187 (The Save Our State initiative) in 1994, it was a ballot initiative to prohibit undocumented immigrants from

using non-emergency services in the state of California. Along with the denial of public benefits, the proposition required that law enforcement question all arrested suspects (believed to be undocumented) about their citizenship. While the proposition described all undocumented immigrants, as with with the deportation threats by the LAPD earlier in the century, it was focused on undocumented Latinos and Mexicans specifically. Latinos did not take kindly to the propositions and demonstrated against the new proposed measure. A protest drew over 70,000 participants in October of 1994 before the vote for the proposition. It was the largest protest gathering since the 1970 March for Chicano rights that turned violent and claimed three lives, including the aforementioned Ruben Salazar. Fortunately there was no violence or arrests. However, the proposition passed in November of 1994. The second initiative during the mid 1990's was Proposition 209. Proposition 209 (California Civil Rights Initiative), once approved amended the state constitution to prohibit public institutions from considering race, sex, or ethnicity. The proposition passed in November of 1996. Proposition 209, however, would not apply to court orders or federal consent decrees entered before the proposition passed. The consent decree imposing racial goals on the LAPD was not affected.

CRASHing Rampart

After the King incident and the Christopher Commission, it was only a few years before the LAPD would be in the headlines again for actions taken by its officers. This time it was not one event, but a pattern of behavior that was going on for years in the CRASH anti-gang unit at the Rampart division in the 1990's. This included alleged

misconduct included shootings, excessive force, planting evidence, drug dealing, bank robbery, perjury, and covering up all the illegal activities associated with them. The testimony that Officer Rafael Perez gave (in return for immunity) completely opened up the public to what officers in the CRASH unit were doing. Perez insisted that 90% of CRASH officers knew what was going on. Perez also claimed that his superiors were aware of the misconduct, but did not care as long as gang members were being arrested. In the end, evidence was brought against 58 officers, with 24 found to have committed no wrongdoing. Twelve officers were suspended for various lengths of time, 7 were forced to resign or retire, and 5 were fired. Over 100 criminal convictions were overturned, with over 130 lawsuits costing the city over 125 million dollars. Yet, the full extent of the corruption in the Rampart division is not known (Chemerinsky 2000).

There were allegations that Chief of Police Parks and other members of the LAPD were involved in the obstructing of the Rampart investigation. On September 19, 2000 the Los Angeles City Council voted to accept a consent decree allowing the Department of Justice to oversee the LAPD for five years. Both the Mayor at the time Richard Riordan, and Chief Parks opposed the consent decree. The consent decree made 108 recommendations for changes in LAPD policies and procedures. The decree was formally entered into law in June of 2001 and lasted until July 2009, when it was terminated. In all, the LAPD minimized the scope and nature of the corruption, and actually abetted the corruption through its own internal negligence or corrupt policies (Chemerinsky 2000).

2007 MacArthur Park

The LAPD would return to its oppressive tactics that made them famous for stopping protests and demonstrations. On May 1, 2007 a rally was held in protest of treatment of immigrants, and Hispanic/Latinos at MacArthur Park in Los Angeles. Protesters began blocking part of the street which was against the permit the rally had. Police then drove motorcycles into the crowd and ordered the crowd to disperse. When that failed, the rally was declared an unlawful assembly. The officers formally gave the request for the crowd to disperse, which had little effect on the crowd. Disputing reports state that the request was never heard and officers began to move to disperse the crowd. The officers then created a line and advanced toward the people. Any orders were only given in English. There were reports of protesters throwing rocks and bottles at officers. The LAPD responded by officers firing rubber bullets into the crowd (Ana 2009).

The Dorner Incident

In early February, 2013, coincident with the start of a series of officer shootings by Christopher Dorner with the purpose of clearing his name, Dorner posted an 11,000-word document on social media. For the purposes of this study, it is important to take into consideration the accusations that Dorner made about the racial problems that currently exist within the department. Dorner claimed that rampant racism and bias still exists in the department between officers. As Dorner stated,

"The department has not changed since the Rampart and Rodney King days. It has gotten worse. The consent decree should never have been lifted. The only thing that has evolved from the consent decree is those officers involved in the Rampart scandal and Rodney

King incidents have since promoted to supervisor, commanders, and command staff, and executive positions."

He also refers to specific events where officers were being racist right in front of him, and how little was done to punish those officers. As Dorner concludes,

"From 2/05 to 1/09 I saw some of the most vile things humans can inflict on others as a police officer in Los Angeles. Unfortunately, it wasn't in the streets of LA. It was in the confounds of LAPD police stations and shops (cruisers). The enemy combatants in LA are not the citizens and suspects, it's the police officers."

Over the course of the day, police in the state and the LAPD aggressively looked for Dorner. In retrospect, officers were not interested in capturing Dorner, but in revenge and the street justice officers were famous for in the previous decades. This was exemplified by the events that transpired. On February 7, 2013, the LAPD and Torrance Police Department fired upon two pickup trucks in two separate instances, in which they believed Dorner was the driver. In the first incident, at least seven officers fired into the back of a pickup truck without warning and injured two women who were inside. 102 bullet holes were found in the vehicle. The second incident was twenty five minutes later, involved officers ramming the vehicle and shooting into the windshield of another truck. Neither persons involved in the shootings had anything to do with Dorner.

The relationship between the LAPD and the minority community and especially with Latinos and more specifically Mexican and Mexican Americans has evolved over time to its current iteration. That history has been filled with misconduct, overreaching power and exploitation, which has resulted in not only apprehension within the minority communities of police misconduct, but of police activity in general. What is evident is

that the police have always kept the Latino community contained and controlled as a priority, including through questionable tactics. Unfortunately for the many victims of police conduct, that control sometimes takes a violent and deadly turn. In most of the decades however, minority officers in the department were few and far between. With more Latino officers we will see how the police and the Latino community relate, now that those whom the LAPD has a history of oppressing are among the ranks in majority numbers.

CHAPTER 4: Review of The Research Literature

Racial/ethnic minorities have not historically been welcomed as or even allowed to become police officers in the United States. The history of police and society cannot be separated but must be viewed as a symbiotic relationship (Williams and Murphy 1990). The United States has had a very tumultuous history with the entry of minorities into most institutions in society, and the history of minorities in policing is no different. This section will examine the previous research in regards to minorities in law enforcement. This section will cover the experiences of minorities in law enforcement historically (mostly focusing on African Americans), then comparing and examining the limited research that has included Hispanic/Latino officers. Some recent studies exclusively focus on Hispanic/Latino officers; however, most studies only have an additional category based on race/ ethnicity. The lack of race-specific policing research will also be examined.

Early Research on Minority Officers

The research on minorities in policing was itself not performed in seclusion to the rest of society and consequently is also subjected to the main paradigms and views of the period in which the research was conducted. This is quite evident in research conducted throughout the history of the United States, as much of the research has followed the traditional Black/White racial binary (See Theoretical Context). This has gravely affected the available research on minorities in policing. As with much of the research on minorities in general, the previous research on minorities in law enforcement has focused

primarily on African American police officers, with few other racial and ethnic minorities the focus of much analysis, or even included at all in many studies on minorities in policing. One argument is that minority officers (African American officers included) have not been included in research because of the lack of sufficient numbers. However, as Williams and Murphy (1990) argue, minority officers have been a part of policing in the United States since the 1800's.

From the earliest inclusion of minority police officers, there was resistance to having minority officers on the force (Dulaney 1996). This ranged from inflammatory racist and derogatory newspaper headlines in North Carolina on the hiring of African American officers, to riots in Mississippi resulting from African American officers using their authority in confronting White citizens (Barlow & Barlow 2000). Minority officers also faced racism and discrimination inside the department. Even when minority officers were able to become officers, as researchers describe, many were barred from arresting Whites, could only work with other Non-White officers, and were relegated to only African American neighborhoods. Additionally, they could not be in uniform while on the job, were restricted to non-command positions, and could not supervise White officers (Barlow & Barlow 2000;Dulaney 1996; Peak 1997; Williams & Murphy 1990). As Barlow & Barlow (2000) succinctly sum up the approaches used against African American officers, "A number of strategies were employed to make African American police officers virtually invisible to the White public (2000:226)."

During Reconstruction because of the increase in political power, many more African American officers were included in departments. The success of African American officers was short lived as after Reconstruction, African American officers were slowly eliminated; By 1910, African Americans had all but disappeared from Southern police departments. In 1900, 2.7 percent of total officers were African American, where by 1910 that percentage had decreased to only .1 percent of officers (Williams and Murphy 1990). As early as the 1860's, there were African American police officers in the North. Chicago appointed its first African American officer in 1872, Philadelphia and Cleveland in 1881, Columbus Ohio in 1885, and Detroit 1890 (Barlow and Barlow 2000). These officers though were mostly looked on as tokens than actual representations of the population.

While in general the professionalism movement in policing is viewed as necessary move by departments, the professionalism movement within policing had a detrimental effect on the advancement and hiring of minority police officers (Barlow & Barlow 2000). Though the professional movement attempted to eliminate significant political influence from policing, it did introduce color blind standards that affected minority officers. African Americans became even more token and decreased in numbers than they had before. However, in the 1940's-1950's, challenges to segregation and discrimination in departments began to rise. African American officers were still subjected to segregated units and some with limited policing powers across the country, depending on the department and geographic location (Barlow & Barlow 2000). During

the civil rights movement in the 1960s, a racial/ethnic representative police department came to be seen as important for improving community relations and by the 1970s, African Americans were entering the profession in more significant numbers accounting for about 6.4% of officers nationally (Raganella & White, 2004). While most of the institutionalized discrimination against African American officers had been mostly eliminated in the decade, negative sentiments and covert racism lingered. Alex (1976) examined this bias and found that White officers believed minority officers caused a decrease in the standards of policing, which the White officers cited as reasons for opposing integration. As will be discussed further with the review of the literature on minorities in law enforcement, though the law had changed and African Americans (and minorities in general) were now subjected to equal protection and opportunity in theory, as with the rest of the society, in practice, race still had a major influence on the experience of the minority police officer.

Minority Experiences in Policing

While much of contemporary research that has examined minorities' experiences as police officers is in the traditional binary view of race, it does profile and give a good starting base to expand our understanding of the minority police officer. The experience of the minority police officer begins long before officers are on the job experiencing what it is like to be a minority in an institution that has historically and currently continues to be dominated by White males. Research has examined the spectrum of minority careers in law enforcement from motivations of becoming an officer, guidance and acceptance

into police culture, the police academy, to the everyday events that minority officers experience. The following section will focus on minorities and the research examining the effect that race can have on an officer of the law.

The experience of minorities in policing begins before even reporting for the first day of the academy. To begin with, research has demonstrated that minorities may not want to apply to become a police officer because of the negative perception of police in general (Alex 1969). Additionally, perceptions of inequality at work can influence whether individuals attempt to become officers in the first place (Peak 1997; Hassle & Brandl 2009). Additionally, the motivations for becoming a police officer vary by race. This topic has been thoroughly examined from the binary racial perspective and to a lesser extent with more recent research on Latinos and Asians as well. Reiss (1967) in early research found that there were differences between motivations for becoming an officer based on race. Reiss (1967) found that African American officers in comparison to White officers, were more interested in economic security, and were more likely to note the opportunity to help others as motivations for becoming a police officer. African Americans were also less influenced by family and friends; this is not surprising as members of minority groups at the time were found in lower numbers in departments and were thus less likely to know someone in policing. Alex (1969), found that minority officers were more attracted to the job based on economic advancement and opportunity, such as a secure income, lack of layoffs, and the belief of advancement. Later, Alex (1976) also came to the conclusion that there seemed to be little differences between

African American and White officers in reasons for choosing to become officers. Echoing Reiss (1967), Lester (1983) also found that White officers also viewed having friends and relatives in the field as being more important than minority officers did. Additionally, Lester (1983) when examining the impact of the structure of police departments found that minority recruits viewed the structure as being more important than White officers.

However, while some studies show differences in motivations, others such as Raganella and White (2004) argue that motivations for becoming a police officer are similar regardless of race. Specifically the authors found that important motivating factors were nearly identical for minority officers (their research did include a rare separate Latino category to be discussed later). For Raganella and White (2004), the most influential factors for becoming a police officer were based on the opportunity to help others, job benefits, and job security. However, Raganella and White (2004) did find that while the factors to become an officer did not vary much, the main difference was the order of importance of the factors in becoming an officer. White recruits cited the opportunity to help people and job security as most influential, with job benefits ranked third. White recruits, however, ranked early retirement and excitement of the work as more influential than minority recruits. Interestingly, White recruits agreed with minority recruits on the least important motivating factors: White recruits cited salary as least influential, followed by a lack of other career alternatives, and structure like the military. Also, White recruits agreed with African American recruits that the power and authority

of the job was also not important. More recently, Foley et al. (2008) found that minority recruits placed greater importance on the opportunities for advancement and the ability to work on one's own. Additionally, Moskos (2008) emphasizes that minority police officers believe that their role as police officers is to protect "good people," while White officers believe their role is to arrest people.

There are and continue to be differences in the job application process as well. Research has shown minorities are at a disadvantage when applying to become officers (Kappeler, Sluder, & Alpert, 1998; Huang & Vaughn, 1996). Many of these disadvantages come not only from the implicit or explicit bias that exists in employment, but also from the process itself. Barlow and Barlow (2000) describe the tests, exams, and other forms of biases that existed and continue to exist. They describe how historically, minority officers, specifically talking about African American applicants, had to face discriminatory standards. Many minorities would have to get physical exams and other tests outside the department as they would be rejected by departments due to alleged physical deficiencies. Barlow and Barlow (2000) describe the case of the first officer in New York City, who had to get an exam outside the department after being rejected three times for an alleged heart condition. After being appointed, the other White officers, "...did not speak to him for over a year, he could not sleep in the police barracks, and was subjected to abusive language from both White and African American suspects (2000:227)." More recently, biased disqualification has lead to many different lawsuits which have resulted in the various consent decrees that have been in place in police

departments across the country (ie. Hunter v City of Los Angeles 1992). It is important to note that though there might be laws and consent decrees in place to avoid the overt bias in hiring, the process itself in general is set to select individuals who 'fit the mold.' While more minorities are now being included in departments, in general we have to consider the type of people and minorities in general that are being selected to potentially become officers. It comes as no surprize that the selection process might favor individuals who are typical of the common idea of an officer, of any race. More than likely hiring officials are not going select minorities or anyone for that matter who they believe will cause waves or problems and try to change police officers and the culture that they are a part of.

The socialization process and the effects of race continue once in the academy. Conti and Doreian (2010), examined organizational attitudes and attempts by law enforcement to form a more ideologically cohesive group, vacant of any racial identification, strictly focusing on their similar occupational identity. The authors examined the racial divisions in policing despite attempts to eliminate them or at a minimum decrease them significantly. Specifically, they focus on the police academy social structure and their training. They describe how recruits were consciously divided into equal demographics, with the specific idea that the recruits of different races could actually get to know each other. Conti and Doreian (2010) conclude that the attempt to shrink the gap between officers of different races fails, and racial divisions are not eliminated.

Research has shown that once officers are sworn in, experiences can vary, with race as a factor. There is research that shows what specific forms of discrimination and bias officers must deal with on an everyday basis from other officers and the police structure/organization as a whole. Researchers have found that racial minorities (predominantly referring to African Americans) who enter policing face racist attitudes, racial discrimination and harassment (racial jokes and stereotyping), and exclusion from informal cultures and interactions. Milutinovich (1977) suggests that racism and the lack of common experience between African Americans and Whites in the workplace may lead Whites to be psychologically and socially distant from African Americans. Research also suggests that race too, affects an individual's occupational opportunities (in hiring, promotion, assignment, and work conditions) in police departments. Buzawa's (1981) examination of the differences in selected work related attitudes between African American male and White male patrol officers in Detroit and in Oakland revealed that African American officers are more likely than White officers to report feelings of social isolation and social distancing. Although dated, previous research suggests that African American officers believe performance measures are biased, favoring White officers (Leinen 1985). For instance, Beard (1977) noted that the majority of African American officers in his study believed that the rules and regulations were applied unfairly. However, these studies were done in a pre- Rodney King world (see Background). More recently in a post Rodney King police era, Morash and Haarr (1995;1999) found that for racial/ethnic minorities, the sense of being invisible, the stigmatization based on

appearance, was related significantly to increased levels of stress. Haarr (1997) found that African Americans were more likely to report feelings of social distance than other officers.

Additionally, contemporary research shows that racial/ethnic minorities have differing experiences. African American officers have a less than favorable work experience than their White counterparts, according to Hassell & Brandl (2009). In their study of the Milwaukee Police Department in 2004, they found that African American male officers reported significantly higher negative work experiences. They reported higher levels of bias, lack of opportunity, and being underestimated in comparison with their White counterparts. In their study, which also did include Latinos, they also found that Latino male officers had work experiences similar to White officers and that Latino males did not experience the same level of negative work experiences as did African American male officers. Many report incidents of being the object of racist talk and repeated harassment by White officers. Minority officers also assert being closely monitored with more scrutiny, and believe they receive harsher penalties or reprimands. There is also evidence that minority officers believe there is a double standard for White and Non-White officers. They also believe White supervisors care more about White officers. This also does not stop once minority officers are promoted to supervisory positions as officers report that they feel their authority is undermined or questioned more because they are racial minorities (Hassell & Brandl 2009).

One way this differing experience is measured is through perception of stress. In general, studies have found that minority officers (mostly referring to African American officers), experience higher levels of police organizational stress levels than White officers. Haarr & Morash (1999) find that aspects of police culture and structural aspects of the occupation itself may lead to increased stress levels for minorities in law enforcement. These aspects include perceived racial discrimination, feelings of isolation, and unequal protection and lack of alliances with other officers and command staff. The authors also found that the racial composition of the command staff influenced the stress levels of minority officers (those not represented). Additionally, being a token minority in a majority White department can also increase stress for minority officers. Hodges & Booker (2015) found that officers of color experienced higher levels of police organizational stress than White officers. Stroshine and Brandl (2011) confirms that token officers do experience the effects of tokenism as predicted by tokenism theory, with African Americans exhibiting the greatest level of tokenism. Toch (2002) found that officers use segregation as a stress coping mechanism. This lead to officers not wanting to work with each other; instead choosing to work with those similar to themselves.

Race can also be a factor not only with police-police interactions but how one is perceived by the public. Alex's (1969) early study of the role of race within police organizations described the social circumstance of African American police officers of the time as experiencing double marginality. First, they were marginalized in society and secondly as police, they were marginalized within their own communities. Studies have

demonstrated that minorities in general have a more negative perception of police than Whites, with African Americans having the most negative perceptions of police, without focusing on race of the officer themselves (Decker 1981; Brown & Benedict 2002). Research by Carter (1985) shows that Hispanic/Latinos have a less negative perception of police. However Cochran & Warren (2012), find that when including the race of the officer in terms of legitimacy of police officers in stops, minority officers are perceived as more legitimate to minority citizenry. They found that African Americans are more likely to negatively evaluate police behavior when the stop is initiated by a White officer. For minority officer stops, they found no citizen race or ethnicity effects, and the primary predictor of citizens' perceptions of the legitimacy of the stop was the reason given to the citizen by the officer. The findings suggest that citizens, particularly minority citizens, rate officer legitimately more objectively when they are stopped by minority officers. When minority citizens are stopped by White officers they view officer behavior more skeptically. Studies have also shown that police forces with larger proportions of minority officers respond more harshly to minority citizens (Mcalvain 2006; Wilkins & Williams, 2009). This means that minority officers might treat minority citizens harsher, but be perceived as more legitimate and more favorably by minorities (Cochran & Warren 2012).

Although police departments have increased the representation of racial minorities and women, research has demonstrated that the assimilation of these officers into workplace cultures has not been problem free. Minority assimilation into police

forces has been slow, with countless incidents of blatant racial bias and discrimination. Today, policing is less blatantly racist or discriminatory, yet vestiges of racial discrimination still exist (Gaines, Kappeler, & Vaughn, 1999). For example, Polk (1995) finds that in many agencies across the nation, minorities are underrepresented at the upper administration levels. Bolton (2003) describes a shared perception among African American police officers that racist attitudes and institutional obstacles prevent full participation within their departments. Based on these findings, he concludes that the disproportionately low number of key positions held by minority officers is an indicator of persistent racism.

Today, with the legislation and social change that has occurred in the recent decades, more minority officers are now a part of the occupation that once barred them from entry. However, the proportion of minority officers still does not match the proportion of minorities in the population. Additionally, minorities that are entering the policing occupation may have a different experience than their White counterparts. However, most of the previous research is on the experience of African Americans; only a few of the studies described moved beyond the simple Black/White binary of examining race. In these studies either Hispanic/Latinos were not included at all or were simply mixed in and counted with the Non-White population. This is a very careless thing to do as it lumps the minority experience together. As will be the focus on the next section, there has been more recent examination of Hispanic/Latinos currently in police organizations.

Why Do Research On Latino Police?

Historically most of the studies on minority police officers have either strictly focused on the Black/White binary, excluding other minorities and Hispanic/Latinos in general, or have included them in the category of "general minority" and did not distinguish between the different Non-White groups and their experiences. However, implicit in this research is that minorities clumped together are the same. This creates a substantial problem; in the lumping together of the minority experience, this eliminates the possibility of any attempt at being able to deconstruct and analyze whether Hispanic/Latinos or any other racial group clumped in for that matter, are similar in their experiences to African American officers or more towards White officers. Hispanic/Latinos in general are one of the least studied groups in the field of criminal justice (Schuck, Lersch, & Verrill, 2004). This is relevant once we examine the literature on Hispanic/Latino officers and find that there has been little research on patterns of assimilation, ethnic identity, and the overall careers of Hispanic/Latino police officers (Conti & Doreian 2010). In fact, the only comprehensive text that exists of current literature that specifically focuses on Latino officers in the United States, was only published in 2015, just over 125 years after the first Latino police officer joined the NYPD in 1888 (Urbina & Alvarez 2015).

Martinez (2007) focuses his research on this exact lack of research on Hispanic/Latino police officers. Martinez (2007) states that the lack of research on Latinos is arguably one of the most serious limitations in the development of criminological research. To demonstrate his point on the lack of research, Martinez describes how a simple academic search of literature on Latinos in policing over the previous 10 years, yielded few results. As he states,

> "For example, a broad search of articles published between 1990 and 2006 with the keywords "Hispanic" or "Latino" and "police" in Criminal Justice Abstracts netted 68 items, but a similar search using "Black" or "African-American" and "police" provided 485 articles on this topic. Clearly, researchers interested in examining race and differential experiences with criminal justice agencies or perceptions of police should extend attention to Latinos and others in multi-ethnic communities (2007:57)"

Martinez (2007) states that this is not only a gap in the literature, but it is completely necessary from a practical standpoint. Latinos should be the focus of specific research in policing in that not only are demographics of the country changing, but with relatively so little is known about their experience, the need to focus more research on Latinos and policing is obvious. Martinez (2007) argues the growth of Latinos has made U.S. society more racially and ethnically diverse rendering studies of Blacks versus Whites obsolete. Yet as late as 2015, scholars have still focused on the lack of research on Latinos in policing. Guajardo (2015) for his dissertation on Latinos incorporation in the police department in Milwaukee comes to the same disheartening conclusion about the lack of research on Latino police officers. As he states, "While researching the Latino police officer experience, I was unable to locate any extensive literature on the Latino

officer experience; rather, most of the work was on the attitude of the public towards law enforcement, and the assimilation and impact of bilingual officers (2015:44)."

Urbina (2015) in defending his rationale for writing his book compiling new research on Latino officers reveals the reasons why Hispanic/Latinos might face a different work experience than White officers or other minorities as well. As Urbina states,

> "Analyzing the ethnic experience reveals that unlike Blacks and Whites, Latinos are confronted by a mixture of powerful and historical contemporary intertwining forces like skin color, language, citizenship, and culture. Issues which do not only influence their everyday experience to include their interaction with law enforcement but also police practices. Evidently, obtaining a more inclusive picture of the ethnic experience from the early days in the Americas to the New Millennium enables us to better understand the current state of Latinos and other ethnic/racial groups, and allows us to gain sight into the future of the already largest minority group (Latinos) and the largest ethnic minority group (Mexicans) in the United States- *the emerging new face of America and the upcoming majority*- which in turn will influence or govern the roll, practice, and future of the American police (2015:29)."

There is now a growing literature on Hispanic/Latinos in policing. However, research is still in its infancy when dealing with Latinos in law enforcement, especially when examining specific ethnicities of Latinos, such as Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Cubans, and as with the topic of this study, Mexican Americans.

Before examining the relevant research conducted on the experience of Hispanic/Latino officers, it is important to examine the assumption of ethnic identification of Latino officers. Irlbeck's (2008) study specifically focuses on the identity of Latino police officers. Irlbeck (2008) surveyed all the Latino officers in a major police department and found three distinctive patterns of ethnic identification.

Most of the officers she surveyed (74%) had a strong self-reported Hispanic identity. These Hispanic officers tended to distance themselves from White culture, and had a sense of pride in being Hispanic, and also they had a strong sense of the connection to the Hispanic community. This group did not like to be lumped in with Whites in a general. 24% of officers self-reported an ambivalent Hispanic identity. These officers recognized being Hispanic, but identified far more with White culture. This became evident when noticing that most of their friends were White, and they generally identified more with their police role than with their ethnicity. Lastly, a very small minority self-reported as White. These officers were of a mixed race (i.e., White and Latino) and were closer to their White parent.

When focusing on the literature on Hispanic/Latino police, there are slight to large differences in policing experiences between Latinos and other minorities and between Latinos and Whites. Beginning with motivation, Raganella and White (2004) conducted the most comprehensive study in comparing the motivations of Latino officers in comparison to African Americans and Whites. Specifically among minorities (African American and Hispanics), the opportunity to help people was ranked first by both, job security was ranked second by both, job benefits was ranked third by both, and opportunities for career advancement was ranked fourth by both. African Americans ranked early retirement as fifth and Hispanics ranked it sixth. Hispanics ranked to fight crime as fifth and Blacks ranked it sixth. Hispanic and Black recruits agreed on the factors that were least influential, including lack of other career opportunities, having

structure like the military, and salary. Hispanic recruits did note power and authority as slightly more influential than African American recruits (ranked thirteenth by Hispanics and sixteenth by African Americans). Hispanics also rated the opportunity to help others people as significantly more influential than African American recruits. In most respects, the mean scores and rankings of Hispanic recruits mirrored those of Black recruits. For example, the top four ranked factors for African American and Hispanic recruits were identical. Hispanics also differed from African Americans in a several ways. Hispanic recruits rated good companionship with co-workers, profession carries prestige, and job carries power and authority higher than African American recruits. In these three areas, Hispanic and White responses were similar. In other areas, Hispanics differed significantly from Whites: specifically, the opportunity to help people, to enforce laws of society, and job carries power and authority.

As with African Americans, research has shown that Latino/Hispanics also face barriers to entry in becoming a police officer. While dated, Carter (1986), focuses on the concept that Hispanic/Latino officers have often cited a belief in unfair hiring and promotion practices which not only disadvantage Hispanic/Latinos but at the same time advance White officers. According to his findings, Hispanic officers overwhelmingly indicated that they perceived the police department's officer recruitment procedures discriminated against potential officers based on ethnicity, and that this discrimination was mostly structural. On promotions, Carter (1986) found that Hispanic respondents significantly indicated that they believed promotions were also based on ethnicity.

Additionally, they believed that the higher the rank, the more likely they felt that ethnic discrimination existed.

More research has examined the experiences of Hispanic/Latino officers (though mostly in smaller departments and departments that are predominantly still White), and what they might face while on the job. Stroshine & Brandl (2011) in their study on race, gender, and the effects of tokenism on minority officers in the Milwaukee police department, found that Latino officers perceived greater feelings of polarization, reduced opportunity, and overall tokenism compared with White males. Latino officers were more likely than White male officers to have had inappropriate comments of a derogatory or racist nature made in their presence, to have felt personally discriminated against because of their race/ethnicity, and to have felt excluded from formal and informal networks at work. These results indicate that Latinos may experience many of the difficulties experienced by females and African American officers in police departments today. However, Stroshine & Brandl (2011) conclude, that for male officers, minority status is not uniformly negative; Latino males have substantially similar (although not completely the same) workplace experiences as White male officers. Additionally, that those officers who have the highest representation in the organization (White, male, heterosexual) have the most favorable work experiences. In general, their study states that in regard to workplace experiences being a racial/ethnic minority brings with it substantially (but not uniformly) different experiences on the job compared to male White officers.

Similarly to the research with African American police officers, Hispanic/Latino officers also feel more criticized by supervisors. Rojek and Decker (2009) find that minority officers are over represented in formally documented complains, especially in complaints initiated by other department officers and supervisors. White & Kane (2013) show that Hispanic/Latinos were significantly more likely to be terminated for misconduct. Additionally, Hispanic/Latino officers are less likely to report trust in police internal affairs than White officers, and somewhat less likely report that they are willing to comply with command staff decisions (DeAngelis & Kupchic 2009). This along with the rest of the different negative treatment can lead to increased negative work experiences, stress, and PTSD. Pole et al. (2005) in their research suggest that not only are Hispanic/Latino officers more likely to confront discrimination and prejudice, but they are also subject to mental health issues, such as PTSD, which is vital to understand for the future of policing.

Mexican American Officers

Duran (2015) is one of the few scholars who focused on Mexican American officers in the United States. Duran studied policing in the Southwest U.S. from 2001 to 2014. He has three qualitative projects; from 2001 to 2006 in Odgen, Utah and Denver Colorado, a second study conducted from 2007 to 2014, examining communities along the US-Mexico border Southern New Mexico, and West Texas (El Paso), and lastly a third study examining police shootings also in New Mexico and Texas. His methodology included ethnographic work, ride alongs, and interviews. Duran reports how officers in

their own words describe being discriminated against, called names, but that they also did help in bridging the cultural and understanding gap that did exist between officers who were not Latino. However, for the purposes of this study the geographic locations in which the studies were conducted were very different than the one for this study. Additionally, the results from Duran (2015) cannot be generalized outside the smaller departments he analyzed, with a different history within the department. Additionally, demographically like most departments around the country Duran examined departments that have a White male majority.

Portillos (2015) examined Chicano officers in the Phoenix Police Department. Similar to Duran he takes a mostly qualitative approach to understanding Latino police. In conducting the interviews and ride alongs, Portillos finds that similar to Raganella and White (2004) Chicanos officers offered different reasons for wanting to become an officer. Many were attracted to law enforcement as kids, even though some might have experienced aggressive policing, that did not dissuade them from moving away from policing as a profession as an adult. Portillos (2015) findings also suggest that many of the officers developed relationships with officers in the community and that most of those relations were viewed as positive experiences. Additionally many officers viewed the occupation of policing in helping establish and progress economically as a reason for joining law enforcement.

Portillos (2015) also examined the effects that traditional police culture had on Latinos in police departments. As previous research suggests with minorities (African

Americans), Portillos found that there was some racial joking in the department. However, many of the Latino officers viewed the joking as harmless. Other officers found the general conservative atmosphere that law enforcement has traditionally been, as an experience in itself. Lastly, Portillos (2015) suggests that perceptions of the Latino community also differ based on race. Portillos finds that in his ride alongs which included multiracial pairings, Whites expressed a more verbally negative association of the Latino community. White officers referred to the Latino community in very negative terms, whereas Latino officers who still might have expressed a negative view of the Latino community, did not do so in such negative terms in comparison to the White officers. Latino officers also expressed looking forward to patrolling the Latino community, something White officers did not express. In general, Portillos research additionally shows that ideologically many Latino officers view problems as being structural. Portillos (2015) study, as with most research was conducted in an overwhelmingly majority White (82%) department, where Hispanic/Latinos were underrepresented, composing 33% of the general population.

In general, with the extensive literature on African American officers and the more limited recent research on Latinos, we find differing outcomes within the different studies that are very relevant for understanding Hispanic/Latinos in policing. While some of the experiences minorities face are quite similar, other studies state that the Hispanic/Latinos in their study are more inline with the typical White officer experience. The one definite conclusion we can take from the studies examined is that the experience

of African American officers is not the same as Hispanic/Latinos. Hence, more Hispanic/Latino research in law enforcement is necessary to understand what it means to be Hispanic/Latino in law enforcement.

CHAPTER 5 :Theoretical Framework

Although this research is inductive, there are several theoretic concepts that each contribute to the understanding of the social context under study. The main literature is on race. Scholars have argued over how to examine race. Historically race was viewed as a biological given (Bernasconi 2001; Smedley & Smedley 2005), an attribute that was predetermined at birth that gave the individual not only different phenotypic characteristics but also essential qualities. The social constructionist view of race proceeded the biological view and scholars debated whether if there were any essentialist qualities to race, or if race was a development made by society. Once it was established that race was not biologically based with essentialist qualities, with few contemporary exceptions (i.e. Hernstein & Murray 2010), scholars sought to understand how race is constructed and impacts society. In examining race, different socially constructed ideologies came to the forefront. Many examine race in a non-reductionist, politically, and historically evolving manner. The best contemporary example of this ideology is demonstrated through the works of Omi and Winant (specifically *Racial Formation*).

Contemporary Race Theory

Racial Formation is built upon the ideas of other scholars and their ideology. As is apparent in their work, Omi and Winant heavily draw on the work of Antonio Gramsci.

Gramsci's ideas pertaining to hegemony, gave Omi and Winant the means to explain how racial formation is related to politics as a whole, as well as (along with racial projects),

> "…facilitate(d) understanding of a whole range of contemporary controversies and dilemmas involving race, including the nature of racism, the relationship of race to other forms of differences, inequalities, and oppression such as sexism and nationalism, and the dilemmas of racial identity today (2002:124)."

For Omi and Winant, the effort must be made to understand race as an unstable and 'decentered' complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle (Omi and Winant 2002:123). With this concept in mind, they offer their own definition of race. As Omi and Winant state, "race is a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies (2002:123)." They make it clear that although the concept of race invokes biologically based human characteristics, selection of these particular human features for purposes of racial signification is always and necessarily a social and historical process (Omi and Winant 2002:123). Equally as important, they state that there is no biological basis for distinguishing among human groups by race. The categories employed by society and human beings to discern and contrast human groups along racial lines are, "imprecise and at worst completely arbitrary (Omi and Winant 2002:123)."

Omi and Winant also ask, "if the concept of race is so nebulous can we not dispense with it (2002:124)?" They argue that an attempt to eliminate race would create some issues. As they state, "It is rather difficult to jettison widely held beliefs, beliefs which moreover are central to everyone's identity and understanding of the social world

(2002:124).” The authors instead propose a different concept; they believe that it is important to understand that race is not an archaic idea, but instead that the concept of race fundamentally continues to play a role in structuring and representing the real world for people on an everyday basis. We should instead think of race as a part of the social structure of society rather than as an aberration within it: we should see race as a dimension of human representation rather than an illusion (Omi and Winant 1994).

Racial Formation Theory

The authors provide a theory of racial formation. First, they argue that racial formation is a process of historically suited ‘projects’ in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized. They explain that too often the attempt is made to only understand race in terms of social structure or culture. Their alternative approach is thinking of racial formation as happening through a link between social structure and representation. They label these vital links “racial projects.” They define racial projects as, “A racial project is simultaneously an interpretation, representation, or explanation of racial dynamics, and an effort to reorganize and redistribute resources along particular racial lines (2002:125).” The authors continue, “Racial projects connect what race means in a particular discursive practice and the ways in which both social structure and everyday experiences are racially organized, based upon that meaning (2002:125).” They expand by giving examples of ‘neo conservative’ and ‘liberal’ racial projects along with identifying 3 other analytical dimensions (political spectrum, at the micro level, and

across historical time). Therefore, racial formation is a synthesis/ outcome of the interaction of racial projects on a society wide level.

As discussed, Omi and Winant (1994;2002) also link racial formation to the evolution of hegemony, the way in which society is organized and ruled. They assert that the United States has been a racial dictatorship; as from 1607 to 1865, most Non-Whites were markedly eliminated from the political domain. This was generally followed by a century of legally sanctioned segregation and denial of the vote. They explain how centuries of racial dictatorship has had 3 large consequences. First, they defined American identity as White, as the negation of racialized otherness. As they state "This negation took shape in both law and custom, in public institutions and in forms of cultural representation. It became the archetype of hegemonic rule in the US. It was the successor to the conquest as the 'master' racial project (2002:129)." Second, racial dictatorship organized the color line as the fundamental division in US society. The dictatorship, "...elaborated, articulated, and drove racial divisions not only through institutions, but also through psyches, extending up to our own time(2002:129)." Third, racial dictatorship "...consolidated the oppositional racial consciousness and organization originally framed by marronage and slave revolts, by indigenous resistance, and by nationalism of various sorts (2002:129)." Omi and Winant believe that acknowledging the presence of a racial dictatorship is crucial for the development of a theory of race in the United States. Omi and Winant also ask a key question: in what way is racial formation related to politics as a whole? They believe the answer also lies in the idea of hegemony. They use Gramsci's

ideas on hegemony to elaborate on the concept, and how it can be extended and applied to an understanding of "racial rule." Racial rule, can be understood as a slow and uneven historical process which has moved from dictatorship to democracy, from domination to hegemony (Omi & Winant 1994: 2002).

Racism

Omi and Winant also analyze racism. They maintain that prejudice was an almost unavoidable outcome of the patterns of socialization, affecting not only Whites but minorities as well. Discrimination not only exists through individual actions or conscious policies, is instead a structural feature of US society. As they state, racism is "…the product of centuries of systematic exclusion, exploitation, and disregard of racially defined minorities (2002:133)." It was this combination of relationships (prejudice, discrimination, and institutional inequality) which defined the concept of racism at the end of the 1960's. Their approach recognizes that racism, like race, has changed over time and allows the differentiation between race and racism. Hence, a racial project can be defined as racist if and only if it creates or reproduces structures of domination based on essentialist categories of race (Omi & Winant 2002). As they state,

"To attribute merits, allocate values, or resources to, and/or represent individuals or groups on the basis of racial identity should not be considered racist in and of itself. Such projects may in fact be quite benign. In order to identify a social project as racist, one must demonstrate a link between essentialist representations of race and social structures of domination (2002:133)."

Omi and Winant also present the parallel debates on the concept of whether racism is ideological or structural. Proponents of ideological argue that racism is first and

foremost a matter of beliefs and attitudes, doctrines and discourse, which only then give rise to unequal and unjust practices and structures. Advocates of structural see racism as primarily a matter of economic stratification, residential segregation, and other institutionalized forms of inequality which then give rise to ideologies of privilege (Omi & Winant 2002). Instead Omi and Winant,

> "…believe it is crucial to disrupt the fixity of these positions by simultaneously arguing that ideological beliefs have structural consequences, and that social structures give rise to beliefs. Racial ideology and social structure, therefore mutually shape the nature of racism in a complex, dialectical, and over determined manner (2002:138)."

Omi and Winant's theory of racial formation will be used as the base to which to interpret the potential findings. As demonstrated, previous research has shown that a large topic of contention between police officers of different races has been the process of promotion within departments (Haarr 1997). Broadly speaking, White officers have backed a more neoconservative and color blind ideology, in which the officers believe they are subjected to "reverse" discrimination and preferential promotional practices. While African American officers focus on a more liberal project of promoting minorities in order to promote more equality and less White officer hegemony (Haarr 1997). While Racial Formation, is the backbone of the examination of the concept of race in the research, there are other scholars who have specifically examined race and the issues racial minorities face every day. Specifically, these scholars examine the evolution of racial projects (in *Racial Formation* terminology) that could influence officer ideology and beliefs about society, other races, and also about being a Hispanic/Latino in general.

Aren't All Minorities the Same?

In research on policing and minorities, racial groups are often clumped together or ignored in favor of strictly analyzing African Americans. This practice ignores other minorities and their experiences and assumes that the experiences of African Americans apply to other racial minorities. This is the binary view of race. Unfortunately, this has the effect of altering research completely, considering that groups who are assumed to be identical can actually be very different, with varying experiences. This has also been frequently the case with the work examining race in police research. Currently this racial binary is the dominant paradigm in the United States for understanding race. While other scholars are moving away from (or attempting to) move away from this dominant paradigm (Denton and Massey 1989), it is still very prominent in the work on race, even in an implicit or unintentional manner. Scholars have focused on the impact of this principal binary view of race. Parea (1997;2013) focuses on the impact that using a racial binary has on race research and the examination of the experiences (or lack of) of those who are not included in the racial binary. Specifically, Parea focuses on race and Latinos. As Parea states,

"Paradigms of race shape our understanding and definition of racial problems. The most pervasive and powerful paradigm of race in the United States is the Black-White binary. I define this paradigm as the conception that race in America consists, either exclusively or primarily, of only two constituent racial groups, the Black and the White. Many scholars

of race reproduce this paradigm when they write and act as though only the Black and the White races matter for purposes of discussing race and social policy. The current fashion of mentioning "other people of color" without careful attention to their voices, histories, and presence is merely a reassertion of the Black-White paradigm (1997:1219)."

This has unfortunately generally been the case when examining race in the field of policing as well.

There are real consequences to examining race in this binary approach. One considerable problem is the comparison of the experience of African Americans to other minority racial groups. As a consequence of this, other racial minority groups must compare the problems and grievances they face to African Americans. Since other racial minority groups do not face identical circumstances, this can dictate what is viewed as being a serious issue, and what is not. Delgado and Stefanic (2012), in their critical examination of the racial binary, also argue for a shift away from the binary. As Delgado and Stefanic (2012) state,

"That paradigm, the Black/White binary effectively dictates that Non-Black minority groups must compare their treatment to that of African Americans to redress their grievances. The paradigm holds that one group, Black constitutes the prototypical minority group. Race means quintessentially African American. Other groups such as Asians Americans, Indians, and Latinos are minorities only insofar as their experience and treatment can be analogized to those of Blacks (2012:75)."

Parea (1997) also describes how the Black/White binary paradigm, being so widely accepted, makes other racialized groups like Hispanic/Latinos, Asian Americans, and Native Americans often marginalized or ignored altogether. This becomes even more problematic when further assumptions about lived racial experiences of non-binary minorities becomes the focus. As Parea (2013) states,

"If Latinos/as and Asian Americans are presumed to be White by both White writers and Black writers (a presumption not borne out in the lived experience of most Latinos/as and Asians), then our claims to justice will not be heard or acknowledged. Our claims can be ignored by Whites, since we are not Black and therefore are not subject to real racism. Our claims can be ignored by Blacks, since we are presumed to be not Black and becoming White, and therefore we are not subject to real racism. Latinos/as do not fit the boxes supplied by the paradigm (2013:464)."

Scholars have demonstrated that the racial binary is not an appropriate means of conducting research on non-binary racial minority populations. At a very basic level, to assume all minorities have the same experiences is simply not good research. We need to move away from the binary, and avoid the constant attempts of trying to fit a square peg in a round hole.

Massey (2009) demonstrates the real impact of the racial binary and the change in perception when ignoring others, especially Hispanic/Latinos and Mexican Americans. Massey (2009) argues that throughout the 1970's into the 1990's Mexicans were increasingly subject to processes of racialization that have rendered them more exploitable and excludable than ever before. This is exemplified by the fact that over the past decade, Mexican Americans moved steadily away from their middle position socio-economically and moved toward the bottom. To illustrate his argument he refers to Lee and Fiske (2006), implementing their stereotype content model to various racial groups and nationalities. The model is used to understand how groups are viewed by the general public, based on a measurement of competence and warmth. Massey (2009) finds that South Americans, Latinos, Mexicans, farm workers, Africans, and undocumented

migrants (who rate lowest of all on both warmth and competence) approach the portion of the graph usually reserved only for the most detested and socially stigmatized groups.

This implies that undocumented immigrants (and further Hispanic/Latinos) are not perceived as fully human at the most fundamental level, thus opening a door to harsh, exploitative, and cruel treatment (Massey 2009). As Massey (2009) states,

> "Historically, Hispanics have occupied a middle position between Blacks and Whites in the American stratification system, but with the restructuring of the political economy of immigration in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the relative standing of Hispanics declined and they came to replace African Americans at the bottom of the class hierarchy (2009:14)."

This is of critical importance as Massey suggests that U.S. policies are moving Mexican Americans and Latinos toward the formation of a racialized underclass. He notes rising segregation levels, increasing levels of discrimination, poverty, stagnating education, and a decrease in social services and the welfare state that has allowed them to fall to the bottom. Massey does not forecast whether this trend will continue, but only where it currently stands given the trend of the last several decades, though he does not indicate a possible reverse in course. As he states,

> "Whether or not Mexicans become a new urban underclass remains to be seen; but it is already clear that after occupying a middle socioeconomic position between Whites and Blacks for generations, the economic fortunes of Mexicans have now fallen to levels at or below those of African Americans (2009:17)."

A Latino Threat Narrative

Leo Chavez (2013) examines what he discerns as the main political and social characterization of Hispanic/Latinos in the United States. Chavez argues that there are

discernable negative characterizations and perceptions of Latinos in general. Chavez contends that at the center of these characterizations is the notion that Latinos are not like the previous generations of immigrants to the United States, who ultimately became part of the nation by assimilation. According to the assumptions and taken for granted truths in this narrative, Latinos are unwilling or incapable of integrating or becoming part of the national community. Rather Latinos are viewed as part of an invading force from south of the border that is bent on re-conquering land that was formerly theirs and destroying the "American way of life (2013:10)." This is what Chavez categorizes as the "Latino Threat Narrative." As Chavez explains,

> "The Latino Threat Narrative consists of a number of taken for-granted and often-repeated assumptions about Latinos, such as that Latinos do not want to speak English; that Latinos do not want to integrate socially and culturally into the larger U.S. society; that the Mexican-origin population, in particular, is part of a grand conspiracy to take over the U.S. Southwest (the reconquista); and that Latin women are unable to control their reproductive capacities, that is, their fertility is out of control, which fuels both demographic changes and the alleged reconquista (2013:ix)."

Chavez believes the contents of the Latino Threat Narrative are always pervasive and implicit in the social context. As Chavez states, "It is the cultural dark matter filling space with taken for granted 'truths' in debates over immigration on radio and tv talk shows, in newspaper editorials, and on internet blogs (2013:4)." For Chavez the problem is that Latinos in general are subject to the consequences of the dominant ideology of the threat narrative, "...as advocates for reduced immigration, media pundits, and politicians pushing tough immigration laws routinely characterize Latinos, both immigrants and citizens, along the lines of the Latino Threat Narrative (2013:9)." The key to the threat

narrative is that it is not just focused on migrants or the undocumented, but that all Latinos. Chavez notes several scholars and politicians that have written about the same "truths" included in the threat narrative, that support the narrative. People such as Pat Buchanan who view Mexican immigrants (and implicitly as Chaves argues Mexican Americans) as "a unique and disturbing challenge to our cultural integrity, our national identity, and potentially to our future as a country (2013:22)."

While Chavez does examine the general idea that Latinos are viewed as a major threat to society, the actual main tenants of his ideas might be slightly exaggerated in comparison to the contemporary representation of the Latinos in America. Chavez focuses too much on reproduction and cessation, in comparison to modern views of Latinos in society. Additionally, while focusing on Latinos in general, in his examples and arguments he does tend to want to focus specifically on Mexican descendant immigrants and citizens, but he fails to fully commit to the argument. Simply by labeling his description of concepts a "Latino" threat, exemplifies this idea. Mexico, Mexican immigrants, and the U.S.-born of Mexican origin are the core foci of the Latino Threat Narrative, but the threat is often generalized to all Latin American immigrants and at times to all Latinos in the United States. Similarly to the racial binary described before, this is also very dangerous territory in lumping all Latinos as having the same experience in the United States. Researchers have focused on the distinctions within Hispanic/Latino groups as well, demonstrating that even within the category of Latino, there is much distinction within (Arreola 2004). For example, it is presumptuous to assume the

experience of the typical Mexican migrant might relate to the treatment a recently migrated Cuban might receive in society.

Chavez also does not focus too much on the criminal perception in the threat narrative. He does focus on the perception of delinquency in comparison to the hegemonic population and by extension this includes crime, but not necessarily the direct link that other authors have argued in their work when it comes to Hispanics/Latinos, and especially Mexicans/Mexican Americans. However, Alfredo Mirande, in *Gringo Justice* (1987), does specifically focus on the treatment of Hispanics/Latinos, and specifically Mexican Americans, and their history within the criminal justice system. Mirande's argument is that a separate legal system exists depending on who you are or what group you belong to. Mirande examines the evolution of a similar threat element as discussed by Chavez, however Mirande begins his analysis with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, where California and other Southwestern territories became part of the United States. Mirande asserts that this threat narrative or perception of threat of Hispanic/Latinos and specifically Mexicans and Mexican Americans stems from a perception of an outlaw persona. Mirande believes this threat stems from the image of the 'bandido.' A bandido is a Mexican bandit, someone who is outside the law. Mirande argues that this bandido persona was applied to Mexicans for over a century, and has continued to be applied to Mexicans and Mexican Americans, just with a more modern equivalent of delinquency, criminality, and perception of stereotypical Hispanic/Latino identity. As Mirande states "Chicanos have typically been victims of police abusing

justice, but they have been portrayed as violent and criminally prone people. The image of the Mexican throughout history in fact has been that of the ruthless bloodthirsty and treacherous outlaw (1987:17)." This association has taken many forms over the years, from the bandidos in the old west, to the Zoot Suiter's of the 1940's, to contemporary lowrider and youth gang culture (Mirande 1987:17).

Similar to Chavez's work, Mirande also focuses on the political and social manipulation in the sustainment of the threat or 'bandido' narrative. Mirande labels this process "the mobilization of bias," as the means which are used to spread the negative images of Mexicans and Mexican Americans. As Mirande states,

> "A very important but relatively unexplored technique is the mobilization of bias. It involves the manipulation of symbols in such a way that they perpetuate myths about the inferiority of the group. Because you got power over the schools, the media, and other agents of socialization most prevalent images of them are extremely induced. It will be contended that the mobilization of bias is an effective, if subtle mechanism of control (1987:23)."

The impact of this mobilization of bias is that in depicting the Chicano as violent and criminally inclined, the emphasis is shifted away from the exploitation and subordination of Chicanos, toward problems and inadequacies within the barrio (Mirande 1987:23). According to Mirande, this not only blames the victims for their own oppression, but at the same time implicitly approves police tactics and abuse. The abuse of Chicanos and Mexicans is not viewed as police abuse, but as a necessary means to enforce the law on a population. The key for Mirande, is that these negative images can also become internalized in a self-fulfilling prophecy. As Mirande states, "This often

leads them to internalize the negative images and to blame themselves for their subordination. When they begin to internalize such negative images, the mobilization of bias has come full circle (1987:24)."

Committing to the Narrative

Adalberto Aguirre, in several of his works extends Chavez's and Mirande's concepts by taking the additional step that Chavez was hesitant to do: focusing specifically on the threat associated with Mexican immigrants and Mexican American citizens. Aguirre argues that an association between Mexican identity and criminality is firmly cemented in the minds of the American public. The modern iteration of this association is what Aguirre labels the "Mexican Threat Narrative." It manifests itself in an identity of dependency on the welfare state, and carrier of illegality (whether concerning associations with drugs, or as smugglers). As Aguirre expands, "This narrates Mexican identity with images of illegal immigrants feasting on free public services; as carriers and sellers of drugs in unsuspecting communities in the United States; and as smugglers of people across the US-Mexico border (Aguirre et al. 2011:696)." Aguirre also argues that as a consequence of the historical and current perception of Mexicans/Mexican Americans, the Mexican body itself has become a symbol of criminality. In essence, the Mexican body itself is a symbol of what society believes are the major issues with Mexicans, and by extension Mexican Americans and anyone who is perceived to be Mexican. This includes issues with immigration; Aguirre argues that in essence Mexicans/ Mexican Americans carry the border on their backs, representative of

an illegitimate presence. This results in two major developments: Mexican immigrants as a threat to the United States and racial profiling of 'Mexican looking' persons (Aguirre & Simmers 2008).

Aguirre argues that the racial profiling of Mexicans has a strong detrimental effect, which he argues is often lost on the public (because of the perception of a binary attitude towards race), and is a major means of expanding the narrative. Aguirre discusses how racial profiling is situated in popular thinking as something that only happens to Black persons. As with analyzing race in binary terms, by thinking that racial profiling affects only Black persons, one fails to consider how it affects the life experience of other racial and ethnic minority groups. Secondly, thinking that racial profiling only affects Black persons ignores the victimization of Mexican American persons in the United States (Aguirre 2004). Aguirre cites Prop. 187, which profiled all Mexican-origin persons in California as out of control immigrants seeking to deprive White persons of social and economic opportunity, as an example of such systemic profiling. As such, Mexican, was associated with negative expectations, such as the abuse of social welfare programs, promoting perceptions that they needed to be controlled by deporting them back to Mexico among other means. The profiling of Mexican origin persons as immigrants or foreigners in turn further criminalizes the population's identity in popular thinking. Aguirre argues the profiling of Mexican identity, is crucial as it results in a negative expectation state that depicts the person as an undocumented alien or drug smuggler. They then become a target of opportunity for agencies (such as a police department),

because it allows them to initiate actions that reinforce the perception that Mexican origin persons are a threat to public life in the United States. Once a racial or ethnic minority group becomes the target of racial profiling, expectation states are formed in the public mind that are associated with negative evaluations for racial and ethnic minorities (Aguirre 2004). For Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants, the negative evaluations result in repressive social practices against them within the US.

CHAPTER 6: Methodology

Given the lack of research in the field of Hispanic/Latino police officers, the most appropriate means to gather data is through a semi-inductive method utilizing qualitative methodology – in this case, interviews. In general, inductive methods are implemented when no theory, or current theory is not expected to apply to newly analyzed social phenomena. While theory and studies exist that focus on other minority officers and their experience as officers, it is not assumed that the Hispanic/Latino officer will have the same exact experiences as other studies have implicitly assumed.

Recruitment

One of the initial concerns of the study was the availability of officers. However there were steps taken in order to make sure the necessary sample was obtained. This included multiple dimensions to obtain participants. This included inside sources, random meetings, and public events. The first source was a former high ranking civilian official in the LAPD. He has access to many of the high level officers in the department, and interacted with them on a constant basis while with the department. The lead researcher was in contact with this source in order to find participants. The source was informed of the projected sample and whether he knew any potential participants. The source initially emailed four high ranking Latino officers within the department. Only one responded and agreed to meet with the researcher. The lead researcher then reached out to the officer to talk to them about what the study was about. The officer agreed to participate in the study

at a future date. The participant was interviewed, and asked if he knew of any potential participants in the study. The subject then emailed five additional high ranking Latino officers in the department, to which four responded and agreed to participate. While the scope of the study is not on high ranking officers in the LAPD, data was still collected and further snowballing technique was used to gain more participants. The data collected from high ranking officers will be used sparingly when appropriate when dealing with the desired samples findings. The second initial lead was an acquaintance currently an officer for the LAPD. He is also Latino, and specifically Mexican-American. This officer was also interviewed and served as a gatekeeper for acquiring further study participants.

The informants were briefed as to the bare bones of the study, and told the study is about police officers perspectives, ideology, and experiences, in order not to bias the informants and the possible participants of the study. To recruit the specific subjects the informants were also asked to speak to coworkers and friends about participating in the study about police officers experiences. The informants were also given a one page consent form explaining the study being conducted, in order to give to the participants who may be hesitant to participate. Informants were also extensively briefed on the anonymity of the potential data provided from potential participants.

There were officers that were also approached at social functions where the public was invited to speak and meet officers, as well as areas where officers were known to visit and/or patrol (this included restaurants in the morning after roll call and also cold approaches on the street or when patrolling the streets). This was a great opportunity as

the officers were more sociable and able to talk, comparable to other scenarios. The lead researcher approached all officers who he encountered while canvassing. There were two types of interaction with the lead researcher at these events. The first was recruiting officers on an individual basis. Officers were approached individually and informed of the purpose of the study. In order to prevent bias to only recruit officers the researcher believed were Hispanic/Latino, all officers were approached about the study and its purpose. The officers then proceeded to inform the lead researcher if they were not Hispanic/Latino. The lead researcher informed the officers that, the researcher was looking to talk to all officers and if it would be possible to contact them via email with more information about the project. If the potential subjects did not self identify as Latino/Hispanic, the lead researcher asked the question "Are you part Latino/Hispanic?" Every officer the lead researcher believed was Hispanic/Latino identified themselves in this recruitment process as such. Other officers who did not identify as Hispanic/Latino, did not physically appear Hispanic/Latino. However as Irlbeck (2008) stated, not every officer who was Hispanic/Latino fully identified with that race or ethnicity, this was specifically true if one parent was not Hispanic/Latino. This was done to prevent possible sampling on the dependent variable.

Secondly, given the nature of these events many officers were not individually available and were either in dyads or small groups. In these interactions the primary investigator approached the group about the study. As described given the nature of the wariness of participating in the study, the primary investigator gave all the officers in the

group his contact information, as well as asked all the officers for an email address, even if they were not part of the desired sample. The primary investigator then gave his contact information if the email was not possible and asked the possible respondents to contact him if they were interested in the project or wanted more information. Additional potential subjects were recruited via online means such as social media and organizational websites, such as facebook and police related groups and organizations. Data was also collected from officers who did not fit the sample demographic (ie. Latino but not Mexican heritage, or rank of Sergeant and above), for studies in the future.

Sample

There is much diversity within the race/ethnicity of Hispanic/Latino itself, as there is not a universal Hispanic/Latino identity and Latinos are more likely to identify with national origins instead of the general Hispanic/Latino concept (De la Garza et al 1992). The sample was limited to Mexican-heritage officers. Additionally, the sample will be limited to the Los Angeles Police Department. This would help in establishing the population of interest in a large department as described.

The sample consisted of 19 male officers. 17 participants were born in the United States. Two in the sample were born in Mexico and immigrated with their parents when they were extremely young. All the participants were US citizens. All described growing up in the Los Angeles area. The age of the participants ranged from 24 years of age to 35 years of age. In terms of education, all had completed at least some college. All officers

had served as officers at least one year in law enforcement and specifically in the LAPD. All of the officers were below the rank of Sergeant.

Pre-Interview Procedures

Once initial contact was made with a potential subject a standardized email or text message was sent. The email or text stated that who the primary investigator was and that subjects of specific demographics and occupation were being sought to be interviewed in a study for the completion of a dissertation at the University of California- Riverside. The potential subjects were informed that the study was on "Latino/ Hispanic officers in the Los Angeles Police Department." The correspondence concluded with, "This study has also been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of California, Riverside, which seeks to protect the rights and welfare or human subjects involved in research. Is this something you could possibly help me out with? Thanks" Those that responded were immediately scheduled for an interview at a later date at a location of their choosing. Those that did not respond received a secondary email or text several days later as a follow up with the potential to participate in the study. That correspondence was concluded with "If you are willing to participate or know someone who might be interested please contact me. Not responding will be assumed that participation is not viable, and no further contact will be pursued. Thank you."

The primary investigator informed the participants that they could choose the meeting time and place, with the requirement that it should be a place where they would be comfortable talking about their jobs. Participants chose several locations that were

close to their homes, in local cafes, restaurants, or public areas such as the public library, or even their departments. Most participants chose days in which they did not work, or after they got out of work if it was in the afternoon. Once the date and time for the interview was scheduled the primary investigator emailed out the general consent form for the study to the participant. The participant was also notified that this was their copy to keep and that a secondary copy would be provided at the interview for them to sign.

Building Rapport with Participants

One of the concerns of the study was about the openness of the officers who volunteered to participate. This was voiced as a concern in previous studies on policing as the population itself is known for being wary of sharing information with the public that would seem detrimental to their occupation and especially other officers. The primary investigator prepared a rapport building process when meeting with officer in order to attempt to circumvent this problem. Additionally, studies have also shown that when dealing with issues of race, the interviewer's race may affect the responses received by the interviewer (Sudman & Bradburn 1974). The results could be different if the interviewer was a different race/ethnicity than those that were being interviewed. This could be especially the case if there were negative responses to the race/ethnicity the interviewer was. To prevent a version of this, the primary investigator was also the lead and only interviewer of the subjects. The lead researcher is Mexican American. This would serve as a means to improve rapport with the subjects but also get a more honest answer when specifically asking questions about race. Another concern was the issue that

the lead researcher has never been part of law enforcement, and does not have that insider acceptance that is associated with police culture. The primary investigator also took steps during the pre-interview process to circumvent this issue.

Because of the nature of the occupation, in order to establish rapport with the subject, the first 5-10 minutes of the meeting we're dedicated to 'small talk.' This included the primary investigator introducing himself, and if the participant was referred by another officer establishing the relationship with the previous officer (only if the previous participant gave consent to use their name when contacting or talking to a potential participant). Additional topics included subjects such as the weather, traffic or the primary investigators time in school. The goal was to relate to the subjects and have them feel comfortable before starting the interview. Once the primary investigator determined that some rapport was established, the primary investigator gave the consent sheet to the participant and ask them to read it, explaining that it was the same consent form that was emailed to them. The primary investigator also reminded the participants of some of the important aspects of the consent form, so that they would be conscious and completely informed at the time. The primary investigator primed the subject by stating that they would be asked a series of questions about their job, their ideology, and similar topics. The primary investigator also reminded the subjects that this was simply for his doctoral dissertation with a possibility in the future that this might be published. The participants were also informed that if any quotes or information about the participants data was included, no names or anything that would lead to identification would be used.

The participants were also reminded that the primary investigator had no specific agenda or take on the topic; the goal of the research was to hopefully fill the gap in the literature. The primary investigator also reminded the participants that he was not looking for any specific answers or for questions to be answered in a specific way but instead was simply looking for what the participant believed, experienced, or the truth whatever the respondent believed that to be. The primary investigator also asked the participants if they had any questions before they got started. One officer after reading the consent sheet commented "You can't guarantee that…" when it came to the protection of the subjects identity in the study. Additionally, "You might have problems with other officers participating." The primary investigator reminded the subject that the primary investigator would be the only person who would have access to the data, and would also protect the subjects beyond the scope of the law, in the off chance if that ever came to fruition. One officer asked whether the study will be published. The primary investigator informed the subject that ultimately that might happen, but initially it is simply for the dissertation requirement of the doctoral program.

Lastly, the primary investigator reminded the participants that the interview would be recorded for transcription purposes. The officers were also verbally given the choice to be recorded or have the primary investigator take notes. The primary investigator informed the subjects that only the primary investigator would have access to the recorder and the data. This data would then be transferred to a specific computer dedicated to the study where the data would be initially held, before transcription. The

data would then also be transcribed by only the primary investigator. The data on the computer would not be labeled by names but by simple numerical codes that only the primary investigator knew. The participants of the study were also verbally informed that the specific computer dedicated to the study would never be connected to the internet at any point during the study. This only appeared once from the officers as during the explanation of the recording an officer commented "You're not going to put this on Facebook or some blog..."

As mentioned the questions themselves were ordered in a rational progression of the topics of interest, placing non-race specific questions strategically before items that specifically mentioned race in order to not inadvertently prompt the subjects of the race based nature of the study. However if during the interview process itself, if the subject did bring up an experience based on race or a similar concept, the primary investigator did dive deeper into the question and asked the subject to expand on that specific topic even though there might have been an item later in the questionnaire that probed that topic specifically. The primary investigator also took notes during the interview as well, to remind him of possible follow ups. The subjects were prompted that the primary researcher might do this, to get the complete picture. Rapport building continued thought the interview itself. This was deemed effective as after one specific interview the primary investigator ended the interview thanking the officer, while the officer responded with, "No thank you, this was like a therapy session (laughter)."

Each interview ended with the primary investigator informing the participants that if anything else of relevance came to mind, to contact the primary investigator to schedule another meeting at their convenience or relay the information via an email or phone call if possible. Participants were also asked whether they were willing to have a general follow up interview if required. There were also several follow ups to the interviews. In the follow ups the interviewer let the participants lead the interview in more of a discussion format. The officers spoke about what was on their mind. If questions were asked by the primary investigator they were the exact same questions as asked before but done so in a more organic conversational ways.

Interviews

Studies on race and police officer interaction have primarily employed qualitative methodology, most commonly interviews (Haarr 1997;Irlbeck 2008;Guajardo 2015, Portillos 2015). Given that some studies focus on race within departments, they could serve as a guide. However, since that research is lacking when it comes to Hispanic/Latino officer samples, it would be problematic and inappropriate to strictly use the interview guides from those studies. Thus, some relevant questions from those studies (specifically four prior studies) were used for this present study, and new questions specifically for Hispanic/Latinos were also used.

Haarr (1997) created a 29 item open ended instrument created for revealing in depth empirical and attitudinal data from patrol officers. Her data included demographics of the officer's background: number of years on the police force, race, gender, age, level

of education, prior law enforcement experience, prior duty assignments, reason for joining the police department, and whether the officer came originally from the local area. The police patrol culture component of the survey instrument consisted of 10 items designed to probe various features of the patrol culture as well as the culture of the larger department, such as "How do officers get their assignments?", "How far in the department do you think you can go in regard to rank or assignment?", "How well do officers on this shift get along?", "How well do officers get along together within the department?", and "Is there a racial/gender division in the police department?" They were also asked "What are the main groups of police with whom you interact on-duty?", "Are they mostly men or women?", "Are they of a particular race or culture?" The questionnaire was designed to tap four major areas of interaction: others with whom the patrol officer interacts on duty, the different types of interactions, the frequency of interactions on duty, and how the interactions developed. Questions that were explicitly included in Haarr's research were also asked on the current research questionnaire.

Irlbeck's (2008) study on Latino Police officer self identification, prompted the necessity for further demographic analysis of the sample population. Irlbeck (2008) also used semi-structured interviews on a one hundred percent sample demographic (N=34) in a police department in Omaha Nebraska. Irlbeck's examination of the assumptions of ethnic identity included a 77 item, 42 open ended questionnaire. This prompted the inclusion of asking directly how respondents self identify racially or ethnically. Irlbeck (2008) did not explicitly include many verbatim questions in her publication, but

however did mention she asked questions besides self identification, such as on Latino officers working in and interacting with the Latino community. Questions focusing on those topics were also included in the questionnaire.

Guajardo (2015) while also focusing on Latino identity of police officers, in addition to ethnographic and historical data, included a 10 item interview questionnaire focusing on biographical information, education attained, joining the department, training in the department, racial identification, and experiences with discrimination within the department. While Guajardo focuses on a more diverse sample to implement his questionnaire, questions in this study also drew from the relevant questions Guajardo formed, to create conceptually similar questions. Lastly, Portillo's (2015) study on Chicano officers in the Phoenix PD was also used as a guide. Portillo's study also included semi-structured interviews and included questions of why officers entered law enforcement, challenges of working with the Latino community, encounters with police, navigating culture, and racialized interactions.

There was up to 92 items for the respondents to reply to. There were three general themes to the questionnaire items. The first set of questions were general questions. The questionnaire began with some demographic questions to make the respondents comfortable with the questions being asked. This was also done for classification purposes. These items included level of education, as well if they were originally from the area. There was also an item that specifically asked how they classified themselves racially or ethnically, in order to determine how they self identify. Demographic

questions also included political affiliation. This question was expanded upon if there was not a clear answer given, or a story behind it, as was the case in a few of the sample. The next set of questions focused on the police officer experience. This included the opening question of "Can you tell me about your experience in being a police officer?" This is done in order to voluntarily elicit information from an open ended question to determine areas of importance, in their experiences as police officers. Additional questions in this area included motivation for becoming an officer, who they interact with on a daily basis while at work, their supervisor, questions about partners, promotions, and training. The third set of questions focused on race specifically, not only in their experience but also in their ideology of what was reality in the department. This included specific questions about being a Latino officer, race relations between officers, discrimination, and minority officer assignments. These questions were asked later in the interview to have the officers become more comfortable and have the questions appear as simply a natural transition. The questionnaire was pretested with former officers within the LAPD, and officers from another local police department. Items that were deemed ineffective were removed from the initial questionnaire. Also questions that were ambiguous were rewritten for clarity purposes.

Coding and Data

Coding of the data proceed on relevant themes and concepts. Coding was done using the Coding Analysis Toolkit (CAT), hosted by the University Center for Social and Urban Research, at the University of Pittsburgh and using the Atlas.ti qualitative

software. Data analysis began as soon as the first interview was conducted and continued with the increase in the sample size, this is important because it directed the next interviews and observations (Corbin and Strauss 1990). Coding proceeded on the understood forms of coding in grounded theory; open coding, axial coding and selective coding (Corbin and Strauss 1990).

CHAPTER 7: Results

This section presents results from the interviews as well as results from prior studies as context for the data collected. The questionnaire ranged from experiences before becoming an officer to their present day rank and status. The data is organized into 3 general themes: 1) participants' racial/ethnic self-identification, 2) motivations for becoming an officer in the LAPD, and 3) participants' on-the-job experiences and ideology as they related to police culture, the promotion process, race-based interactions including the experience and perception of racism/discrimination, and interactions with and perceptions of the community.

Self Identification

One of the first questions asked was how participants identified themselves racially or ethnically. As Irlbeck (2008) described in her work on Latino police officer self-identification, one of the first assumptions when conducting research on ethnic/racial minorities is whether they self identify with that ethnic/racial category at all. The assumption that Hispanic/Latino officers will self identify with that specific group is not an accurate statement. As Irlbeck (2008) demonstrated there were a small percentage of officers in her study who did not self identify as being Latino, and instead self identified as White. This was primarily based on the fact that one parent was not Hispanic/Latino and the officer self-identified more with the Non-Hispanic/Latino patronage, which was White.

Two questions were asked about the respondents self identification: an open ended question asking for self classification based on race/ethnicity and a question about whether they identified as Hispanic/Latino. All the respondents self identify through a combination of the questions asked as Hispanic/Latino. Some self identified as Hispanic/Latino in their open ended self classification, others categorized themselves with other responses, yet when asked directly with the follow up if they were Latino/ Hispanic, answered yes. The most predominant self classification of race/ethnicity was the identification of Mexican American. The second most common form of self classification was a self description of being Latino/Hispanic. Two officers self identified first as being Latino. Those were the only two officers that interviewed that were not born in the United States, but instead were born in Mexico and traveled to the US as children along with their parents. While they did first self identify as being Latino, they did also describe identifying as originally being from Mexico in their answers, as the officers described, "100 percent Latino, I'm from Mexico" or "I'm Latino. I was born in Mexico and I came with my parents and my siblings when I was really young."

While the sample is small it is of note that it was these same officers that self classified as Latino, did not initially self identify as being Mexican. In fact, none of the respondents self identify as strictly being Mexican. Neither did any respondent classify themselves as being strictly Hispanic, Chicano, White, or any other race/ethnic classification. Additionally, because of the fact that there was the potential for White and/or another identity, participants were also briefly informally asked about their parents

and if both parents were classified as the participant described themselves. Every participant in the sample confirmed that their parents were both how they self classified, and in essence not a self identification of being multiracial or White.

Additionally when asked about self identification of race or ethnicity there was some ambivalence from many of the participants. This was among the group that self-identified as Latino/Hispanic. It appeared as though there was some hesitancy about the appropriate term they wanted to use in order to self classify themselves. There was also additional information given by some participants when asked about their self classification of race and/or ethnicity. Participants described themselves with their preferred term, but added additional information that portrayed ambivalence about what term to use, or the nature of race/ethnicity itself. As some officers remarked after the question "How do you classify yourself racially/ethnically?"

"Is there an official race?...Aren't we all one race? I'm Latino/ Hispanic."

"Hispanic/Latino. The strange thing about this is that Latino is not a race [laughs]. I'll go with that."

"I would say Latino, Hispanic [smirks]. Or what we are calling ourselves today?"

As Irlbeck (2008) describes there can be different tiers of identification with the Hispanic/Latino identity itself. As in her study even those in the population that had a Hispanic/Latino identity wavered in the amount of saliency. Those that self identified as Mexican American did not have this ambiguity, as those that did classify as

Hispanic/Latino. The data related to the saliency of race/ethnicity in the occupational context will be discussed later in the chapter.

Motivations for Becoming a Police Officer

Previous studies have focused on the motivations of officers in general, with fewer studies specifically focusing on racial/ethnic minorities. Studies have found that the reasons officers noted why they joined law enforcement did not vary much, regardless of race/ethnicity. However the order of importance of the reasons varied by race/ethnicity (Raganella and White 2004). Minority officers noted helping people, job security, and benefits as top reasons. Multiple reasons were given by the different officers that were similar to studies that have focused on minority and specifically Hispanic/Latino officers previously. Additional factors included the structure of the occupation, as well as a sense of duty, and additionally the LAPD as an organization in itself as a motivating factor.

Motivations: To Help People

Most officers gave more than one reason as to why they decided to apply to be an officer. However, the concept of helping others was the main reason given as a motivation. This falls in line with previous research on minority and non-minority officers (Raganella and White 2004). As described when officers were directly asked "Why did you want to become a police officer?,"

"I wanted to help people. I saw a good great need. There is always a need for good officers."

"To help people. I wanted to effect and change people's lives for the better, who wouldn't like that in their job?"

More specifically, the respondents emphasized helping the community, specifically the minority community. Officers in the sample described growing up in the greater Los Angeles area and wanting to make a difference in the community through their chosen occupation. As officers described:

"I wanted to work where I have an impact, because I'm from the community."

"So for me, I grew up in minority communities, I said what the hell, maybe I can make a difference and create some change."

"I saw being a police officer as being one of those opportunities to give back to the community and to participate within the community so they can be self sufficient."

Other officers described not only the desire to help people and the community, but based that desire specifically on their experiences growing up in the minority community. Namely, it was to do a better job than previous iterations of police officers that they were aware of. This included officers that were depicted on television through the scandals that hit the LAPD throughout the years, or the officers they heard about through other people, or who they actually had contact with. As officers described:

"Being from the community that was predominantly minority, you see and hear all the things that happen with people you know and police officers. I did not want to be like that. I wanted to be better than those officers, to be an example of how an officer should be; professional at all times."

"So then to me I said if I join, I can make a difference. I don't have to treat people that way; excessive force, rough people up. I can be a more compassionate, understanding individual."

"You saw all the knuckleheads with Rampart, and other things that happened in the LAPD, I wanted to do better. I know that wasn't the department. I knew I could do a better job"

As described, believing in the idea of helping people was the top reason given for becoming an officer, but more specifically with this sample, the idea of focusing on the community as well as being a better officer by helping people and providing better service than they or others received growing up in their communities was an important factor. Officers did also describe and go into further detail about their own interactions with law enforcement throughout their lives, and any potential impact that might have had on their motivations to pursue law enforcement.

Motivations: Police Interactions

Portillos (2015) in his examination of Chicano officers found that interactions with officers as adolescents was present in many in his sample. The same was the case with officers in this study. Portillos also found that the nature of those interactions, specifically if they were negative interactions did not impact the participants from wanting to become officers. However, in his sample in general interactions with police officers were recalled to be mostly positive.

In the interviews conducted for this study, participants did discuss interactions with officers in their neighborhood as being a direct influence on their motivation to become an officer. Other participants describe officer interactions growing up, though they did not mention that those interactions directly influenced their chosen career. In general when focusing on police interaction with the participants before they were officers, there were two general classifications of interactions; interactions as children or

teenagers, and interactions as adults, before they were police officers or even considered becoming an officer.

Pre-police interaction: as adolescents

There were specific context in which participants had interactions with officers as adolescents. Participants described seeing specific officers assigned to their communities who they knew of and interacted with, as well as in schools. Many of these interactions were not initiated by the participants, but by the officers themselves. Those that were initiated by officers had a specific context where children/ adolescents were present. These interactions can generally be coded as negative or positive experiences for the participants.

Negative interactions

Participants described having negative encounters with police officers. Participants described being approached or confronted by police officers as children or teenagers in their communities. As a respondent described their interactions with officers, "I was a delinquent kid, nothing major. But I had my run-ins with police when I was younger. Usually for being dumb, being a kid."

Though there were only a few of the officers who described having negative interactions as adolescents or teenagers, respondents also described the interactions as an understandable or defendable action by the officers. By stating that they were responsible for their actions and that as a consequence the officers took action, it was as a responsive measure and not a proactive response to them specifically. There was also the

acknowledgement that it wasn't fair. However this again is then viewed from the perspective of the respondents as an understandable action. As one participant responded:

"I know what they (police officers) do and you know what they sometimes do. I've had knees on my back and my neck but you know what, I understand. I understand, sometimes it wasn't fair, but I understand. I really do."

Participants also described not only negative interactions with themselves but also negative interactions with their immediate family as well. One officer also described a negative incidence where his parents were confronted by officers, and that interaction escalated to the use of force which resulted in negative consequences for the participant's family. As the officer described:

"The last thing my parents ever wanted me to be was a cop, Why? Because they had been abused at the hands of a cop."

However officers that describe those negative interactions with officers before they became officers did as discussed earlier, want to help people within their community by being different than the officers they had interacted with in their communities. As described negative interactions as adolescents was not very common in the sample. Most of the interactions with police officers as adolescents were actually viewed positively as Portillos (2015) described. The sample also did not describe that the negative interactions colored their judgement of law enforcement, the LAPD, or deterred them from wanting to join law enforcement later in life.

Positive interactions

The most common interactions with police officers as adolescents were positive for the respondents. The context of these interactions were substantially different than the negative interactions. The positive interactions took place in their neighborhood, in groups, while in the streets interacting with other adolescents. As officers described:

"I remember being maybe like 10-11 and talking to the police when I was out with my friends riding bikes or doing things what kids do. They would stop their cars and talk to us. Where we went to school, where we lived, about what we were playing and to be safe. That kind of thing. I thought it was great. We're kids and they wanted to talk to us. No one forced them to, and as kids you're like 'Wow, that's cool'."

"The officers, I don't remember if they were (always) the same ones or not, they were White, but they would be in my neighborhood. I never had any bad feelings or (bad) interactions with them. I talked to them usually when we were in a group playing outside. But they never questioned us or anything bad, they were just patrolling doing their job."

Another officer talked about the interaction with officers while in school and how he engaged in conversation with the officers. This was the only other context described by officers in which they had some form of interaction with officers as adolescents. As described,

"We engaged in conversation and he told me some stories. That seemed interesting to me, and the fact that he was willing to talk to me was a positive influence."

"I couldn't play with the normal kids and so this officer took his time and he would sit at the bench with me, since I couldn't do anything else but just sit there."

In general, most of the interactions as adolescents vary depending on the context of the interaction. Obviously those that ended up with negative implications for the

participants were not remembered fondly, though the other interactions with officers on patrol or in schools were viewed as more positive. As stated, those negative interactions were not cited as having a negative influence in their decisions to pursue law enforcement. However, not surprisingly interactions as adults were more directly cited as having an influence on wanting to join the police department.

Pre-police interaction: adults

There were also cases of interactions with police as adults. These interactions were quite different than the interactions as adolescents; participants did not describe any specific negative interactions as adults before they were police officers. The interactions as adults were based on specific interactions that helped inform or motivate the participant to potentially seek employment as an officer. One participant described how a ride along with officers influenced his opinion of not only the occupation but of police officers as well:

"I was in college, finishing my degree at that time. I didn't know any American police officers at the time. So I started reading stuff and talking to people (about potentially becoming an officer) and I went on ride alongs, not many, and they were good guys."

One participant described how being around officers or seeing police officers in different scenarios not only influenced their opinion of officers, but also influenced their decision to seek employment as well. Their experiences gave them a new understanding of the position and what doing 'police work' could actually be. As described,

"I was very involved (with his children). It seems like everything I did with them there was cops around. Be it at the school, at the park, at the church, at my job. I was like they do everything, they're everywhere, it's not just patrolling the streets and that is something I wanted to do and I said that's it, that's what I want to do."

There was also only one instance of an officer being motivated by knowing of another officer on a personal level. It was also not someone in the immediate family but a friend that they knew growing up that also happened to be their neighbor. As the officer described,

"I was close to my neighbor. He was a few years older than me at the time, but he applied got in and he did not do the military route first. He only had a couple years of college I think. I asked him how he liked it and what he did, and he told me that it was good overall. I think he had been an officer for like 2 years at that point. He said the job was different than you expect (chuckles). He was right."

As described, there was only one instance of knowing someone else who was an officer and it wasn't an immediate family member. As research has shown knowing someone who is an officer can have a large effect on motivation to become one as well, specifically for males (Lester 1983; Raganella and White 2004). However, that research not surprisingly shows that having relatives or knowing other individuals who are police officers were cited as being less important as a reason for becoming a police officer to minority recruits, probably based on the fact that they knew less people, other minorities, that were police officers already.

Motivations: A Job and Financial Stability

Policing as providing financial stability was a recurring theme with the participants. This is not surprising as job security is usually noted as among the top reasons for becoming a police officer regardless of race or ethnicity (Raganella and White 2004). Both males and females, and White and minority officers in Raganella and

White's (2004) study cited job security and job benefits among the top 4 reasons for motivation to become police officers. This was also the case in this study, as officers stated:

"I was looking for a job and I needed a job, I didn't have any education that qualified me for anything else so they had this program."

"I was looking for a job. I was in college, I wanted to finish college, go to law school and my dad tells me the LAPD is hiring, especially Spanish speaking and I thought I could do that while I go to school and make real money. I know people do that, be cops and go to law school, and then the reality of it seduced me."

"I worried about what the hell was I going to do. I wasn't a delinquent. I went to school, but at that time I did not know that I could go to college, so after high school I was really worried. I did the military first. So about a year or so after that, I jumped in, and my dream was to become a police officer, start a good career with real money, and I pushed myself towards that, and here I am."

Job related reasons as a source of motivation was generally given as a secondary response, though there were officers that did describe job related attributes as the main motivation. However monetary compensation was not necessarily the goal, but the idea of financial stability and certainty was the important factor for the participants; the specific need for employment specifically one with career aspirations. As Raganella and White (2004) describe, other job perks not related to the actual duty or assignments such as a potential career advancement and early retirement were stated among the more influential reasons for becoming a police officer as well, regardless of race or gender.

Motivations: Structure and Duty

Raganella and White (2004) along with Lester (1983), also included a category which they labeled as "structured like the military." This was also encountered in the sample. However not surprisingly this was only among the participants that had military experience in their careers prior to becoming officers. Those that did not have military experience did not mention the structure of the occupation and its similarity to military structure as a motivating variable. Participants describe the allure of the familiarity in their previous occupation in the military and how knowing the structure would be an easy transition. As officers stated:

"I think being in the military for 4 years. I think it was kind of a natural progression for me to go into policing because of discipline, of the structure that was already used."

"I was in the military. It just made sense, a lot of overlap between the two; similarly structured and organized."

Other officers also described a sense of "duty" in the motivations for seeking employment in law enforcement. This mostly stemmed from an extension of their experience in the military. As officers described.

"Well that's a good question, I was 23 years old just got out of the Marine Corps and at the time just like when I joined the Marine Corps, I didn't know I wanted to defend my country, I had this sense of patriotism, or duty, or whatever you want to call it. Well kind of the same thing why I wanted to join the department."

"The natural instincts just kicked in, to protect you can say. The military was one thing that I wanted to do. And I joined the military, did go, did all that, came back. Thank goodness nothing major happened. Once I came back I went to college, but I also wanted to become a police officer. As I was doing that, finishing my degree, my application with the police department kicked in and LAPD, like that it happened so quickly."

Another officer described a sense of duty, but was not focusing on the military component. It was a sense of duty and responsibility to his family. Specifically with his parents. His parents immigrated to this country several years ago to Los Angeles, where the officer in the sample was born. The officer found a sense of duty to his parents to make something of himself and to contribute to society as well. As described,

"I know my parents went through a lot to get to this country so it is always a reminder of what they went through, expenses, and labor, and sacrifices to bring you and your brother here so that you could do something with your lives. That was always something that stayed in the back of my mind. I don't want to waste that. All their hard labor, so I thought about always improving and doing something where I can help, and help society and help society be a better place. I just had to."

While this can also be categorized essentially as helping people, this was different as described, as not only helping people and doing something they viewed as being productive and relevant for society as a whole, but that this desire came from a sense of duty from the struggles that his parents endured as the main motivating factor.

Motivations: The Job Itself

Participants also expressed interest in becoming an officer because of perceived characteristics of the job itself, such as the adventure and the ever-changing nature of the occupation, which officers viewed as appealing. As officers stated:

"I'll put it this way, think about most people's jobs. I never wanted to sit in a cubicle and push papers. I wanted to do something with my life, that I liked to do, that was new and constantly changing. Being in law enforcement lets you do that. There is no routine day. You never know what or who you're going to run into or what call you might get. You definitely have to be on your toes. You can't do that in an office."

"There are a lot of people doing work with huge responsibilities that are 22-23 years old which is also part of the the attraction of the job, it's the responsibility thrust on you. An unusual responsibilities."

Though this was a minority of the sample, this did come from the younger participants in the sample, specifically those that had the least time as officers. As in Raganella and Whites (2004) study this was among the least cited reasons why people joined law enforcement.

Motivations: The LAPD Itself

Another source of motivation was the LAPD itself and the perceived prestige and positive image associated with it. As officers describe,

"Join the LAPD? Like well really I could do that. And you always heard of the 'world's finest.' What you have heard of with the 'not contracts but commitments,' and the best of the best go inside, and the competitor in me, and so I could do that. So I threw my hat in the race and see what."

"There are certain things, you hear a lot of good and bad things about the LAPD because they're so big. There's always somebody doing some stupid thing, but there is a culture and it's not what the critics thinks it is. It is a culture of hard work and honest service and honorableness. That's what drew me to the organization."

"I remember seeing movies where the LAPD was involved and I thought it was great. I think the uniform as well. The LAPD is very professional, and equally as important they look the part."

As the officers describe in their motivations, the positive nature of not only the occupation, but specifically of the department was a motivating factor. While other studies have focused on popular conceptions of police in media such as in films and television, previous studies have not focused on large departments or departments that

were the subject of the source material. Officers described wanting to become police officers, but also specifically wanting to be part of the specific department, the LAPD. This could possibly have to do with having a positive occupational identity. As discussed later however, a less positive perception/interaction with the community could have an impact on that occupational identity, and how one perceives the occupation itself.

The following section focuses on areas of police experience and ideology/perceptions of the participants. It begins with the introduction and attempted establishment of culture and the occupation norms, followed by the identification with the occupation, as well as the manifestations of culture through classic markers. This will lead specifically into a focus on interactions/perceptions of race as well. To conclude, the focus shifts to the interactions and perceptions of the minority community.

Academy Training

One of the first formal constructs of the introduction to policing is through the training new recruits receive in the academy. Here officers are introduced to not only the tactics and policies of the department, but to the culture and expectations of being a police officer and part of the LAPD. The participants were not asked directly about their experiences in the police academy as Conti and Doreian (2010) examined, but instead were only asked one question: "Did you receive any training on how to interact with other officers?" The goal was to inventory if officers received any type of training about interacting with other officers and also (irrelevant whether they received the training or

not) whether they remembered any training at all or any such formal rule sets when interacting with other officers.

There were two main responses to this question. The first was the majority response by the officers, that they received no training on how to interact with other officers. They mentioned that there was extensive training on how to interact with the public in different situations, as part of their everyday jobs. However, other participants mentioned that there was not necessarily training on how to interact with other officers but that there was department policies that were used as the basic guidelines for officer interactions. That was the extent to which the department focuses on officer-officer interactions, according to the participants. Though one participant also described a few hours of cultural training on diversity, however, this was not directed specifically at the officer-officer interaction but overall, which includes the community and the public to which the participants would encounter. As the officer described,

"Well there's training in the academy. Training where you learn to do police work and things of that nature, so you interact with other officers, you learn to rely on your partners and what you can do with them. You are also given cultural training at that point. Does it stick, or not, I don't know."

As alluded to in the previous quote, officers also focused on the effectiveness of the training. Other officers did describe that the training they did receive was not an effective method of creating a homogenous unit as was intended. One officer acknowledged that any training on interacting with other officers and people in general,

about how to treat people, was largely ineffective do to the individual histories of the officers. As the officer described,

"I think a lot of that has to do with how we're living and how were growing up and our political affiliation. Then a few hours of training at the academy is supposed to change things? That's about the extent of it."

Previous research by Conti and Doreian (2010) focused on the attempt by a police department which had issues of police-community interaction, specifically in a racial context. The department tried to remedy this by introducing new recruits to different racial and ethnic group interactions early in the academy. This worked to increase higher levels of social knowledge and friendship between individuals of different races/ethnicities, but not expunging underlying ideology regarding race. Conti and Doreain (2010) noticed that when directly presented with issues of race, diversity and challenges, late into training, the officers resorted back to initial perceptions regarding race/ethnicity that wanted to be eliminated in the academy process.

Another area in which the academy emerged as a topic of interest was how the participants described their experience of the academy in terms of negative interactions between them and their training officers. As an officer described:

"The first 2 weeks they are there in your face. They try to find out if you can take the yelling in your face right now. How are you going to take it in the streets? In the public when you get the guy that's half-drunk or the guy that doesn't like cops at all? So they try to filter them out and some of them will just quit within the first week. "Well I didn't sign up to get yelled at." (simulating a training officer) "Well you didn't sign up to be a police officer then." You can't get yelled out here in a controlled environment, why are we going to put you through an academy, because what are you going to do then?"

There was also an officer who specifically focused on the racial nature of the academy, focusing on the similar behavior as described by other officers but interpreting it in negative racial terms. As the officer described:

"It's okay during the academy to do the same thing, to use some ethnically disparaging remarks, so they may not be as blatant or obvious as they were before. To defend it. Saying something like "Damn it we're toughening you up for the streets, if you can't take it here what are you going to do on the streets?"

Since group homogenization is a goal of the academy, to use race/ethnicity based or coded remarks seems counterintuitive. Conti and Doreian (2010) describe how the goal of the increase in interracial interactions in the academy was to create a homogenous ideology within the class of recruits. They describe that the goal of the interracial mixing within squads was to introduce recruits to other demographics they might not have come into contact before to increase rapport and favorability of the demographic. As Conti and Doreian (2010) describe, relations were increased with favorability, yet new officers at that state had not shed their racial identity in favor of the proposed occupation identity that was pushed on them.

Culture

The examination of police culture has been studied over the years, specifically the impact that it has on the officers, the community, and the interaction between them. More recent scholarship has focused on police culture and the minority (African American) experience with culture, with the influx of minority officers throughout the recent decades. While no specific questions were asked about police culture in the study, the

topic of police culture came up. In general when it comes to occupational culture, in the course of the interviews, officers acknowledged that a culture exists within the organization, as officers described,

"Yeah there is a culture that exists, its real."

"There is a way of doing things, how to act. You can call it a police culture. People view it negatively. It's like the military, the military has a culture, a brotherhood. Is that bad? I don't think so."

Officers also describe how or in what forms the culture of policing exists. Officers also acknowledge not only the existence of the culture but that they themselves are subjected to the norms and values of the occupational culture that exists. As the previous quote alludes to however, how officers see or describe the culture varies.

Conservative Maneuvering

One of the components of traditional police occupational culture is the conservative nature of the occupation. This is of particular interest given where Hispanic/Latinos stand politically, specifically given the Mexican-American sample. Some officers described being uncomfortable with the conservative atmosphere when first introduced to the occupation. As an officer described,

"This, the structure and order and discipline was new to me. I didn't do the military route which a lot of them do, and I did not consider myself conservative, my parents were Democrats. So this was interesting as many of my colleagues are Republicans. After being an officer, I have to say I side more with the Republicans ideas, at least when it comes to law enforcement."

A few officers described as coming in with certain ideals but those changing over time while in the occupation. One officer specifically described how the occupation changed his political affiliation and ideology:

"I'm an Independent, but I started out as a Democrat. Once I became an officer, its very difficult to keep those liberal ideas. I'm not saying that you can't be a Democrat and in law enforcement, we have many people here that are, you know we're in California too. But once you join it's part of the culture. It's a very conservative atmosphere, it just comes with being part of the job."

Officers also described coming in with expectations that they would change some aspects of policing, essentially the negative aspects of the culture. As described in the motivation of officers, many wanted to improve the conditions that they or others in their community have faced. However, many quickly changed their ideals given the reality of the nature of the occupation. As they describe,

"You hear people want to become officers because they want to change things. I laugh at that idea. I thought that too. You find out very quickly that you have no say and you just follow orders as they are, if you want to keep your job."

"I came in with the idea that I wanted to change some things. Looking back on that I did not know really what I was getting into. You're on the bottom of the ladder. Change starts from the top."

"I was very naive back then, I said, I came in with those things. I'm going to change the department. I'm going to help those in the community. I'm going to bring my point of view, my point of thought and everything."

One officer also described how he changed overtime specifically being uncomfortable and unfamiliar with the cultural component of the occupation. He felt that

he was essentially playing a role, but as his tenure in the department increased it became a part of him. As the officer described,

"As the years went on I grew into my skin. When I first started, I felt like I was playing a role, but if you play the role long enough you're no longer playing the role, it's who you are."

As the last quote indicates, the officer went from not embodying the occupational culture in the academy to embodying it through everyday activities and expectations of being an officer. The subject acknowledge that how he viewed the occupation and culture, changed to where he identified with it, essentially the culture succeeding to create an identification of being "blue."

Blue ID

Though the officers recognized their own racial identity, a second identity emerged from the occupation itself, as a police officer. There were two specific forms in which this "blue" identity was expressed in the interviews. The first was in the creation of an identification based on those that are a part of the occupation and those that are not, essentially relating it to the public and the community. Specifically officers described their experiences and how other individuals (some even named politicians, community organizers, etc) do not understand what officers must deal with and are hence viewed as obstacles to overcome. As officers describe:

"Unless people put on this uniform and walk in these boots, and see what we see on our end. They will never understand. They will not understand (emphasis added by the respondent). We will always be the enemy. We stick together. We're all blue."

"We understand the people, we do. We do have a brotherhood, we're all blue because of the badge we wear, regardless of politics, or really anything."

The second form of identification is in relation to the job and understanding almost in familial terms that the officers will be there regardless of any other issues. Even when discussing possible race related issues (as will be focused on later this chapter) there was a return to a "blue" identity. When asked questions about varying concepts including any issues or tensions that may exist in the department, respondents were willing to discuss those issues and concepts, yet would return to the police identity. Officers would describe themselves that under stress, that identity would supersede any problems and group members would aid the other members regardless of the issues they may have. As officers describe:

"We're all men in blue, we understand that we have a job to do in the law enforcement and so we would back each other up (if there were any problems)."

"But you hear people have problems, but you don't have much to bitch about, chill out. You're here for a reason so shut the fuck up. We get along great, we joke, even on the street, we count on one another, we put our lives on one another, but in the end a call comes out and we roll. We take care of business."

While the police identity was salient among the sample, here that identity seems to supersede any issues that officers might face (in their opinion). However, one officer described an incident, involving another officer, where this identity was challenged. An officer called for backup, and other officers did not respond quickly. As a result, the officer received some injuries. The accusation was this was some form of retaliation for another specific incident; an incident where an officer broke with the norms of the

culture, by breaking the "code of silence" and was then viewed as an outsider by other officers.

The most notorious manifestation of police culture is the code of silence. There were two conflicting views of the code. One was the adherence to it, and the other was the avoidance of it, in a self preservation referred to as "cover your own ass" attitude, not surprising especially given the history of the department. Officers who described this attitude said they would only do it if it was absolutely necessary. Officers did not want to bring other officers into problems or situations that they did not have to. There were specific instances of these norms being implemented, adhered, to or rejected, and the consequences/retaliation that came from those actions.

Retaliation

When not adhering to the culture, officers describe receiving retaliation based on their actions. In general, officers acknowledge and know this aspect of the culture and fully acknowledge the consequences of not adhering to it, as officers described,

"If you don't speak the party lines and support it you're going to be alienated."

"You're damn right they are (afraid of the retaliation), and they have every reason to be so."

"Do you want to be unpopular? You like being liked? It's a nice feeling. It's a nice warm feeling. You're a good guy, you know what I get … I have to take this call (and mimics person leaving). They don't want to be seen with you."

Officers in the sample faced retaliation for actions that went against various aspects of the culture. They faced retaliation from other officers and the department. An

officer who blew the whistle on illegal activities in the department involving other officers became alienated from other officers because of the reporting of his actions. He said,

“You can't go against the culture. For myself, for example I blew the whistle on some stuff that I found to be inappropriate and what not, and for a second let's just suppose that perhaps what I blew the whistle on wasn't that big of a deal. But let's go even a step further, let's say there was smoke but there was no fire. Let's give the department the benefit of the doubt: I overreacted? Now the department's appropriate response is he overreacted let's suspend him ...because I tried to do the right thing?

In another incident an officer also reported other officers, however in this instance knowing full well the potential repercussions that followed, As described,

“I was disenchanted because I couldn't believe this happened. But long story short I reported officers that were doing misconduct in the community that we serve. I reported it and it was the right thing to do and I knew I was probably going to get fall back from it but I said you know what it is what I believe is right.”

This officer described the repercussions and retaliation taken by other officers, when specifically asked if the officer faced any repercussions or retaliation for reporting the officers. As described,

“Well I did do the right thing, and then when I came back to work and I was assigned to work with another officer maybe that officer didn't know what happened. So we're going to go clean the car, because you have to put all your equipment together. I would hear other officers tell him hey ‘John’ watch your back, you're working with ‘Tom’, who's going to dime you out. They say you wear a jacket, meaning that you have been identified as as a rat and that means people don't like him for whatever reason.”

Officers also focused on the fact that there was no general mechanism for doing the 'right thing' as the department does not provide support to people who make these claims even if they are following departmental policy, As stated,

"There exists no mechanism in the organization right now that would support an officer from doing the right thing and in turn being covered. You're going to get officers ostracized period."

Another officer in reporting another event in which there was some possible officer misconduct echoed a similar response. As described,

"I did the right thing and I'm the one getting hounded? So this is where I started having second thoughts. Man I thought I was doing the right thing in a department that supported this kind of behavior when you report it. Maybe not."

Officers also described that action or lack of action taken on their behalf when they felt retaliated against. Specifically officers reiterated that they felt there was a disconnect between the rank and file officers and the command staff/department. They did not feel supported even when 'doing the right thing." As summed up by an officer,

"They say that the patrol officers are the backbone of the department. We are. We take the brunt of the hate, the heat, everything from the public and you reward them in this manner? No wonder you have bad cops and no one wants to work the streets, because of the bottom of the bottom are out there in the streets. And it's sad we have good officers in the street, but when faced with that stuff? It is very damning and damaging. We do everything out in the streets but now we also have to watch our backs from the people who are supposed to take care of us? That's bad."

One officer who believed he was actually targeted by command staff, was previously under investigation, but was not sure why. There were three commanding officers that targeted him specifically for reasons still unknown to the officer. The officer

thought he was going to be fired, and underwent serious amounts of stress, for months. Later he was cleared of all wrongdoing (the accusation itself was not serious in nature) and was later made aware that he potentially had a solid case for a lawsuit against the department. However he did not pursue those means because of the repercussions of that suit, even if shown valid and legitimate. As described,

"Here's what's the pattern i've seen. They fire you. You fight for your job. Meantime you have no job, you probably end up losing your home. More than likely your family, go through all that stress. For what so you can get a little bit of money? It ain't worth it. I know i'm in the right so i'm going to do my job accordingly. I have done nothing wrong."

Unfortunately, the retaliation component can take a racial tone. One example is as described in the case of Christopher Dorner. As described Dorner claimed that he faced racially motivated actions taken against him by other officers as well as the actions taken by the department. One officer specifically brought up Dorner in the conversation about retaliation as an example of things that could happen. As described,

"You look at the Dorner case, you hear what he did was horrendous. I don't care what he claims others or the department did to him, horrendous you can't do that. I'll tell you right now that shit happens. It exists...it's exists. He handled it terribly, horribly, the ramifications of what he did was just horrible, but what he pointed out in terms of favoritism in terms of how were dealt with (minorities) it's accurate, it still hasn't changed."

Another officer described making an offhand comment that included racial content but was not racist in nature. The comment included an observations about the racial composition in the scenario he and other officers were in while socializing on duty.

By making this comment the officer broke with the code in the eyes of the other officers and received negative feedback, and was viewed as an outsider. As described,

"I made that comment. It's not till later that week that I find out that apparently I'm very sensitive to Latino issues, and that not to say anything negative about minorities around me because I'm militant. Based on that comment! You can't speak your mind when it comes to that kind of stuff because you're going to get alienated."

As demonstrated throughout some of the description and examples of maneuvering culture, occupational identity, self identification, and retaliation, aspects of race/ethnicity are intertwined in the process of becoming an officer. However, these occupational experiences are without explicitly making race/ethnicity the main variable under analysis. However, the study now moves to specific race/ethnicity based interactions and ideology with the respondents, other officers, and with the community itself.

Race Based Effect

While studies have focused on the potential impact of race on officers, the experience of the Hispanic/Latino officer, specifically the Mexican-American officer remains incomplete. The following section focuses on ideology of the officers in the sample based on the interactions with other officers and the community. This includes aspects such as joking and promotions. As Haarr (1997) and others have analyzed, one of the largest separations in ideology between White and African American officers is the perception of inequality especially when it comes to the topic of promotions. Also included in this section is the samples perception/interactions with the community and

lastly how officers believe their race/ethnicity influences, or does not influence their occupation. This includes whether they have faced or believe they have faced any racism or discrimination in their careers as of yet.

Jokes

Previous scholars have discussed how one of the forms that race is manifested is in joking (Haarr 1997;Holdaway 1997). While from a cultural perspective it may appear as though joking may be a means to relieve stress it does take a racial nature at times. Portillos (2015) stated in his research that racialized joking was not intraracial but interracial in nature, where two officers were interacting that were not the same race/ethnicity. When asked about the general focus of joking on the job itself, the participants revealed that there was indeed joking occurring between officers, and that the joking would take a racial form sometimes, as an officer described:

"Yeah we joke around sometimes, and yeah sometimes it deals with being Black or Hispanic or White too. I had one partner who would joke around and about being Black and stuff like that but yeah."

Others described that the joking existed but did not take a racial form. Officers here we also somewhat ambiguous about the nature of the joking. As officers described,

"No it doesn't go that far, you can't, there's too much on the line. The department really has tried to crack down on that kind of stuff. They start to take it real serious now."

"Oh no, not saying it doesn't happen but in my experience I haven't dealt with that. I wouldn't do it either."

What is implicit in these statements is that there is departmental policies against racial aspects in general, and that it wants to be eliminated by the department. When

discussing the topic of racial joking in the department over the years with an informant, the question was asked whether this has changed over the years to which they responded,“Has there been a change? You tell me. Is it as blatant? Maybe not. But it wasn't as blatant back then either (2000’s). Because it was unacceptable when I first started and still not acceptable now. So they had to be somewhat subtle and disguise it as just cop humor or you're a little too sensitive, or can't you take a joke or toughen up, it's okay.”

A small sample of the officers described the fact that the racial joking does happen, but that they try not to engage or become involved in the action itself. This was due to the consequences of the action itself, since it was against department policies. As as officer described:

“Yes it does happen, but you have to nip that in the butt right away. I don't like that grab ass shit, especially like that. Someone is going to take it too far, feelings get hurt, someone gets reported and written up. I understand that there is joking around that's fine.”

Of the officers that did describe racial joking, they described that the joking did take a racial form but that the purpose of it was not to harm or make fun of the other person, as officers described:

“It’s no big deal I do it back. We’re not serious. I’m not going to call you an F’n N-word or anything like that. It's not like i'm trying to hurt, anything like that.”

“Oh yeah, we joke all the time in the locker room, when at a call, not in front of people obviously. But we’re friends and we joke around. But and it's a big but, we know we're just joking around, we don't take it that far.”

Here it is established that if the joking is to occur, there is an assumed understanding of the nature of the joking itself. Officers also described that the joking between officers was part of the occupation as an officer described,

"It's part of the job and we do it since the beginning. And it just becomes part of your everyday."

Officers however also not only included the fact that the jokes were not serious or meant to hurt their intended target, but that it was a good thing and a sign of camaraderie and being part of the in-group. As officers described,

"But you don't do it to everyone (joke), just the people who you know, they know it's a joke and not going to take it to the Sarg. But you know those people (that will report it) as well and that's fine, that's their personality. In those situations you watch your back or your tongue I should say and keep it 100% (professional) all the time."

"You only do it with people you really know, because really it's on you. You have to develop that relationship working together. The other person has to know its not serious too. You only know that by knowing the person and working together."

In general joking in a stressful occupation such as law enforcement is seen as part of the occupational culture. Portillos (2015) focused on the fact very similar to the findings here, that the officers seem to view joking and especially racialized joking as part of the occupational culture. Describing the joking as harmless seems to point to this fact. However, not as in Portillos (2015) research there was some slight descent from this general attitude. This possibly stems from the racial based history of the department itself and the departments attempt to change some blatant aspects of that culture.

Promotions

Previous studies have specifically focused on the contentious aspect of promotions, specifically when it comes to race. This research as with much of the research on policing historically has focused on the Black-White binary, not focusing on Latinos/Hispanics and their perception or ideas related to promotions. As discussed in the methodology section, many of the questions regarding promotions were lifted directly from Haarr's (1997) study focusing on race, gender and interactions, specifically on promotions. These questions included "How do officers get their assignments?" and "How far in the department do you think you can go in regard to rank or assignment?"

It is important to note that during the data collection process, I received communication from one of my informants (not in the sample) that there had been a meeting in which specific high ranking officers were present. In this meeting there was discussion about the promotional process especially when it came to minorities and Hispanic/Latinos in general. As described in the background of the study, though there is general proportional representation among the lower non-supervisory ranks of police officers, when focusing on the higher ranking officers, the representation substantially drop. During this meeting one of the command officers made the comment that has circulated within the department. The command officer stated "The reason we don't see more females and minorities in command staff positions is because they are not willing to sell their souls like their male White counterparts." and that the officer did not believe in the merits of Affirmative Action.

Previous discussions about promotions have also taken place in the department where other reasons were used to describe the reasons why the numbers were so disproportionate when it came to command staff. One of the reasons cited by an informant was that command staff stated that Hispanic/Latinos have not "been in the department that long," and had therefore not had the proper time to advance in the ranks. My informer did not believe this was the case. As they stated,

"Their response was well Latinos are fairly new to the organizations it might take some time for them to train and open them up to those positions. For the record Latinos have been in the LAPD since day one. In fact the Chief has worked with many Latino officers that died in the line of duty. I think it's an insult to the families and their memories when you say we are new to this department, and that's why they're not promoting."

With this sample, when asked if they have specifically had been promoted accordingly so far, all officers agreed that they had in fact been promoted accordingly, or that they have perceived that they have been promoted accordingly. Though the officers themselves agreed that they had been promoted accordingly, there was variance in terms of what officers believed about the promotional process over all. Officers were also asked about the perceived fairness of promotions and the promotional process, including if there were any advantages in promoting, the process, and any problems or issues with promotions. When examining perception of fairness in what officers believe there were two separate forms of perceptions of fairness in promotions. Judgements of fairness in the promotion process itself, and also in whom or who does not get promoted.

Process

The promotional process itself is an area of contention between the officers. When asking about the promotional process, all the officers seemed informed about how the promotional process works. The way promotions are handled were described by an officer in the sample:

"The Captain selects the best qualified based on the recommendations of all the board. The Captain, based on the recommendations of the board, 90% (of promotions go) with the board's recommendation. If not he'll pick whoever he wants from that pool of qualified candidates."

Interviews with command staff members yielded a similar process. Command staff, specifically focused on the concept of a meritocracy and that the promotional process, while not perfect, was the best one in place. However among the sample, there was debate about the subjectiveness, or the human element involved in the process and issues that could/ did arise because of it. As officers described,

"The majority of the officers think that's it's screwed up (the promotional process). Guess what they did? Nothing. Nothing has changed absolutely nothing. So, now it is ongoing problems. No one does anything until the next, you know the next bubble pops up, and it's in our face and we have to deal with it again, but nothing has been done."

"They say well we have someone who's been here a while and he's a P-2 and he really wants to promote. Bullshit, you'll tell me, i'm more qualified and i'm better, but you should know the way the department works, so you should understand why, if he's from this division. I think he was telling me you did a good job but, don't tell me that part. That just pisses me off more, and gives less credence to the department."

"So we're (Latinos/Hispanics) well-represented in the worker bee ranks, but as soon as we start getting into supervisor we take a dive and they can argue that we're not testing well or whatever but a lot of those are just based on interviews. And interviews, it's a subjective process."

Some officers described a racial component to the promotional process, specifically when it came to the human element and the interview process. Specifically with the fact that the makeup of the boards and the command staff that was making these decisions put them at a disadvantage, even if it was unintentional. As officers described,

"Why is it that we do not have minority representation within these coveted positions, well who are the Captains? Who's sitting on those boards? Who are the lieutenants?"

"It's hard for minority candidates to sit in front of an all White board, for a female to sit in front of an all-male board and think that there's going to be a fair shake or that they are going to look at that candidate without any bias. We all have our biases. So until we have some change in the composition of those interview boards we're going to lack the representation"

Officers were also asked whether they believed the promotional process was fair and if there were any groups, (not specifically focused on race/ethnicity) who might have an advantage in promotions or opportunities. Officers varied on whether the promotional process was fair. Many in fact stated that they believed the promotional process was fair. Specifically they focused on the perceived meritocracy of the process. As officers described,

"It's fair, it treats everyone equally. Nothing is ever perfect though. There are going to be people that complain about everything"

"Yes, I would say so, from what I've experienced and that's all that I can speak of, it's fair."

However, one officer believed the process was not fair based on the process and possible advantages that might be gained by other officers in other assignments. As the officer described,

"To a degree I say yes and no. Yes it's fair because it's a testing process. To someone in patrol out in the street, and they have to study for the Sergeant exam, it's not fair to them because they're out there in the street and there are seminars that are conducted to prep them for interviews, what gets covered. Well someone in patrol cannot readily go, if you work the night shift you can't attend those things. But someone who works in the inside office, and you have people who naturally know how to take tests, but for someone who may not have it and in patrol it's unfair. You're more than likely at the mercy of the supervisor. You don't want to rock the boat. But other than that you want to study. You study on you own, take the books, try to learn the material."

Promotional Advantages/ Disadvantages

While most officers believed the process was fair, there was a stark difference between the process and perceived fairness versus the perception of advantaged or disadvantaged groups when it came to promotions, opportunities, and who gets promoted in the department. Officers in the sample were asked whether any racial/ethnic group had an advantage when it came to promotions and whether any racial/ethnic group had any advantages in opportunities in the department. Most officers stated that there was no advantage to any specific group when it came to promotions or opportunities in the department. One officer also specifically focused on the merit based component of the promotions/opportunities of the department, when asked "Do you believe there is a difference in opportunities in the department based on race?"

"No, there's differences and opportunities based on competence, There's differences of opportunity based on education, and there's differences in the opportunity on the combination of thereof as well as your experiences, knowledge skills, and abilities."

As described with the samples answers to the fairness of the process, with a possible racialized component of the interview process, so too was a racial component evident in the responses given. As with the interview process some officers stated that

Whites have some advantage in the opportunities and promotions in the department. As an officer stated,

"The number don't lie, you tell me why robbery homicide is 90 percent White, then tell me what that explanation is?"

Another officer described that those that are typical of the 'classic' officer are more likely to be promoted or get the best assignments because they fit the mold. As the officer described,

"You didn't hire or you don't hire the super left-wing guy who says he's going to change things. Now even if it's unconscious, no you don't do that. Why? Because you're looking for the secure, same guy, military experience, conservative. The classic guy who falls in line. So who's also more likely to get promoted? Well who's doing the promoting? Well people who have that background and experience that are looking for the same thing."

Another officer described the advantages a racial group has but because of the situation, not specifically because of nefarious intent. When asked if any racial group has any advantage when it comes to promotions he stated,

"[Laughs] Yeah I do, but you know I guess we have to put that in the proper context. We are in an organization where a predominant amount of decision makers happen to be male Whites, and so I think that is present when they are making decisions on promotions, assignments, etc. Now I don't know it would be any different if it was a predominantly African American department, or a predominantly Latino department. I think it makes an impact who is at the top, that who makes those decisions. Whether it be predominately White, African American or Latino; I think it would make a difference. In order to change that we need a balance, in order to make sure it is fair."

Other officers explicitly stated specific groups do have advantages in the promotional process and in opportunities, specifically focusing on African Americans. When asked specifically do you believe there is a difference in opportunities in the department based on race/ ethnicity? officers stated,

“Yes. oh absolutely, they're interested in more Blacks, they want to check boxes.”

“African Americans do get more preference, more leeway. I went for a position the Sergeant told me straight up when the interview was over, he closed his laptop and said I would hire you today, you're perfect for the position. But i'll tell you right now the Captain already has someone in mind (African American male). I said then why did I take this interview? Why did I waste my time? They have to show that its been out there (the promotion). They have to show that they interviewed a Hispanic, a female, that they did this, and this. And the Sergeant told me (about the officer in mind) and that guy don't know shit. It’s an IOU thing”

These officers did not feel this was fair and that African American officers were getting advantages that other race/ethnicities did not. These officers were also asked why the department would give advantages to other races/ethnicities. As the officers described,

“I guess for the department it looks better. I know when you look at different departments that's just it and you see all White; whenever you see a predominant color then right away that's what goes through people's heads, officers, community whatever. All the races. They’ll look at them hey they got all White up there (promotions). So that's why the department tries as hard as it can to get all the different people that it can.”

“I didn't like that. But I could see why they are promoting for Blacks. When Blacks are having a problem as a P1 I see more officers say ‘no you have to make it because we have so few.’ I said look at them for what their qualifications are and not for the skin color. I know people were getting mad.”

Others in their responses also described that this reflected an easier path for African Americans compared to other officers, specifically focused on the White officers. As officers described,

“We're trying to get more Blacks on the department. If you were White you're going to need to score a lot higher and work a lot harder than those that were just trying to get on because we needed that slot covered.”

“We should not know their race/ethnicity or anything like that. Give them (focusing on African Americans) a test see what they can spit out and just give them a number. If you read a name it tells you something about them maybe, and that still happens today which I don't think it's good. Everyone knows it exists that's just the way it is.”

“I wish it was not so obvious. When we have an officer who is struggling and he is African American, (pause) I see that they cater more to the African Americans, to help him. If it's a White officer, they will help them but not as much. You know what, I don't see color, this guy's a jerk, he's whatever, he just doesn't get it, he is just going to be a bad officer. I don't think he should be out there, but they're saying oh I feel sorry for him. Why are you catering to him more? It's just because he's Black? That bothers me.”

“So for example you have an Asian or a African American officer here who scored an 80 and yet you have a White officer who scored a 95. We need an Asian officer, so we're going to give it to the Asian one. So yeah it's going to help because it's going to help the department maybe when we go into an Asian Community, stuff like that. But that guy studied harder and did a better job, but because they're White they didn't get it. So it's a double-edged sword.”

In previous studies focused on relations in police departments, promotions or the promotional process is a very contentious component of any ideology held by the specific minority groups. As Haarr (1997) described in her research, one of the major paradigms through which White officers view minority officers is through the lense of preferential treatment in which promotions are a part of the unfair process. The idea is that under qualified officers are not only being hired but also once hired are also being promoted at the expense of the perceived more deserving White officers. With the officers interviewed, the perception of the promotional process was similar.

In the follow up to the promotional question, participants were asked then, who promotes, specifically into the supervisory roles. As described by the sample, many of the officers have negative feelings about command officers and also about their own promotional path in the future. One of the themes that emerged was the type of people the department promotes. As officers describe,

"This department promotes bad behavior, promotes bad people it doesn't know what to do with them."

"It's hard for me because I have so much respect for law enforcement and I do, there's so many good people, but I see sometimes when people are really jerks they get promoted and that's what happens. We had a Captain here who was terrible and they transferred him and the only way they could transfer was to promote him. If they promote you, you have to go...That's how it works."

This has created an interesting scenario with some of the officers. Some officers have stated that because of the process and the command staff that they've interacted with, they are not looking to promote into the management ranks. As officers stated,

"I had a bad taste in my mouth because of Sergeants, and I know all Sergeants hangout together and early I had a Sergeant that gave me a hard time. Do I really want to be a Sergeant? No I don't. I know I can, but no. People in upper management telling me I should get my butt in there and take the exam early. People are retiring. People who don't have that much experience, 8-9 years are becoming Sergeants, and I think wow you don't have that much experience, and you're going to be a Sergeant? But people are retiring and need to fill those spots. People that I knew passed the exam, and I said did they lower the bar? I find it interesting that they say it was harder before, and people that I did not think had a chance of making it are making it."

"I never wanted to go up Sergeant, Lieutenant and stuff. I don't want to do that. I think it takes away, they become managers and they don't see the true police officer. What people see are the patrolman, the Sergeant, and the patrolman that's who they see. They don't see the detectives they don't see the structures or anything like that. They see the patrolman

who's out there knocking the door and that's what they see and that's who we need to help shape and mold and the best way to change the department for me."

Promotions as an overall concept was a very contentious topic of discussion among the sample. As described in the experiences with promotions and any advantages or preference given to any groups, officers described that a potential racial component was attached to promotions and any other advantages. However surprisingly, officers did not describe this as explicitly racism or discrimination, simply that it was unfair. Additionally, Haarr's (1997) and others research into the perception of promotions is very relevant to discuss the findings about which paradigm about promotions does the Mexican American sample falls more in line with. However that line becomes clearer when focusing on racism/discrimination the sample may believe they may (or may not) have faced so far in their careers.

Racism & Discrimination

One of the largest examinations in the literature has been whether minority officers face any type of discrimination while on the job. This has been examined from the perspective of interactions with the community, but also to a lesser extent with other officers of different rank. Most of these studies have focused on Black/ White relations in smaller departments as shown. Studies (including those that included Hispanic/Latinos) have found that officers do face similar forms of discrimination and racism as they would in other institutions and occupations in society. Officers were asked several questions directly related to race, including if they have ever faced discrimination or racism in the

department, if there is a racial division in the department, and the overall state of race relations in the department.

When strictly focusing on race/ethnic relations in the department, officers were asked whether there was any tension, problems or divisions based on race/ethnicity in the department. There were two forms of answers; those that stated no, and those that believed there were divisions in the department. One officer when asked if there was a racial/ethnic division in the department answered,

"You know I'd be stupid and ignorant and be lying if I said no. We all have our biases. We all have our prejudices whether we want to say them or not. (Pause) That our life experiences and stuff we've had happen in our lives. What happens here, what happens outside in our personal world, I think it's just a fact of life."

Other officers described the division as manifesting in sharing space. As Haarr (1997) described, one of the forms in which race is manifested in a police department is in the separation and use of space. In her research she found that officers did not interact on a voluntary basis very often with other officers of differing race/ethnicities, if they were not directly assigned or working together. A similar situation was described by officers in the interaction or lack of interaction. As officers described,

"I see the African-American officer still gather together. I see the Hispanic officer still gather together. I see the White officer still gather together not completely, but I look at it and I'm like it isn't supposed to be like this. This isn't supposed to be. You know they say we don't feel that way, if push came to shove and there was a riot that happened today we would all be blue I know that. I know that, I feel it, and we would all die for each other, but when there's not that (it happens). Let's be police officers. There is racial tension."

"As a Hispanic, we don't want to see that. I'm sure that's happened within the African Americans, they say all these guys are ganging up on us, were the minority. I understand

all that, I've heard the other guys talk in that manner (other minorities), I know that I've seen it. It's indescribable, that you can see the divisions, the cliques aspect, but at the same time at the end of it all, if I were to get into a fight, pressing my button I need help, I know that they'll be there."

During one of the interviews, we took a 5 minute bathroom break. When returning to the area that the interview was happening, we passed 3 African American officers talking to each other in one of the halls. Once returned to the interview room the officer stated, "See! I told you that's the way it is, it just happens that way, they're all talking together." As described when focusing on occupational identity, even though there was acknowledgement that tensions or problems existed, there was the return to the 'blue' identity.

Other officers described that the division or racial tension was not as obvious as that might have seemed. It was not manifested in the traditional open forms that may be expected or associated with obvert forms of racism/discrimination. As the officer stated,

"Is there a racial division in the department? (Pause)You know I don't think it exists to the naked eye anymore. I think we've done a better job forcing it in the shadows because it exists yeah, I think so."

Officers we also asked if they themselves have ever faced discrimination or racism in the department by other officers. As stated, previous research has shown that minority officers do race forms of discrimination and racism on the job. While this has focused on the Black /White binary, there is an implicit assumption that officers if faced with racism/ discrimination will acknowledge it happening. Here however, regardless whether it happened or not, the predominant amount of officers described that they have

personally not faced any racism or discrimination in the department. As officers described, when explicitly asked, “Have you ever faced any racism or discrimination in the department from other officers?”

“I don't think I have.”

“No, that I've been aware of, I've never been called wetback or fucken Mexican or anything of that nature. Trust me I would not hold back if I was.”

One officer stated that he had not been the victim of racism or discrimination in the department, at least he believed he had not, and he gave a rationale why. As the officer described,

“No I haven’t and if I did I would have never known because I've never paid attention to it. That's one thing my dad always told me; work hard for a living but don't ever expect anyone to give you anything. So i've never and that's what they showed me through their actions. They're both working making a dollar fifty an hour to make ends-meat but it's the first job that became available and they took it. They weren't going to sit around collecting unemployment or welfare or whatever it was just because they didn't want to work hard. So I would say no. And I've never paid attention to that. I've never allowed anyone to pigeonhole me into any particular cubicle you know, for whatever it is I refuse to do that”

While officers did not believe they were not victims of racism, the question was also asked whether they personally have heard or knew others who claimed that they had been the victims of racism. Officers described that they did in fact know or heard others claim discrimination. As officers described,

“I have heard others claim. I don't know if they were or not. But yes.”

“Yes. There was a complaint, all you had to do was sign your name. I didn't sign my name. All they asked me was if you've ever been discriminated against. I said no. Maybe I had, maybe I haven’t. But I don't know. I didn't feel it.”

While there was no focus on which minority group may have claimed to face discrimination some officers specifically focused on one racial/ethnic group. Officers referred to claims of racism or discrimination from African American officers. As described,

“Who I've heard make those claims is African American officers say that. It saddens me, I haven't seen it but they've said it, the claims are there. I get along great with them. I have heard, but no one has been able to prove, because I would certainly stand up for anybody. But i'm not in their shoes, i'm not in their skin. I'm not there at that particular time, to see or witness it, but I have heard.”

One officer also focused on the claims of racism or discrimination from African American officers, however they specifically focused on the concept that not all officers, depending on race, have the same experience in the department; that specific claims of discrimination could have some validity. As described,

“The biggest one is specifically for African American officers. The tension, the community expectations, beliefs about police officers. They have to fit in a workplace, much more than the Latino officers, they get torn. I had no idea about this, my assumption was the Black cops see it the way I see it, this is what I see. The experience of African Americans in our country is unique. We Latinos can point out and complain about the disparities and all that but we’re not in the same ballpark. We voluntarily get in trunks of cars to come here. We’re not dragged in chains on a boat.”

While the previous quote alluded to some empathy and acknowledgement of different experiences in the department based on race, and that claims of racism or discrimination are possible even if they might not have themselves experienced it, this

was not the norm. As is evident in the general officer perception of those groups/ individuals who have claimed racism or discrimination in the department. It was generally not a positive perception. As described by officers,

“I've seen the others claim (racism/discrimination). From the ones that I've known that I've seen I don't think that those claims have been valid. I think that some of that, some of that attention was brought upon themselves through work habits, through work ethic, those conditions.”

“There's a saying where there's smoke there's fire, but a lot of time it’s a self induced fire. Some people are just looking to file a lawsuit, I don't know. Different people have different agendas for one reason or another. I haven't seen it, i've heard it. I will speak up if i saw it (racism/discrimination). I have not seen it and I would not put up with it.”

“Yeah there was a detective for a long time because he did not make Sergeant. And my remarks are not meant to nullify those experience or perspectives, but it wasn't. I did not feel myself he was discriminated against, and if someone says that they were, they may have been, I can't speak for anyone else's experiences. But I have to tell you, in particular individuals that have brought forth the discrimination banner if you know their work that's not what it is. It's not because you're Latino, or a Black or a woman, it’s because you're a bad employee. There may be Latinos and African Americans who are discriminated against, and that's the only reason why they don't fulfil their aspirations, but that's not the case with you...”

“I don't think they face anything in general (minorities). I don't like when somebody starts to have a problem; like maybe you would ask me that today and I'm a new officer and I haven't been treated differently and I'm fine. I'm fine and then you see me a month or two from now and I'm having problems maybe with training, well it's only because they don't like me because I'm female or my race or whatever. It's kind of like an ace. I'm not going to have a problem, but just in case, and I see a lot of them holding that as an ace in their pocket. But if you ask them, I have asked them, ‘no no no,’ but then they'll start playing a race card, the woman card, whatever. You were fine up to this point, but then this was kind of like my ace in the hole just in case, so when we needed it, it will be played.”

As described, officers seemed definite about whether or not they have faced racism or discrimination, but were certain that others have also claimed to have experienced racism or discrimination from other officers. However it is clear that officers do not look favorably on groups or individuals that claim they have experienced racism or discrimination while on the job. Many claimed that officers were either not telling the truth, too sensitive, or that it was based on individual merits unrelated to race/ethnicity that was really the issues at hand.

The Community

One area of concern in the experience of the officers was their perceptions and interactions with the community. In general research on minority officers and the community have shown a differing relationship. As Portillos (2015) shows when discussing the community, though some Hispanic/Latino officers still described the community in negative (or neutral) terms, it wasn't as negative as non-minorities described the community, or feelings about working the community. Thought here was no comparison group, similar circumstances were apparent with the officers described. When focusing on the community there are two forms in which the community became the focus in the interviews. The first reflected ideology or perceptions of the community and the second on interacting with the community.

Community:Perceptions

As described in the motivations, many officers described that one of their motivations was to better and improve the community. Officers in the sample also related to the community. Specifically officers were empathetic towards the situation of the community and its problems. As described by officers,

"I've been an officer in a predominantly Latino city, we talk about L.A. being diverse, LA is not diverse, LA is a Latino city, but I think being able to identify with the people who depend on you, can call on you, rely on you for protection and assistance, not that the Non-Latino officers don't have this or can't develop this empathy, I think they can, and they do, but if you grew up one, it just cuts the time. And empathy is not exclusive to any race."

"I think that Latino police officers have a great deal of empathy and understanding of where people are coming from and many officers that have experience of working with you directly or indirectly. I was raised as a Latino dealing with the communities of Los Angeles. There's a lot of Latino communities, so you can empathize, you can connect and relate to everything that they're going through. Whether it's the culture, the food, the way the father is in the home, the way the mother is, the way the kids are being disrespectful. It gave me such a better insight into how to deal with the public and to be able to talk to them through those issues. Where I work, I work with guys who've come to Los Angeles from you know Kansas City, Missouri, Wichita, Kansas, Michigan, where they come from, it's a culture shock to them. You know not knowing the difference between someone from Mexico and from Guatemala, El Salvador, and it's a culture shock, and they would treat them all the same. There's differences. I think being Latino in the LAPD was a plus for me."

Officers expressed that they were able to empathize with the community and its issues because they themselves were from the community as well. As officers describe,

"I could relate to a lot of the challenges and experiences that this community faced. Working this division, it was a community that was about 90 / 95% immigrant."

“My interactions with the community? It's been great, I love the direction the community is heading. I loved everything I've done there.”

“The relationship that we share with the community is by and large a by product of my Latino heritage and my upbringing, and my exposure to the difficulties as a Hispanic in this country.”

Officers also described a structural understanding of issues within the community and not individual deficiencies, or everyone in the community that is the issue. Some officers described that they understood the situations that people in the community had no control over. As officers described,

“We have to work for the common good and that is to keep our community safe. They don't have a choice like I told them. Most of the guys don't live here. You live outside this little area because you have a choice and you can, and the citizens that live here don't and they depend on us and they depend on you to be that difference, to be that ‘Thin Blue Line’ that protects them from predators, so we're here for them.”

“Look it’s good people in shitty situations, who’s to say that any of us in similar situations and circumstances would not (long pause).If you're desperate (pause).We all have to eat, and make money, have a roof over your family's head. I have a job to do, but I'm just being real.”

“You can't hold the sister responsible for the brothers actions or the whole community responsible for the actions of one person or some people that live there and so that plays a factor as well.”

This sentiment of empathizing with the issues that the community might face was also expressed in the samples description as to whether minority officers should be patrolling minority areas. This is important as this can have an influence on their interactions with the community (as described later in the chapter).

There was also the sentiment of not only empathy and understanding the community because it would be best for the community, but also because it would be best for the officers from an tactical perspective, As officers described when specifically asked if minorities should patrol minority communities,

"Absolutely. They have to have an understanding of the communities that they're serving and knowing that you can be identified by the community as someone who knows their culture, knows their customs, I think gives our officers an advantage. Certainly some of those things come with some feelings that if they (the community) don't get what they're really looking for, they can really turn on you quickly. But for the most part I think it's a plus."

"You need to have a representation of all of them. But simply because you're a minority does not mean that you're going to treat minority population better (favorably). I think that we need to be reflective of the community and we need to have people on the police department that have the same or similar cultural values as those that they serve. People who know the community."

"It probably is better for the community. I know the department really pushes that the department tries to do that for all races. And we have so many different ones; they try to get them in those different areas, in those different communities and things like that. I think it helps with the community. Officers don't have a problem with it. I don't think its a pain upon them, like oh I got this because I'm Black and they need Black officers here. No, it's kind of like good you go handle that because if you can make it better down there then that's less that I have to worry about. I don't want to go in and them already giving me a hard time and don't want to talk to me because I am Hispanic and yet this is a Black community it works for the best in the long run I think."

Officers not only related to the community and their issues but also felt that being representative of the demographics of the community helped understanding the community more than non-minority officers who are assigned to minority communities. As previously described, officers did mention negative interactions as adolescents and one of the motivations of officers was to not repeat the same treatment of the community.

Officers also described how understanding the community is an important consequence of possible actions taken by themselves, other officers, and the community. As officers described,

"Our officers do a great job. It's a tough business to try to discern a bad guy from a good guy just by looking at him. It's a tough business, but how we treat people is very important when we do that and if you don't have an understanding for that culture then you're going to have difficulties trying to make it in those communities."

"Growing up with people that look familiar to you, like if you grew up in a predominantly White neighborhood or a Black neighborhood, or a Latino neighborhood, you know, you're familiar with those people. You're not threatened by a lot of the stuff that they do. You're not likely to overreact because somebody flips you off because that's the way we do it sometimes. But when it's not your norm, something you're used to, then how you reacted to those things, it changes a little bit. What perspective and how you view people changes. How you enforce laws changes. When you grew up in a neighborhood and all you're accustomed to seeing is minorities servants as gardeners, as repair people, then you don't really have a lot of respect in other arenas for those people. Does it translate to how we enforce? To say it doesn't would be foolish."

As officers described, most in the sample feel connected with and want to help the community. Additionally being Hispanic/Latino in these minority communities serves the officers better in understanding the communities and its constituents. As alluded to as well, many officers feel that it might give them a tactical advantage over non-minority officers when interacting with members of the community.

Community: Interactions

The second form communities was the focus on in the interviews was through the actual interactions with the community and potentially how the ideology influences those interactions. One officer explained that while officers do treat the community equally,

they do change their behavior based on the community they are in, as well as who they are interacting with. As the officer described,

"You can't treat the people in South-Central like they treat the people in West LA. They have different types of crimes, different types of activity, different types of people and I hate to say that. In (this area) you treat people with respect but then you have the knuckleheads and sometimes I'll say hey you motherfucker get over here, get your act together and they listen to that. And you go to West LA and you try to do that (he snaps his fingers) and the Watch Commander comes and you find yourself,well (laughs)."

Another officer also described seeing this action taken by other officers, but with malicious intent; treating people differently based on the location and demographics of the population. As described,

"(mimicking an officer)Yo Mamacita tell me what happened and speak slow cuz I don't understand that language you're speaking. Would you go to Brentwood and speak to a White woman in that fashion? 'Baby just tell me what happened.' I don't think so. You know so because of the socioeconomic status of minorities we would treat them differently. We wouldn't give the same level of respect and dignity that we would other people. The one thing that we all have in common is that we just want to be treated with respect and dignity, if we can do that with each other we solve most of our problems. But when you as an organizational representative of this department go out and talk down to people they're going to elicit a response. Why would you talk to people like that? Do you want someone talking to your sister like that? I give the same respect to the guy driving the BMW as everyone else."

Officers also described how their own race/ethnicity could help to calm a situation due to the fact that the community members would change their actions, just because the presence of a minority, specifically Hispanic/Latino officer and what that meant to the community members. As described,

"You can just tell, when they are talking to a Latino officer, it's different. They need that, they need someone who understands, it makes a big difference. Because really think

about it. We're called because its a bad situation many times, and there is fear, even if you're the victim. But when you see someone that understands, that's like you, its easier on everyone."

Officers also described how language was also part of the process, specifically the ability to speak/understand or attempt to understand Spanish. Most of the sample was able to understand Spanish and many were conversational. Officers described how the language was useful for the position in de-escalating a situation and influencing the community actions at the scene. As described,

"It was good for them also to to see me as a Latino/Hispanic. They can relate to that. They could better understand and you could see a lot of times when you come into the picture as a law enforcement officer regardless of what country they were from, you could always see that apprehension in their demeanor. Once you started speaking Spanish, you can see that tension completely go away and I figured okay he's one of us so that kind of helped if you look at a lot of the situations."

"A lot of times when they see us, you can just read their faces and body language and you can see that they're like oh no what do I do. I start speaking Spanish, you can see that tension fade, and okay and they're laughing and then all talk about who I am where I came from and crack a joke. So it becomes more interactive and it's really not the uniform and the institution, and it's not talking, it's the person that's a human being."

Officers also described negative interactions, or interaction in which their race/ethnicity was used as a means by the potential suspects in order to try and receive preferential treatment because of the officers race/ethnicity. As officers described,

"I've gotten some calls where we have had to deal with people who were critical of my race or my ethnicity and they thought they were getting an unfair shake because I was fighting with that person. You know if this person was White or if they were African American, well you're only helping out the Latino because you're one of them. It happens quite frequently to all of us no matter what; White officers, African-American officers. But I will say this, I think that the people who are the hardest on us are those that identify

with us: Latinos are hard on Latinos, African Americans are hard on African American officers."

"I've experienced the reverse, where you know call it discrimination, call it whatever word. I was bantered and badgered for enforcing a law against my people. And I was expected to give them breaks because you know I looked just like them and that was not the case. You break the law, you break the law. Everyone can be held to the same standard. I was called names, I was called all kinds of stuff by individuals who were in the Latino community. But the other day(pause). I knew that what I was doing was the right thing, I will not be prejudiced, I was not giving preferential treatment to anyone. I was upholding the law with equal value to anyone and anybody."

Officers described that they are unable nor wanted to provide special treatment, and are also considered racist or have been called racist by suspects, in those situations by other Hispanic/Latino citizens. As described,

"I've been called racist against my own. It's usually when they don't get their way. I can't let you get away! You broke the law!"

"Oh they'll even say you're racist, you're racist against your own kind and i've been said that a lot. As a police officer i've been called racist by Latinos and Mexicans, whatever, by the Hispanic community left and right. When I don't help someone get away, a crash, DUI, no, I can't help you, you broke the law. 'Oh come on, you're a homie,' Are you freaking crazy? I'm not going to lose my job. I'm going to do my job. I've been called racist to the nth degree by my own people. To me that's very disheartening, as a police officer and as a human being you're out there breaking the law you want me to show you mercy? I understand if you are begging for money. I hate my job that day when I have to go shush the homeless. I know why you're here, hang in there. But if you're breaking the law i'm not going to do that. When I get the racist against your own kind thing, it hurts me, it hurts me personally, and this is wrong."

As described by the previous quote, officers described having mixed feelings because of these interactions with the community, of being accused of possibly being racist. As described,

"It's sad, I have a job to do and i'm doing it. I have to treat everyone equal and I am, and being called racist. It's even worse when it's Latinos saying it.(pause) It's not people I know, but I feel like I do. It sucks."

"I get very disheartened when that happens, to be called racist by your own people, like if its personal. It's not personal. I'm enforcing the law. But no one wants to be called that."

"Many people, my partners and everything we have compassion. But when I get called racist or names, it is bad. Its deflating. To say the least I know a lot of officers that are Black, White, get the same thing."

With the interactions with the minority communities officers in general describe a more negative relation or climate regardless of race that is currently the trend. As officers described when focusing on the community and their perception of police,

"I believed what I was doing, and that the department was supporting, and that the community was supportive, but in the last years that's not there anymore. It's sad to see that it has changed. I understand that it's a pendulum and i'm hoping that it will change and go back, there has to be a happy medium, i'm not saying that all cops walk on water, and all wonderful."

It appeared as if several officers would not become officers today if given the opportunity over. This was due to the perception of a lack of support from the community, the media and how they were portrayed. As officers describe,

"You know it's sad to say, but I wouldn't become an officer today. It's changed. The support is just not there, from the city, the mayor, the community. We are just looked at as the enemy."

"If things were different I would not become an officer today."

This was an interesting development given the occupational demographics of the sample, being relatively early in their careers. However, this can possibly be considered an extension of the data described earlier of some in the sample not wanting to promote above a certain level.

What is apparent before thoroughly analyzing the data in the following chapter, is that not only are the classic studies on the binary approach to studying race and policing flawed to exclude Hispanic/Latinos, but even those that do include but group Hispanic/Latinos with other minorities, have simplified the experience of the Hispanic/Latino police officer. The data generally points to the conclusion that the experience of the Hispanic/Latino police officer, and more specifically the Mexican American police officer, cannot be simplified to other minority experiences and needs to be fully explored and analyzed on its own.

CHAPTER 8: Discussion

Self Identification

As expected, as previous research has demonstrated, when it pertains to the self classification of Hispanic/Latinos, the largest number in the sample identified with a specific nationality; most in the sample classified themselves as Mexican American. However, what was surprising was the amount of respondents who self classified as Hispanic/Latino voluntarily as their primary form of self-identification. In contrast with previous research, the self-identification of respondents as Mexican American as the overwhelmingly preferred form of identification, was not as dominant as would be expected.

Given that there was no self identified interracial heritage, the fact that no one classified as White did not come as a surprise. However, no one in the sample self-identified also as strictly being Mexican. The primary response given by respondents was specifically Mexican-American. There are several possible explanations as to why this was the case. Massey's (2009) work as how the public views Hispanic/Latinos and specifically Mexicans/Mexican-Americans comes to mind. Given the negative associations with Mexican or Mexican American identity, currently and historically, respondents may not have wanted to identify with that level of specificity, and instead preferred the less negative pan-ethnic identity of Latino or Hispanic. This self-identification was also of interest, given that the two officers who were actually born

in Mexico did not describe themselves as Mexican or Mexican American, but used Latino instead.

The second potential explanation is the separation of the immigrant identity of the respondents, by not strictly using the term Mexican. Scholars have described how subsequent generations are less likely to strictly identify with their ethnic nationality and more likely to increase their distance from the first generation. When strictly focusing on the classification of Mexican, Comas-Diaz (1999) in an attempt to clear ambiguity in racial/ethnic classifications argues that *Mexican* specifically refers more to the inhabitants of Mexico, but it is not used to designate citizens of the U.S. or naturalized citizens of the U.S. of Mexican ancestry (as the sample overwhelmingly is). If the officers subscribe to that identity, they would not strictly describe themselves as *Mexican*. Given their occupation, the institution of policing itself, and the current political climate, to make the distinction between Mexican and Mexican American could be viewed as important. At the same time, using the term *Mexican American* can refer to individuals who are US citizens of Mexican heritage. Comas-Diaz (1999) argues this is an acceptable term to many Mexican descendants, except for those that do not identify with Mexican ancestry, but more with a *Spanish* ancestry. This may have been a factor with respondents who self identified as being Hispanic/Latino.

However, as described there were no respondents who described themselves as being strictly *Hispanic*. With the term Hispanic, this was the main form of census identification for Hispanic/Latinos, and it first introduced in the census in the 1970's.

Hispanic is a broad catchall used to describe a historical and cultural relationship to Spain, and a general term for all Spanish speakers (Comas-Diaz 1999). Falicov (1998) argues that the term *Hispanic* is supported by conservative groups who view European ancestry as superior. Given that policing in general is a conservative institution it is surprising that no respondent self identified as *Hispanic*. However, this term was used to refer to Hispanic/Latino officers during the interviews. It wasn't until much later that the term *Latino* was introduced to recognize the diversity within the group itself, focusing more on the ancestry related with the Americas. *Latino* is viewed primarily as a more politically correct term today (Falicov 1998). Given that no one in the sample exclusively used the term Hispanic might suggest the saliency of the ancestry associated with the Americas, the lack of a Spanish identification, or simply using the politically correct term.

Additionally, no one in the sample self-identified as being *Chicano*. The term *Chicano*, has a strong liberal political history (Mirande 1994). The term was widely used during the Chicano/Brown Power Movement by Mexican Americans to express a resistance to U.S. political state. Comas-Diaz (1999) states that there are Mexican Americans who also view the *Chicano* label as pejorative in that it is used to create a new identity for their culture, rather than focus more on mainstream culture. Regarding the sample, it is not known if respondents knew the term or the social political historical context of the term, but the omission of the term in self-identification issues would be an area of exploration in the future.

Another possible explanation is that given competing terms that can be used for self-identification (Comas-Diaz 1999), it is possible the respondents did not know how to identify themselves or what would be the appropriate term to use. While there was an expectation of some variance in the responses especially given previous research on Hispanic/Latino self-identification, what was not expected was the ambiguity in the responses that was given by respondents in the sample. Many of the respondents did not know how to self identify when initially asked about their identity. This may have been an outcome of the availability of several terms that can be selected for self-identification. The respondents may not have been informed of contemporary social issues regarding the topic of race. It might also reflect a politically correct form of self-identification. As described by an officer specifically referring to the changing nature of ethnic/racial classification for Hispanic/Latinos, this could be due to the fact that the terms that are used to identify Hispanic/Latinos of people have changed over the years. The respondents might not have known how to identify themselves. It could have been that this was not their initial form of identification, but was simply a fallback to a larger Pan-ethnic form of self-identification in order not to use the incorrect term.

In addition, some respondents were noticeably uncomfortable with the concept of race. These officers expressed the ambiguity of the term race by questioning it outright, specifically focusing on the concept of a colorblind ideology. While it cannot be determined how the respondents adopted a colorblind ideology, it falls in line with the classic White officer demographics that previous studies have examined (Haarr 1997).

One of the overarching arguments that will be discussed later, is the fact that officers' conceptions of race are reiffied in their social interactions in which race is most salient, which is primarily in their interaction with the community, especially the negative interactions. In summary, while it's only a small aspect of the identification process, all of the respondents did self-identify in some form and did not skip or not answer the question.

Motivations

As with previous studies the motivations for becoming an officer were similar. As Raganella and White (2004) described, helping people was among the top reasons as to why people wanted to become police officers. A search for research with specific qualitative data about helping people as a motivation for officers yielded little results. However, given the data collected and previous research it can be argued that although helping people is a overarching idea, there is a difference in who minority and non-minority officers are talking about helping. The assumption is that helping people or the community infers that officers are describing the same people, which as this data shows may not be accurate. While previous quantitative studies have found that both minorities and non-minorities stated they wanted to help people, officers in the study's sample specifically focused more on the minority community.

As Portillos (2015) notes, non-minority officers are significantly more hostile and derogatory in descriptions of minority communities; in contrast, minority officers have a more positive or neutral attitude toward minority communities. Minority officers in this

sample saying they want to help the community is stating that they specifically want to help minority communities. However, this does not mean that minority officers do not want to help people in general as a motivation, but specifically it is helping minority communities that is the central motivator. This idea is expressed by the respondents stating that they wanted to help minority communities, and create an impact on or change within them. The respondents described the idea of giving back or helping the community from which they came and also described being a better officer than the officers they previously encountered in their lives.

One reason the desire to help the community was paramount is the lack of officers who are performing well in their or other communities. This knowledge came from word of mouth and the media. Implicitly, officers are stating that their communities received subpar and different treatment based on their own treatment and others. However, the negative interactions with the respondents or their family, with officers in the community did not decrease their motivations but might have actually increased and fueled them to be a better officer themselves, as described in the officers' narrative of wanting to provide a more professional service.

It is important to remember that these negative interactions with officers were reportedly rare, and that in itself, could possibly impact on the motivation to pursue law enforcement; it would be different if it was more than the rare run in with officers. If respondents negatively interacted with officers on a more constant basis these interactions should have more detrimental effects on the person's perception of law

enforcement, and motivations to become an officer in general. If the interactions are viewed as understandable, then they would not be looked at as being as negative. However it is unknown whether this 'understanding' of the interaction happened before or after they were officers. It was not viewed as being the norm, but was specifically a few 'bad apples.'As studies have shown, when it comes to minority communities and police, there is subpar and differing treatment of minorities and the communities, such as over/under policing minority communities (Barlow & Barlow 2000). However, as noted in this chapter most of the interactions were perceived as being positive.

The interactions as adults were based on specific motivations for becoming an officer. The respondents did not describe negative interactions as adults. This is probable from the fact that negative interactions as adults would have a large influence of the perception of law enforcement. Nevertheless, if they had negative interactions as adults which ended in an arrest of themselves or others, this would increase the likelihood of the officers either not wanting to apply or simply being eliminated from the vetting process, which would eliminate those that have a criminal record. Additionally, if previous interactions were overwhelmingly negative then they might not have wanted to become officers in the first place, and it would be viewed more as an institutional issue.

There was only one instance of an officer personally knowing another officer before becoming a police officer. The respondents not personally knowing an officer is not surprising as with the LAPD specifically, large demographic shifts are a relatively new phenomenon. The LAPD was overwhelmingly White even up into the 1990's. It

makes sense that minority members are less likely to know officers on a personal level. This is important because as the number of minority officers increases, this is over time likely to increase the likelihood of minorities especially Hispanic/Latinos, knowing police officers on a personal level. This could influence other minorities to join or want to join law enforcement whether it is specifically the LAPD or not. With the studies that do exist, such as Raganella and Whites (2004), it makes sense that White males cite knowing officers on a personal level as higher in influencing their decision to pursue law enforcement, and that it is ranked lower among Latinos, because the likelihood of knowing an officer is lower, as described is the case among the Mexican American respondents.

Job security and financial security were also common themes as it is when focusing on officers motivations of any race/ethnicity. In the Raganella & White (2004) study, job and financial security was tied first among males as the most common motivation and second for Hispanic officers behind helping the community. This was described mostly as a secondary response to the primary motivation of helping the community. However, there are two differences from previous research that did not come up when describing the motivations of the officers. In the Raganella & White (2004) study, other job benefits were also perceived as high motivating factors for the 'Hispanic' part of the sample. This included job benefits and early retirement. These motivations were not mentioned by the officers in the sample. They described only aspects of job stability and financial security, but did not describe the benefits or specifically retirement

possibly because they are relatively early in their careers. However, possibly related to that is that in Raganella and White (2004) research, 'opportunities for advancement' was the fourth most cited reason by Hispanic officers in the sample. The officers in the sample did not describe 'moving up' as a motivating factor. While this might be due to sample size or time of tenure of the officers, some officers did describe not wanting to promote above a certain level, and that the promotional process in the department is perceived to be subjective.

Given the fact that there were officers in the sample who had military experience, it is not surprising that these officers liked the structure of the institution, because of its similarity to the military. However, as described in previous literature, this was not a very highly cited motivation for becoming an officer (Raganella & White 2004). It would be interesting to examine the percentage of officers that had military experience in the department, both those rank and file, as well as command staff. This is important as it relates to the big issue of the promotional process, where as described when focusing on who gets promoted in the department, it was suggested that those officers similar to the command staff, ideologically, and those with military experience are favored. Further research could examine and actually determine 'who' really gets promoted (and why).

The ever changing nature of the occupation was important for some, and as described this came from the younger participants in the sample. However, where this sense of adventure came from is not only the general perception of police officers, but also as described in the respondents' narrative, in the LAPD itself. Depictions in the

media, specifically of the LAPD was a positive motivator. There were negative media depictions of the LAPD, throughout the 1990's and 2000's with the scandals in the department, however, it is not known how these depictions influenced motivations. It appears very similar to the interactions as adolescents; while there were both positive and negative interactions, the positive interactions were looked at as a motivating factor, where the negative interactions did not hinder the motivation to become an officer. Similarly, the negative depictions of the LAPD did not hinder motivations to become an officer and similar to the interactions as adolescents, may have actually increased motivation, by striving to be a better officer. Also the respondents described specifically wanting to join the LAPD. Scholars have focused on a positive occupational identity as a motivator in career decision making, as occupational identity has been focused on as a major component of one's overall sense of identity (Kroger 2007) and a central one at that (Schwartz 2001). However, a less positive perception/interaction with the community could have an impact on that occupational identity, and how one perceives the occupation itself.

Culture

Academy Training

The officers learned from their training little about how to interact with other officers. This is interesting given the changing demographics of the past 20-30 years within the department. The important aspect is not whether the officers received the training, it was the fact that they did not remember even if they did receive it, or express

the effectiveness of it. Given the fact that there is constant scrutiny between officer action and the community on a national level, it is not surprising that the focus was often more directed at the interactions with the community. The question is, as based on the Conti and Doreian (2010) study, after the academy, do the officers revert back to initial conceptions about race/ethnicity, or do they continue and completely accept the new culture?

As in the academy, the introduction of the institutional culture is a top priority. While some respondents did view that culture in racial terms, this behavior was mostly excused as normative cultural behavior. As the officer described in the academy that it can get racial sometimes, but that it is done with the occupation and the culture in mind to 'toughen them up' and get them used to the occupational norms. Does this occupational identity increase with time spent in the academy and in the occupation itself. In Conti and Doreain's (2010) study, they found that the sample resorts back to initial perceptions of race late in the process. Given the colorblind paradigm that exist in the department and the different social and demographic context that exists in this study, it is believed the same process does not happen in this scenario. As will be discussed later, the White/Black binary becomes the dividing line in racial terms.

When focusing specifically on culture, the officers noted that a culture does exist, and understand they are a part of it, and are subjected to the norms of the culture. This idea is very salient among the officers. Even though they are first introduced to the culture in the academy through the rough normative interactions with training officers

even though some did view this in racial terms, in general the officers do not seem to view the culture in negative terms. Instead officers focus on the positive components of the culture; the culture is understood as the normal state of policing. For example, the respondents understood and described culture through a brotherhood, or a unit similar to the military. If described in this manner, as one respondent stated,"How could this be viewed as a bad thing?," is a very understandable perspective on police culture. As will be described later in this chapter, this internalizing of culture by the respondents can have an impact on the perception of events such as promotions and discrimination, and even adopting initial motivations. Many of the officers described wanting to help the community, specifically to do better, to change those negative aspects of policing. However, once they entered the occupation and encountered the hierarchy, culture, and normal state of operations, they realized that they could in fact not have the large impact they initially stated as a key motivator. Instead the officers largely embraced their new roles in the department.

Some officers also changed their political ideology in some areas when they became part of the occupation. This is further evidence of the acceptance of the occupational culture by the respondents. No officer described not becoming or accepting the culture in most forms. However, it is not known whether this is a general trait of the acceptance of culture for those that enter the occupation, or possibly whether those that do not accept or adapt, possibly leave the occupation. Further research is necessary to

examine Hispanic/Latinos and their reasons for leaving policing. However those that remain were very salient in describing "We're all Blue."

Blue ID

Guajardo (2015) focuses on the identity of officers and came to the conclusion that a salient Latino identity begins to supersede culture to a large extent. Regarding this study, an examination of the data suggests that it might not be the case. The demographics of each department might have a significant influence on the coalescence of identity. In Guajardo's (2015) study, Hispanic/Latino officers gained a more salient identity and came together to face issues in a large metropolitan police department. Specifically, the officers in being the numerical and ethnic/racial minorities in the department bounded together because of their perception of that organizing being necessary. The Latino identity is a central component in Guajardo's (2015) study because Hispanic/Latinos in his study are still in the demographic minority and perceived as being outsiders; where their perceived needs and requests as demographic/ racial minorities and request are not met. With the LAPD, ethnicity over culture has not currently manifested in the way it has for Guajardo's department because of the different context and demographics.

With the LAPD, in currently having its minority as majority demographics in the department has gone through the phase of the perceived need of a strong Latino identity, as described in the the background to the study. The LAPD does have a Latino based organization (LALEY), besides the union that focuses on Hispanic/Latino issues in law

enforcement. However, respondents also described being a part of that organization without specifically focusing on that as a central aspect of their occupation. Most only described simply giving a negligible amount of funds to the organization directly from their paycheck. The strong Hispanic/Latino identity is not viewed as being more important than the culture of the department because of the representation demographics and instead is viewed as more colorblind in application which becomes more beneficial to departments. It is more beneficial for departments to recruit more minority officers in order to receive legitimacy from the other minority officers. Though Hispanic/Latinos in the LAPD might face similar issues as other departments where they are the numerical minority, the officers in being the numerical majority, perceive those interactions and treatment as the common officer experience. Nevertheless, it does not matter whether officers face the issues or not, but whether they perceive they face the issues or not.

When focusing on police culture the acceptance of that culture in becoming part of one's identity is a crucial process. To not accept the culture or reject it completely does not create the expected effect of the identification with the culture. If not accepted the rest of the culture, at least the part that is viewed positively, does not come or exist in the saliency that is required or desired from others in the occupation. This identity exists in the sample; when describing the issues that may come up between officers, the tensions, racially and other issues, according to the officers, an occupational “Blue” identity would supersede those issues or problems.

Officers are fully aware of the consequences of not adhering to the cultural norms that exist. Still, some respondents still did what they believed to be the right thing even when they knew that they were going get some form of retaliation. Officers view retaliation through both sides of the chain of command. They view it as retaliation from other officers in not following the culture, but on the other hand they believe that they also don't have support from the department, when faced with the situation of doing 'the right thing.' As with previous studies when focusing on the structure and hierarchy relations between officers and command staff there is a disconnect with command staff (Barlow & Barlow 2000; Haarr 1997). Officers believe they are in a no win situation.

Promotions

Participants believed that they personally had been promoted fairly, regardless of whether they felt there were problems in the promotion process. Whether they were actually promoted fairly doesn't matter for this discussion. Their perceptions of being promoted fairly impacts on their thinking and actions. The respondents believed promoted officers *earned* their promotions. This belief might change with longer tenure. However, the officers are also aware of complaints made by other officers about the promotion process itself. Many officers did not agree or support a specific part of the promotion process; this is because there is an ideological dichotomy the officers experience with promotions that was created by the department.

The promotion process itself is very contentious among the sample because of the perceived contradictory nature of the promotional process and its outcomes; this is

because there is an ideological dichotomy the officers experience with promotions. Specifically, the officers did not like the fact that the boards deciding the promotions had so much power. The officers perceive the board's criteria for advancement to be subjective and not completely merit based. The idea of a meritocracy is part of the culture of policing. The officers have no problems with the parts they view as merit based, which are viewed as very black and white, as either completed or not. However, when focusing on the human element, the officers do not view that process as completely merit based. As described, officers had major issues with the boards because they viewed them as being unfair or preferential; it goes against what the officers have been taught since day one in the academy. The officers are told everything is merit based, yet through their own experiences or the experience of others, they perceive it as otherwise, and they obviously have a real problem with it.

Here the respondents acknowledged that there might be implicit biases, because of the fact that it cannot be explained away by merit based process. It is more socially acceptable in the institution to believe there might be some issues or other reasons involved, even if it was unintentional, because it is not merit based and because it is also more obvious to the respondents. Though it was mentioned by the respondents that race/ethnicity could play a role, as will be described later in the chapter in focusing on the manifestation of race, to state or believe one's race/ethnicity is a variable without explicit forms of evidence, is explained away on individualized grounds by other officers, and is

not socially acceptable by officers because it not only is the status quo, but because officers will then be equated no longer with "us" but instead with "them."

The non-merit based subjectivity is most clearly manifested in how the respondents view other races/ethnicities and fairness in who gets promoted, and if there are any advantages for any groups. As noted in previous research by Haarr (1997), White officers focused on a more colorblind ideology, which they felt that the African American officers did not do their jobs accordingly and that they had distinct advantages over White officers. African American officers focused more on inequality in the promotion process. Similar results were found with the Mexican American sample. As is the dominant paradigm in the institution, the Mexican American respondents also generally expressed a colorblind ideology. As described, many officers specifically focused on aspects such as test scores and assignments, which are viewed as being completely based on merit and not on any subjectivity, political, or racial/ethnic variables. This is also expressed in the advantages of the 'classic' officer; the idea that the 'classic' officer is more likely to be promoted. The officers rationalize the promotion of the classic officer based on those perceived merit based advantages. It is not known however, how much officers adjust their behavior or actions to fit this 'mold' of the classic officer in order to get promoted. If this happens to be the case, then the status quo is reproduced in the 'classic' mold.

The most distinct indicator where these officers stand in relation to Haarr's (1997) findings, when it comes to the Mexican American officer, is focusing on specific

racial/ethnic advantages. Most of the officers said there were no advantages. However, those that said there were advantages pointed specifically to the African American officers and the perceived advantages they had. Specifically, the perception that African American officers have advantages in promotions because their low numbers and the department's desire to have them succeed. As a result, there was a suggestion from the Mexican American respondents that African American officers, and specifically African American officers who have promoted, are perceived as not as qualified as other officers. As is exemplified by the officer stating that the other non African American officers 'studied harder' but got passed over for a promotion because the department wanted to fit a quota. Specifically, the respondents did not view themselves as being subjected to the same preference; here the ideology falls in line with Haarr's (1997) research and White officer ideology. This perspective is further exemplified when the focus shifts to whether officers in the sample believe they have been the victim of racism or discrimination in their careers.

Racism & Discrimination

Respondents described racial tension in the department, however, they did not explicitly state that there are no outcomes of racism or discrimination from that tension. The tension that exists in the department is just the normal state. However, in their acceptance of their occupational identity, respondents made sure to state that their occupational identity supersedes the racial tension in the department. Essentially, what they are saying is that there are tensions in the department, but that they are just feelings,

and no direct actions are taken from those feeling. The occupational identity is used as a default where they all relate together as one experience. The occupational "Blue" identity is used to try and eliminate the racial tension; by emphasizing the occupational identity as the identity that matters the most.

An unexpected result in the study, is the respondent's conception of race. specifically, respondents view and understand racism and discrimination as exclusively overt. In the interviews, regarding aspects of joking and the promotion process, and as described in the research literature, respondents are subjected to forms of racism and discrimination. However, the overt forms of racism have been mostly eroded from the department as much as possible through past lawsuits and consent decrees that the department has faced over the years. The racism and discrimination faced by respondents, would be in a structural and institutional form. However, whether they have faced racism or discrimination is not the issue, it is whether they believe they have or have not, because their actions are based on those beliefs.

This concept is further exemplified as described by some respondents, many of them feel that they have not been subjected to any racism or discrimination in their tenure in law enforcement. This would likely be accurate if the respondents are focusing on overt types of racism such as racial slurs, which was described by an officer as an example of racism or discrimination (that never happened). The respondents also stated that they specifically would stand up for other officers if they were to witness racism or discrimination, but not specifically focusing on any race or ethnicity. However, no

respondent described actually doing so, possibly because of only looking for overt or obvious forms. Equally as important many officers noted that they were either not sure they have been victims of discrimination. The respondents also expressed that even if they were subjected to forms of discrimination they talked about they did not recognize it. Interestingly other respondents stated that they never paid any attention to it if they ever had. Officers described that they were taught or did not pay attention to race/racism, assuming it was not actually detrimental to their career.

Respondents who believed they had not been subjected or victimized by racism or discrimination knew other people who claimed to have been victims of discrimination or racism in their careers. When describing the discrimination that occurred respondents specifically focused on African American officers as the examples of who would face those claims of discrimination. This exemplified the larger racial paradigm of the Mexican American officers; in the interviews when focusing on promotions and racial/ethnic advantages, and also examples of discrimination and racism, officers mostly used and described race not only in classic forms, but also using the Black/White binary perception of race.

Additionally, officers specifically stated that they did not know whether those accusations of racism/discrimination were true, and in no instance did an officer state that they believed those accusations had any veracity to them. This is important for two reasons. The first is that in many instances officers explained racism/discrimination in individualistic terms, job performance, and merit based language. In essence, returning to

the colorblind paradigm used. Officers described that racism/discrimination might happen but that was not the case with the specific officers that they knew. The officers they knew were not victims, but instead had some individualized trait that was the real reason behind the issues. As described, this is problematic because it appears that officers are not aware of how to recognize racism and discrimination besides in its major forms, or it is explained away in individualistic terms.

Secondly, this is likely a result of the main context in which race is encountered in the department as an officer, which is with the community. Specifically, the officers in the sample encounter claims of racism and discrimination in what they perceive as on a constant basis in the community. They view these claims as being false and as an excuse in order to try and get out of an arrest or a citation. This is the most common form in which racism and discrimination is encountered. Claims of racism and discrimination are undoubtedly viewed as something that is done by "them." This undoubtedly has an influence on how they view racism and discrimination in the department from other officers. Accordingly, if a suspect were to claim racism or discrimination in a non-overt form, officers who claimed racism or discrimination are viewed as making excuses for the "real" reasons they have problems.

The Community

Perceptions/Ideology

Officers in general had more positive perceptions of minority communities. As previous research has found, non-minority officers have shown to have a more negative perception of the minority community (Portillos 2015). Overall, the officers in the sample agreed that the minority officer also has a better understanding of the community. This is important, as this could possibly influence their behavior and interactions with the community as will be discussed. In general officers demonstrated that they related to the community as they were very aware of the community and the possible issues many people faced, that were different from other more affluent areas of the city. As the respondents described, they were more empathetic and understanding of the community better than non-minorities. Respondents did note that this did not necessarily mean that non-minority officers did not understand the community, but that it was a learning process for those officers.

For this study, being Hispanic/Latino was in general viewed as a positive attribute and actually made their job easier. Officers described how being Mexican American, and Hispanic/Latino in general, facilitated the understanding of Latino culture, even if the specific cultures encountered were not necessarily Mexican, or Mexican American. To the officers this helped in grasping a basic understanding of Latino people. For one, in being able to distinguish between different nationalities in the city. This does not necessarily mean that the Latino officer would know the difference between different

Latino/Hispanic nationalities immediately, but they would know not to make assumptions about the nationalities in their interactions, such as assuming that all Latinos are the same, or Mexican, given the demographics of the city.

This idea of empathy was also helped because of the structural perspective of the community. The respondents understood that it was not whole areas and all people within those communities that were the problem. Given the fact that many of the officers were from the same communities that are described as being high crime minority areas, it is understandable that they would have a different perspective than other officers, whether minority or not, that were not from those communities. As described in the motivations section, respondents described negative interactions, or knew of these perceptions in the community, and experienced many of the issues that many people in the community experienced. This helps in building empathy and understanding of the community. Additionally, the overall context of interactions of the community would help in determining the perception of the community. Officers (regardless of race) who are not from the community would have a more negative perception of the community because that is the main form in which they come in contact with the minority community, on the job usually in a negative form. Whereas someone from the community, here specifically Latinos who grew up in these communities, would have a different context from which they perceive the community; growing up there and not just through the interactions while on the job.

The officers also understood that being Hispanic/Latino could influence their actions and the actions of the community. This was emphasized when focusing on whether minority officers should patrol minority communities. Overall the respondents agreed that this would be a good choice but for two completely different reasons. Specifically officers believed it would be good for the community. However, this was not the main reason. Officers focused more on the officer experience and advantageous tactics, instead of the community itself. Specifically in knowing what might be a dangerous situation or action and what is not. The officers described because of the culture, Latino officers are able to discern more of the nuances in behavior.

Interactions

Officers described that based on their ideology and race/ethnicity, interactions with the community would change in comparison to another non-Latino officers. A few officers even specifically described themselves and others changing their behavior depending on who and what area they were interacting with the public. There were two different forms this took. As a respondent described, some officers changed how they interacted in a negative and disrespectful way if dealing with the minority community. Previous research has found that this inequality in policing exists (Barlow & Barlow 2000). Officers in the study however, did not engage in this type of behavior, because it was viewed as a disrespectful action. Instead as described by the specific officer who admitted to interacting with Latino youth differently, behavioral interaction changed because of the perceived effectiveness of the change in behavior, specifically when he's

focusing on minority youth in the community. It was based on history, and understanding the community in the officer's perspective, and stern discipline which he believes would be more effective tactic in that specific situation with that specific population. The different behavioral interaction was based on a tactical advantage and also with having a positive impact on the youth.

This concept related to the perception of the community as well. The officer(s) who change their behavior when interacting with minorities is taking advantage of the situation because they know they can. This could relate to the power the officers yield in each community. As described by the officer about not interacting with a White woman in a higher socioeconomic area the same way because of the likelihood of getting in trouble. It is not known if this is a conscious action by the officers as to how they interact with the community. However, the officers are well aware that who they are can change the interactions with the public, especially with members of the Latino community.

The behavior of the officer can change depending on who they are interacting with, however what was focused on and more important from an institutional perspective is how the behavior of the public changed with a Latino officer, and specifically why that matters. The argument that minority officers have a better understanding the minority community, and would better serve the community in their time of need and be more effective for them. Officers did specifically talk about the fact that the public's interactions did change when a Latino officer specifically interacted with a Latino population. With the community, as described by the officers, Latino members of the

community would change their demeanor and that the context of the interaction would change with the presence and interaction of a Latino officer. The more relaxed and humanization of the institution of law enforcement itself helps in dealing with the immediate circumstances, especially if interacting with victims of a crime or a witness. This benefits the community as they receive better services, and overall treatment by law enforcement. This is especially true if there is a language barrier and the officer speaks Spanish. It is unique to the Latino officer and the is the importance of overcoming the possible boundary of language that could hinder services to recent immigrants, and other Hispanic/Latinos who predominantly speak Spanish.

This is another example of interest convergence with the Hispanic/Latino officers and the community. While this benefits the Hispanic/Latino community, from a tactical perspective it helps the officers better assess the situation and be more effective as an officer in those communities. This helps establish legitimacy from the institutional perspective. Legitimacy is a large component of the problems when it comes to law enforcement, aspects of excessive force, differential treatment etc. This is where having Latino officers in the community increases that legitimacy. Now, whether the members of the community are receiving equal services and treatment, is not the question, it is whether they perceive those actions to be legitimate.

CHAPTER 9: Conclusion & Future Directions

Conclusion

Three major themes emerged from the data: 1) how does the sample encounter, experience, and understand race, specifically in the context of their occupation; 2) does race/ethnicity supersede police culture, and 3) what are the implications of the answers to the first two questions. The respondents experienced race/ethnicity in a very unique way, driven by the institution itself as it exists today (and its racial history as well), the greater social paradigm of race, but also by how officers encounter race within the community in general. All of which impact and influences their interactions and perception of race within the department.

The respondents understand race through a colorblind paradigm, explaining differences in treatment such as in promotions, through individualized deficiencies and merit based arguments, which they have been taught how to interpret in their occupation. Race/ethnicity to the sample is not viewed as a valid variable of influence on an everyday basis. Respondents believe that race/ethnicity does not have an influence on their behavior. This is mostly because the respondents perceive race and its influence as strictly existing in individualistic and obvert forms. Similarly, the respondents also view racism and discrimination as existing in the predominantly overt forms in the occupational setting; existing solely in the expression of racial slurs or clear manifestations of racism/discrimination based undeniably on race/ethnicity. Because of this understanding and interpretation of race, the respondents are ill equipped to notice

and recognize non-obvert types of racism/discrimination, even if officers are on the lookout for possible actions of racial discrimination.

To the officers racism/ discrimination should be something that is obvious to everyone. This is problematic given the actual manifestation of race in contemporary occupational settings. While the respondents do acknowledge that implicit biases may exist, they are unversed in how these biases would actually be manifested while on the job, or specifically how these biases would exist between officers themselves, as the focus is more on the public. The respondents claimed not to be victims of racism or discrimination based on the obvert forms of racism they understand racism to be. Given the changes in laws and policies, most of the obvert individualized forms of racism and discrimination in the department, and in occupations in general, have been greatly reduced. Hence, respondents believe that racism and discrimination in the department has mostly vanished in their view. This is understandable from the respondents' perspective of how race and how discrimination/racism is manifested in their perspective. This understanding of race and its consequences is additionally what makes it difficult for officers to understand and agree with claims of racism or discrimination from other officers, and especially from citizens in the community.

While the respondents perceived they have not been the victims of discrimination/ racism, they do encounter claims of racism/discrimination in the department. Respondents are aware of other officers who did claim some form of racism/discrimination. This accusation by other officers of unequal treatment is also

understood and interpreted through the colorblind paradigm. As such, the claims of discrimination or racism are dismissed on individualized or merit based grounds. The respondents don't claim that racism or discrimination doesn't happen, but if it is not glaringly obvious, it is the individual officers who created their own problems (based on a lack of adequate performance or personality traits). For officers, claims of racism or discrimination (when race is not viewed as a salient variable), are interpreted as nothing more than an excuse or an overused tactic or strategy utilized by racial minorities to gain advantages which they have not earned, which can easily be explained away or justified by personal deficiencies in which they have created the situation they find themselves in.

The main form in which race is manifested while on the job is between officers and the community. Specifically, respondents associate race with suspect activity; it is viewed as an action taken by suspects as a tactical response to an officers' justifiable action. To the respondents, suspects use race (possibly trying to get leeway or preferential treatment from the officers) as a method for trying to get out of an arrest or citation. Given the respondents' perception of race, this is viewed as a negative interaction. This is especially viewed as a negative interaction when specifically dealing in the occupational context in which officers encounter claims of racism or discrimination most often; not with other officers, but as with race in general, they encounter manifestations of race/racism while patrolling the streets. To the respondents, claims of racism and discrimination is a last resort and frivolous tactic used by suspects in order to not get arrested or receive a citation. Respondents view these accusations as an invalid excuse, a

"card," that can be played when needed by the minority suspect. This has a great importance to how the respondents understand and view racism and discrimination not only with the community but also with other officers.

This main interaction where race and claims of racism or discrimination is manifested provides the context in which race centered interactions and claims of racism or discrimination between officers is understood. Because claims of racism or discrimination are associated with suspect activity, specifically invalid or unjustifiable activity, when it is claimed by other officers it is understood in the same context. Given that the form of racism or discrimination that may be claimed by officers is not as obvious as others might need it to be as evidence that it is actually occuring, claims of racism or discrimination by officers are viewed as not having credibility. Claims of racism or discrimination are viewed in the same way as if a suspect was to claim racism or discrimination; as a last resort tactic by minority officers because they did not get their desired outcome, specifically in the case of officers, they did not *earn* their desired outcome in which they claim they have been the victim of racism or discrimination (such as in promotions). Instead the lack of a desired outcome by the officers claiming racism or discrimination is justified by others on individualistic merit based (colorblind) criteria. The officer is perceived very negatively for "making excuses," because this is the same concept and context (to the officers) in which the suspects use race and racism.

From a occupational culture perspective, officers do not want to be associated with "them." The fact that racial discrimination and race in general is associated with

suspect activity, there is a general negative perception of race in general. Even a potential acknowledgement of individual racially based discrepancies is avoided. This is best exemplified in the respondents specifically focusing on the fact that even if they were racially discriminated against, they never paid attention to it. By doing do, they avoid making an "excuse," and the negative perception that comes along with that. Nevertheless, the respondents are fully aware racism or discrimination in all probability does happen in the department. Yet, because of the fact that it is only viewed and understood in overt forms, this influences the perception of claims of racism and discrimination. Officers who would be potentially blatantly discriminated against would not be viewed in the same manner as suspects, on the contrary, because of the obvious and clear nature of the claim, officers would actually be supported by other officers, as respondents have vehemently claimed.

Where it is more acceptable to focus on race and discrimination is when the respondents believe an action or decision is not explicitly based on merit and when race is perceived as the driving force. This is why the promotional process is a huge point of contention between the officers. The officers view race as not only having an impact on the promotional process, but specifically that it has a detrimental effect on all racial groups except African American. African Americans are the perceived beneficiary of the promotional process, which is detrimental to more "qualified" non-African American officers. This is also the most obvious form of the manifestation of race in the department in the view of the officers. In this context, and in others where race might be the focus,

the sample reverts to the Black/White binary perception of race, specifically focusing on the plight of African Americans compared to everyone else. This reifies race for the officers in the binary form. This is one reason why the culture of the institution supersedes race/ethnicity, because where race is manifested, it is in the Black/White binary by the White and Latino officers.

Previous research has argued that when focusing on minorities in policing the culture of the institution, of policing itself, supersedes the ethnicity of the minority officer (Barlow & Barlow 2000). However, this was based mostly on studies of African American officers in smaller institutions where they were the numerical minority. Few studies included and even fewer focused specifically on the Latino/Hispanic officer. Yet these studies did not try to explain how or why this happened (culture over ethnicity). It was generally hypothesized that possibly the minority as majority demographics of the department would help in changing the culture of policing. If anything, the increased minority demographics have only succeeded in further ingraining classic police culture by legitimizing it. It is very difficult to claim racism/discrimination when you are the numerical majority. When minority officers are in token numbers, the claims of racism/discrimination and differential treatment is easier to recognize, and as Guajardo's (2015) study demonstrates, ethnicity becomes a driving force out of perceived necessity to change the status quo. However, once minorities become the majority, as in the LAPD, the phase of the perceived need for ethnicity as as driving force for necessary change no longer appears relevant to officers. The hegemonic police culture is no longer viewed as

preferential for the non-minority group and detrimental to the small numerical minority group, because the minority group is now the numerical majority group. The respondents have moved away from a salient ethnic identity in their occupational setting. Hegemonic police culture is now viewed as the normal state of the occupation, that all minority officers (the numerical majority) experience in the occupation. The problem is, if this is the case, hegemonic police culture (now normalized in minority officers) will be reproduced in future cohorts of minority police officers; the classic police culture then becomes minority police culture as well.

Interest Convergence

This becomes a case of interest convergence for the community, the officers, and the LAPD. For the community, they receive the racial/ethnic representation they desire, which results in the perception of greater legitimacy of police in communities of large minority demographics. The communities also receive the benefit of having officers that have a less negative view of the communities in which they police by having an understanding of the structural issues that members of the communities face. The communities also receive officers whose main initial motivations were to help those same communities in which they came from, and to provide a better officer experience. For the officers, they fulfil their initial motivations of policing the community, providing a better service (which includes providing language services). However from an officer and departmental tactical perspective, having more Latino officers is a known distinct advantage. Officers believe that with their cultural and linguistic understanding of the

communities, they are at a tactical advantage when interacting with the community, whether with victims and especially with suspects. Lastly, the department benefits the most out of this convergence of interests as hegemonic police culture is normalized for Latinos, and departmental legitimacy is increased not only with officers, but from the community as a whole. Whether Latino officers provide a better officer experience is not the question, it is that it is perceived to be so.

The concept of using minority officers to monitor minority communities as strictly a tactical advantage (from the institutional perspective) has a long history in policing. As described in the earliest form of policing in the United States, the earliest form of law enforcement was the slave patrol, and later on extended to African American officers that would be used to strictly patrol other minority communities, with full policing powers against other minorities, but not against non-minorities (Barlow & Barlow 2000). There was also the case with Native Americans in law enforcement in which they were used to track and enforce laws specifically against other Native Americans (Barlow & Barlow 2000).

As described in the background to the study, there is even precedent for the use of Latino officers as a tactical advantage, as early on some of the most notorious officers that had interactions with the Latino community in Los Angeles were of Latino heritage themselves (Escobar 2004). As discussed, the Latino officer creates an interest conversion scenario within the department; not only do they increase the legitimacy of

the department by attempting to meet city demographics, but they increase their effectiveness tactically as well.

Future directions

To change police culture, Latino/Hispanic police officers need to change their paradigm and move away from the colorblind and binary race models. To understand that racism/discrimination does not exclusively exist in the form that led to litigation within the department and the various consent decrees over the years. However, it is not up to the department to do this, it actually goes against their interest for officers to have a more contemporary understanding of race/ethnicity. As in Guajardo's (2015) work, it is up to the various Latino law enforcement based interest groups and organizations around the country to inform officers of the value and current relevance of race/ethnicity in policing, not just with the community but within departments as well.

For Mexican Americans in policing, much work still needs to be done, in order to understand what the future holds for them, the community, and the rest of society. The experiences of Mexican American officers needs to be examined in other areas around the country, including the experiences of female officers, and officers in all capacities along the hierarchy of departments. Studies with larger samples, autoethnographies, and other qualitative as well as quantitative methods, would help bridge the large gap that is the lack of knowledge we have about Latino officers ideology and experiences on the job. As this study has shown, there is a great need for further examination of the motivations,

self-identification, and interactions of Mexican American officers, and more broadly speaking of Latinos in general.

Further research is required to examine other nationalities of Latinos in the United States in large growing urban areas, with different geographic departmental socio-political histories. The examination of Cubans in Florida, as well as Dominicans and Puerto Ricans in New York comes to mind as a possible points of departure. Either way, we are just at the beginning of understanding not only Mexican Americans in policing, but also the vastly understudied Latino (and Latinas) officers in policing in general and the impact that has on the community, other officers, and society itself.

Work Cited and Bibliography

Aguirre Jr, A. (2004). Profiling Mexican American identity: issues and concerns. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *47*(7), 928-942.

Aguirre Jr, A., Rodriguez, E., & Simmers, J. K. (2011). The cultural production of Mexican identity in the United States: An examination of the Mexican threat narrative. *Social Identities*, *17*(5), 695-707.

Aguirre, A., & Simmers, J. K. (2008). Mexican border crossers: The Mexican body in immigration discourse. *Social Justice*, *35*(4 (114), 99-106.

Alex, N. (1969). *Black in blue: A study of the Negro policeman*. New York, NY: Appleton-Century Crofts.

Alex, N. (1976). *New York cops talk back: A study of a beleaguered minority*. New York: Wiley.

Ana, O. S. (2009). Framing peace as violence: TV coverage of LA's May Day 2007. *NACLA Report on the Americas*, *42*(1), 52-55.

Arreola, D. (Ed.). (2004). *Hispanic spaces, Latino places: Community and cultural diversity in contemporary America*. University of Texas Press.

Barlow, D. E., & Barlow, M. H. (2000). *Police in a multicultural society: An American story*. Waveland Press Inc.

Beard, E. (1977). The Black Police in Washington, DC. *Journal of Police science and administration*, *5*(1).

Bernasconi, R. (2001). Who invented the concept of race? Kant's role in the enlightenment construction of race. *Race*, 11-36.

Bolton Jr, K. (2003). Shared perceptions: Black officers discuss continuing barriers in policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *26*(3), 386-399.

Brown, B., & Reed Benedict, W. (2002). Perceptions of the police: Past findings, methodological issues, conceptual issues and policy implications. *Policing: an international journal of police strategies & management*, *25*(3), 543-580.

Brown, M. K. (1988). *Working the street: Police discretion and the dilemmas of reform*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Buzawa, E. S. (1981). The role of race in predicting job attitudes of patrol officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *9*(1), 63-77.

Buntin, J. (2010). *LA Noir: The Struggle for the Soul of America's Most Seductive City*. Broadway Books.

Burt, K. C. (2001). Tony Rios and Bloody Christmas: A Turning Point between the Los Angeles Police Department and the Latino Community. *W. Legal Hist.*, *14*, 159.

Carter, D. L. (1985). Hispanic perception of police performance: An empirical assessment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *13*(6), 487-500.

Carter, D. L. (1986). Hispanic police officers' perception of discrimination. *Police Stud.: Int'l Rev. Police Dev.*, *9*, 204.

Chambliss, W. J. (1994). Policing the ghetto underclass: The politics of law and law enforcement. *Social Problems*, *41*(2), 177-194.

Chan, J. B. (1997). Changing police culture: Policing in a multicultural society.

Chavez, L. (2013). *The Latino threat: Constructing immigrants, citizens, and the nation*. Stanford University Press.

Chemerinsky, E. (2000). An Independent Analysis of the Los Angeles Police Department's Board of Inquiry Report on the Rampart Scandal. *Loy. LAL Rev.*, *34*, 545.

Christopher, W. (Ed.). (1991). *Report of the independent commission on the Los Angeles Police Department*. Diane Publishing.ess.

Clemetson, L. (2003). Hispanics now largest minority, census shows. *New York Times*, *21*.

Cochran, J. C., & Warren, P. Y. (2012). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in perceptions of the police: The salience of officer race within the context of racial profiling. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *28*(2), 206-227.

Cockcroft, T. (2012). *Police culture: themes and concepts*. Routledge.

Colby, S. L., & Ortman, J. M. (2015). Projections of the size and composition of the US population: 2014 to 2060. United States Census Bureau.

Conti, N., & Doreian, P. (2010). Social network engineering and race in a police academy: A longitudinal analysis. *Social networks*, *32*(1), 30-43.

Crank, J. P. (2010). Police culture in a changing multicultural environment. *Controversies in policing*, *2*, 53-74.

Davis, M. (2006). *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles (New Edition)*. Verso Books.

De Angelis, J., & Kupchik, A. (2009). Ethnicity, trust, and acceptance of authority among police officers. *Journal of criminal justice*, *37*(3), 273-279.

Decker, S. H. (1981). Citizen attitudes toward the police: A review of past findings and suggestions for future policy. *Journal of police science and administration*, *9*(1), 80-87.

De la Garza, Rodolfo, O., (1992). *Latino Voices: Mexican, Puerto Rican, and Cuban Perspectives on American Politics*. Westview Pr.

Dean, G. (1995). Police reform: Rethinking operational policing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *23*(4), 337-347.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2012). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. NYU Press.

Denton, N. A., & Massey, D. S. (1989). Racial identity among Caribbean Hispanics: The effect of double minority status on residential segregation. *American Sociological Review*, 790-808.

Dodge, M. M., & Schiesl, M. (Eds.). (2006). *City of Promise: Race & Historical Change in Los Angeles*. Regina Books.

Dowler, K. (2005). Job satisfaction, burnout, and perception of unfair treatment: The relationship between race and police work. *Police Quarterly*,*8*(4), 476-489.

Dulaney, W. M. (1996). *Black police in America*. Indiana University Press.

Durán, R. J. (2015). Mexican American law enforcement officers: Comparing the creation of change versus the reinforcement of structural hierarchies. *Latino police officers in the United States: An examination of emerging trends and issues*, 128-147.

Endore, S. G. (1944). *The Sleepy Lagoon Mystery*. R and E Research Associates.

Escobar, E. J. (1999). Race, police, and the making of a political identity: Mexican Americans and the Los Angeles Police Department, 1900-1945.

Escobar, E. J. (2003). Bloody Christmas and the irony of police professionalism: The Los Angeles Police Department, Mexican Americans, and police reform in the 1950s. *Pacific Historical Review*, *72*(2), 171-199.

Farkas, M. A., & Manning, P. K. (1997). The occupational culture of corrections and police officers. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *20*(2), 51-68.

Felkenes, George T., Paul Peretz, and Jean Reith Schroedel. (1993)"An analysis of the mandatory hiring of females: The Los Angeles Police Department experience." *Women & Criminal Justice* 4.2 : 31-63.

Firozi, Paulina., " 5 things to know about Ferguson Police Department." USA Today., " August 14,2014., https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2014/08/14/ferguson-police-department-details/14064451/

Foley, P. F., Guarneri, C., & Kelly, M. E. (2008). Reasons for choosing a police career: Changes over two decades. *International journal of police science & management*, *10*(1), 2-8.

Gaines, L. K., Kappeler, V. E., & Vaughn, J. B. (1999). Policing in America (3e éd.).

Gallup. "Gallup Review: Black and White Differences in Views on Race." (December 12, 2014) http://news.gallup.com/poll/180107/gallup-review-black-white-differences-views-race.aspx

Garcia, M. (1984). Americans all: The Mexican American generation and the politics of wartime Los Angeles, 1941-45. *Social Science Quarterly*, *65*(2), 278.

Gates, G. J., & Cooke, A. M. (2011). United States census snapshot: 2010.

Goldsmith, A. (1990). Taking police culture seriously: Police discretion and the limits of law. *Policing and Society: An International Journal*, *1*(2), 91-114.

Guajardo jr, A. G. (2015). Incorporation of Latino Police Officers into the Milwaukee Police Department: How a Group of Latino Police Officers Shed the" Blue Shield" for a Latino Identity.

Haarr, R. H. (1997). Patterns of integration in a police patrol bureau: Race and gender barriers to integration. Justice Quarterly, 14, 53 – 85.

Haarr, R. N., & Morash, M. (1999). Gender, race, and strategies of coping with occupational stress in policing. *Justice quarterly*, *16*(2), 303-336.

Hangartner, J. (1994). The Constitutionality of Large Scale Police Tactics: Implications for the Right of Intrastate Travel. *Pace L. Rev.*, *14*, 203.

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

Heck, W. P. (1992). Police who snitch: Deviant actors in a secret society. *Deviant behavior*, *13*(3), 253-270.

Herrnstein, R. J., & Murray, C. (2010). *Bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. Simon and Schuster.

Hillstrom, K. (2014). *The Zoot Suit Riots*. Credo Reference.

Hodges, I. V., & Booker, T. (2015). A comparative study of perceived work stress among police officers of color and white officers and its implications for management.

Holmes, M. D., & Smith, B. W. (2008). *Race and police brutality: Roots of an urban dilemma*. SUNY Press.

Huang, W., & Vaughn, M. S. (1996). Support and confidence: Public attitudes toward the police. *Americans view crime and justice: A national public opinion survey*, 31-45.

Irlbeck, D. M. (2000). Latino police officers: negotiating the police role.

Irlbeck, D. (2008). Latino police officers: Patterns of ethnic self-identity and Latino community attachment. *Police Quarterly*.

Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R. D., & Alpert, G. P. (1998). *Forces of deviance: Understanding the dark side of policing* (Vol. 2). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1989). *The evolving strategy of policing*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Kraska, P. B., & Kappeler, V. E. (1997). Militarizing American police: The rise and normalization of paramilitary units. *Social problems*, *44*(1), 1-18.

Lamberth, J. (1998). Driving while Black: A statistician proves that prejudice still rules the road. *Washington Post*, *16*, c01.

Lasley, J. (2012). *Los Angeles police department meltdown: The fall of the professional-reform model of policing*. CRC Press.

Leinen, S. (1985). *Black police, white society*. NYU Press.

Lee, T. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Not an outgroup, not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the stereotype content model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(6), 751-768.

Lester, D. (1983). Why do people become police officers: A study of reasons and their predictions of success. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, *11*(2), 170-174.

Lipsitz, G. (2006). *The possessive investment in whiteness: How white people profit from identity politics*. Temple University Press.

Lopez, I. F. H. (2009). *Racism on trial: The Chicano fight for justice*. Harvard University Press.

Los Angeles Police Department, Sworn & Civilian Personnel By Class, Sex, and Descent (SPRGE) Report, February 2016, http://www.lapdonline.org/sworn_and_civilian_report

Manning, P. K. (1995). The police occupational culture in Anglo-American societies. In W. Bailey (Ed.), The encyclopedia of police science (pp. 472 – 475). New York: Garland Publishing.

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.

Martinez, R. (2007). Incorporating Latinos and immigrants into policing research. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *6*(1), 57-64.

Massey, D. S. (2009). Racial formation in theory and practice: The case of Mexicans in the United States. *Race and social problems*, *1*(1), 12-26.

McCluskey, C. P., & Francisco, A. (2007). Policing the Latino community: Key issues and directions for future research. *Latinos in a Changing Society*, 183.

McCluskey, C. P., & McCluskey, J. D. (2004). Diversity in policing: Latino representation in law enforcement. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*,*2*(3), 67-81.

McElvain, J. P. (2006). *Shots fired: An examination of police shootings and citizen behaviors* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside).

Mirande, A. (1987). *Gringo Justice: Catholicism in American Culture*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Mirandé, A. (1994). *The Chicano experience: An alternative perspective*. University of Notre Dame Pess.

Milutinovich, J. S. (1977). Black-white differences in job satisfaction, group cohesiveness, and leadership style. *Human Relations*, *30*(12), 1079-1087.

Morales, A. (1972). *Ando sangrando (I am bleeding): A study of Mexican American-police conflict*. Perspectiva Publications.

Moskos, P. (2008). *Cop in the hood: My year policing Baltimore's eastern district*. Princeton University Press.

Morash, M., & Haarr, R. N. (1995). Gender, workplace problems, and stress in policing. *Justice quarterly*, *12*(1), 113-140.

Omi, M & Winant, H. (1994) "Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s." *New York City: Routledge*.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (2002). Reflections. *Racial Formation”. In Race critical theories, Edited by: Essed, P and Goldberg, DT*, 123-145.

Pagán, E. O. (2003). *Murder at the Sleepy Lagoon: Zoot Suits, Race, and Riot in Wartime LA*. Univ of North Carolina Press.

Peak, K. (1997). African Americans in policing. *Critical issues in policing*, 356-362.

Perea, J. F. (1997). The Black/White binary paradigm of race: The normal science of American racial thought. *Cal. L. Rev.*, *85*, 1213.

Paoline, E. A. (2001). Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of criminal justice*, *31*(3), 199-214.

Polk, O. E. (1995). Effects of Ethnicity on Career Paths of Advanced/Specialized Law Enforcement Officers, The. *Police Stud.: Int'l Rev. Police Dev.*, *18*, 1.

Portillos, E. (2015). Chicano Police Officers Working in the Latino Community: Diversity,Police Culture, and Unique Perspectives and Challenges. In Urbina, M. G., & Alvarez, S. E. (2015). *Latino police officers in the United States: An examination of emerging trends and issues*. Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Prieto, G. (2015). "Traitors" to race,"traitors" to nation: Latina/o immigration enforcement agents, identification and the racial state. *Latino Studies*, *13*(4), 501-522.

Raganella, A. J., & White, M. D. (2004). Race, gender, and motivation for becoming a police officer: Implications for building a representative police department. *Journal of criminal justice*, *32*(6), 501-513.

Reaves, B. A. (2011). *Local police departments (2007)*. DIANE Publishing.

Reaves, B., Maskaly, J. Employment of Latino Officers by Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement Agencies in the United States: Emerging Trends and Issues In Urbina, M. G., & Alvarez, S. E. (2015). *Latino police officers in the United States: An examination of emerging trends and issues*. Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Reiss, A. J. (1967). *Career Orientations: Job Satisfaction, the Assessment of Law Enforcement Problems by Police Officers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. Rohrlich, T. (1991). The Times Poll: Majority Says Police Brutality Is Common,". *Los Angeles Times*, A1.

Rojek, J., & Decker, S. H. (2009). Examining racial disparity in the police discipline process. *Police quarterly*, *12*(4), 388-407.

Salinsky, D. A. (2006) Not your father's police department: Making sense of the new demographic of law enforcement. The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology 96(3): 1209–1243.

Schuck, A. M., Lersch, K. M., & Verrill, S. W. (2004). The "Invisible" Hispanic? The Representation of Hispanics in Criminal Justice Research: What Do We Know and Where Should We Go?. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, *2*(3), 5-22.

Skolnick, J. H. (2008). Enduring issues of police culture and demographics.*Policing & Society*, *18*(1), 35-45.

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, *60*(1), 16.

Pew Research Center., "Stark Racial Divisions in Reactions to Ferguson Police Shooting." Washington, D.C. (August 18, 2014) http://www.people-press.org/2014/08/18/stark-racial-divisions-in-reactions-to-ferguson-police-shooting/

Strauss, A. Corbin. "J.(1990)." *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*.

Stroshine, M. S., & Brandl, S. G. (2011). Race, Gender, and Tokenism in Policing An Empirical Elaboration. *Police Quarterly*, *14*(4), 344-365.
Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. M. (1974). *Response effects in surveys: A review and synthesis* (No. 16). Aldine.

Toch, H. (2002). *Stress in policing*. American Psychological Association.

United States. Department of Justice. Civil Rights Division. (2015) Investigation of the Ferguson Police Department. Retrieved from The Department of Justice Website: https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/opa/press-releases/attachments/2015/03/04/ferguson_police_department_report.pdf

United States. Department of Justice. Tribal Justice and Safety. "Percentage of Local Police officers Who Were Racial or Ethnic Minorities Nearly Doubles Between 1987 and 2013." (May 14,2015) https://www.justice.gov/tribal/pr/percentage-local-police-officers-who-were-racial-or-ethnic-minorities-nearly-doubled

Urbina, M. G., & Alvarez, S. E. (2015). Latino police officers in the United States: An examination of emerging trends and issues. Charles C Thomas Publisher.

Van Maanen, J. (1974). Working the street: A developmental view of police behavior. In H. Jacob (Ed.), The potential for reform of criminal justice (pp. 83 – 130). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Walker, S. (1999). The police in America: An introduction (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Reforming the police: Racial differences in public support for change. *Criminology*, *42*(2), 391-416.

White, M. D., & Kane, R. J. (2013). Pathways to career-ending police misconduct: An examination of patterns, timing, and organizational responses to officer malfeasance in the NYPD. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *40*(11), 1301-1325.

Wilkins, V. M., & Williams, B. N. (2008). Black or blue: Racial profiling and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, *68*(4), 654-664.

Williams, H., & Murphy, P. V. (1990). The evolving strategy of police: A minority view.