

## Unpacking the Foundations of Representative Bureaucracy Theory and American Policing

**Abstract** In this chapter, we review the representative bureaucracy literature and set the theoretical foundations for the rest of this book. First, we delineate the two primary dimensions of representative bureaucracy theory: passive and active representation. Next, we make a case for the application of representative bureaucracy theory to the area of policing. We outline the key issues of race and policing in America and highlight important scholarship explaining the historical context of effects of race on community–police relations, particularly as it pertains to African-Americans and other minorities. We then turn to the application of representative bureaucracy in the context of policing. We include an overview of the work that has been done in this area as well as the need for additional research, situating the case of the police within the broader context of representative bureaucracy. Finally, we highlight the importance of understanding policing from a representative bureaucracy perspective as a necessary component of establishing effective policing policy and practice.

**Keywords** Representative bureaucracy · Racial representation  
Active representation · Passive representation · Representation  
Race and policing · Discrimination · Racial profiling · Street level  
bureaucrats · Bureaucratic discretion · Race in American politics

## 2.1 HISTORY OF UNREPRESENTATIVENESS: RACE AND AMERICAN POLICING

Before delving into existing scholarly research on representative bureaucracy and American policing, a textured backdrop of racial identity and criminal justice systems in American history is necessary. It is difficult to fully understand the current conditions and challenges of race and representation in American policing without presenting the historical pathway of events that led to this point. For this project, one consistent strand of American history particularly relevant to American policing is defined by strict adherence to systems of White supremacy and state-enforced minority exclusion, from slavery through Jim Crow, a purposeful directive to separate, subjugate, and create a very clear and discriminatory racial hierarchy (Alexander 2010).

Reflective of this broader historical backdrop, today's law enforcement institutions mirror these larger societal divides and the systematic underrepresentation of minorities. Indeed, Jim Crow-Era institutions were tasked with maintaining racial caste through "law and order" and social control mechanisms aimed disproportionately at minority communities (Alexander 2010; Rios 2011). Today's attention to diversity in law enforcement and other administrative institutions is a contemporary phenomenon whose origins date back only as far as the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s. While the issues of race, representation, and bureaucracy have long intrigued political scientists and social observers, scholars, practitioners, and policymakers have only recently begun to systematically examine the causes and consequences of racial representation in American policing. Through historical discussion and exhaustive literature review, this chapter sets the backdrop of race and policing in the American context, yielding keen insight into current challenges and potential reforms aimed at engendering a more representative bureaucracy.

## 2.2 AFRICAN-AMERICANS AND POLICING IN AMERICA

America's history of policing and criminal justice administration has long been blemished by racial stratification and discriminatory actions motivated by racial bias (Alexander 2010; Rios 2011). From the nation's founding and its early systems of slavery to more recent systems of Jim Crow segregation and mass incarceration, American criminal justice has traditionally been utilized as a prominent tool of promoting and edifying the racial hierarchy through discriminatory and oppressive social

control measures aimed at systematically marginalizing racial minorities (Wacquant 2009; Alexander 2010; Rios 2011). The core American ideals of racial inclusion and equal protection embedded in phrasing such as “all men are created equal,” along with representativeness in American institutions as a normatively desirable goal, have remained stubbornly elusive throughout America’s history.

The current status of minorities in the criminal justice system can be traced as far back as the seventeenth century. Bacon’s Rebellion serves as an apt illustration of this long history. Bacon’s Rebellion was a racially integrated uprising by both White and Black indentured servants in Virginia in 1676 (Alexander 2010). Motivated primarily by protecting and expanding their economic interests, the land-owning class responded by driving a wedge between the racially diverse protesters. Plantation owners systematically demoted the status of African slaves while simultaneously promoting the status of poor White Americans by giving them access to selective benefits and privileges, disrupting any further multiracial class-based alliances (Alexander 2010). One form of early racial privilege provided to impoverished Whites but withheld from Blacks involved the creation of “slave patrols,” granting lower-class Whites the authority to detain or punish runaway Black slaves (Alexander 2010; Edge 2009). Thus, as early as the seventeenth century, we see the intentional racialization of American law enforcement as a political tool of social control. Law enforcement in early America was oftentimes informal and centered on swift vengeance for criminals and slaves (Edge 2009). Racial representation within US policing agencies, much less anywhere within federal, state, and local bureaucracies, was not merely an afterthought or tertiary goal of governance; it was anathema to the foundations of White supremacy. These foundations of dehumanization existed formally under slavery and the Three-Fifths Compromise until the Civil War, and then racialization morphed into less formal yet still highly oppressive systems of “Black codes,” “convict leasing,” and Jim Crow segregation in the decades that followed (Blackmon 2009; Alexander 2010).

After a brief period of racial equalizing known as the Reconstruction Era, which witnessed the passage of the “Civil War Amendments” outlawing slavery and promising federally guaranteed protections (Epps 2006), alternative racialized systems of social control again began to emerge in response. Instead of actively pursuing racial integration of early police forces in America, many departments, especially but not exclusively those in the South, remained largely segregated and centered around enforcing discriminatory laws and hiring practices (Katznelson 2005). The racialized origins of discriminatory law enforcement activities continued in earnest

following Reconstruction when several states and localities instituted “Black codes” and “convict leasing” systems designed to provide cheap, primarily minority, convict labor to commercial enterprises (Blackmon 2009). During this period following Reconstruction until the mid-twentieth century, police forces in America began forming across the country with greater agency formalization and professionalization (Maguire 1997; Reiss 1992). However, glimpses of racial integration were few and far between.<sup>1</sup> Jim Crow segregation solidified racial tensions between the overwhelmingly White law enforcement officers and the predominantly poor and disenfranchised minority citizens and communities, retarding any progress toward genuine racial integration into law enforcement administrative contexts and enflaming police–community relations (Alexander 2010).

### 2.3 BLACKS AND AMERICAN POLICING IN THE POST-CIVIL RIGHTS ERA

Following a period of equalizing measures and heightened racial inclusion of the 1960s, reactive countervailing forces have strained relationships between minority communities and law enforcement. Some go so far as to argue that the discriminatory and oppressive social control regimes beginning in the 1970s were only slightly removed from those of centuries prior (Alexander 2010). Residents of Northeastern and Midwestern metropolises such as Buffalo, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Saint Louis responded to a post-World War II influx of Black Americans with similar conditions of segregation, poverty, police harassment and frustrations found in Southern states in decades past (Wilson 2012; Sugrue 2014; Kruse 2013). Under conditions of social and economic marginalization and dislocation, urban riots sprang up with some regularity in the mid-1960s, with a particularly notable burst of uprisings following Martin Luther King Jr.’s assassination in 1968 (Alexander 2010). In response to sustained urban unrest centered in minority communities, conservative elites such as Barry Goldwater, George Wallace, Ronald Reagan, and Richard Nixon started making strategic racial appeals to White voters with coded themes of “law and order,” which involved aggressive police responses against racial minorities who dared to demand equal rights or police accountability (López 2015; Kruse 2013).<sup>2</sup> In the subsequent television and Internet ages, media depictions and narratives of urban unrest and high-profile police incidents from Los Angeles, CA, in 1993 to Ferguson, MO, in 2014 shape and perpetuate the popular associations of minority citizens with criminality, deviance, and unworthy of protection from police harassment (Lawrence 2000).

Two developments in the post-Civil Rights Era have exacerbated racial tensions between law enforcement and minority communities, which persist to the present day. First, in 1968, the US Supreme Court's ruling in *Terry v. Ohio* opened the legal door for the enactment of stop-and-frisk policies such as those found later in *Floyd v. City of New York* to be implemented in racially discriminatory fashion in New York City. In *Terry*, the Court ruled that the law enforcement officers may stop and frisk anyone when they have reasonable suspicion that the suspect is armed and dangerous, as long as the suspicion is formulated on reasonable and articulable facts. This authority extended to more intrusive practices like frisking the suspect to search for weapons (Alexander 2010). In places where stop-and-frisk policies were adopted as agency procedure, most notably New York City, they tended to be applied unequally toward different racial groups. According to NYPD administrative data compiled by the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU), from 2002 to 2015, more than five million "stops and street interrogations" occurred in New York City (NYCLU 2016). During this time period, between 53 and 56% of stops were of African-Americans, while 27 and 33% were of Hispanics. In contrast, stops of Whites composed only 9–12% of stops (NYCLU 2016). These figures are, of course, dramatically inconsistent with civilian population demographics. These relatively aggressive policing tactics and posturing in high-poverty, predominantly minority urban areas (Holmes and Smith 2008), combined with the fact that routinely 85–90% of those stopped and interrogated are found to be totally innocent of any wrongdoing (NYCLU 2016), have further enflamed tensions between minority citizens and law enforcement (Alexander 2010).

Second and potentially more importantly from a national policy perspective, in 1971 President Richard Nixon initiated the "War on Drugs" when he declared that narcotics were "America's public enemy number one." This war targeted law enforcement resources not at suburban cul-de-sacs and university campuses inhabited disproportionately by White individuals and where drug use also occurred with regularity, but rather predominantly at racial minorities residing in low-income urban neighborhoods (Alexander 2010; Rios 2011). Following Nixon's salvo, Presidents Reagan and Clinton accelerated the drug war during their administrations, first with the passage of the Drug Abuse Act of 1986 followed the Clinton Administration's famed "1994 Crime Bill" (Alexander 2010). Even resistant Democratic elites frequently found the

electoral appeal of strict social order and mass incarceration too much to resist (López 2015; Alexander 2010). Both bills served to erode rehabilitative efforts in exchange for more punitive measures aimed at drug-related offenses. Only decades later was the War on Drugs openly discussed and criticized for its effects on minority communities and high incarceration rates (Alexander 2010; Mauer 2006).

These criminal justice policies and decidedly punitive administrative shifted toward “toughness” in these heavily minority areas since the 1970s have since led to widespread mass incarceration and subsequent disenfranchisement and distrust among African-Americans and their interactions with law enforcement (Alexander 2010). According to criminal justice researcher Marc Mauer, “African-Americans made up a smaller proportion of those sentenced to prison during the early part of this [20th] century than is now the case. Black offenders made up 21% of the prison population in 1926, compared to half of all prison admissions today” (Mauer 2006, p. 133). Racial disparities in incarceration have again accelerated in recent decades (Chang and Thompkins 2002; Alexander 2010). In 2008, approximately 1 in every 15 African-American males—1 in 9 among males aged 20 and 34—resided within a correctional facility, and nearly half the total prison population is comprised of African-Americans (Pew Center for the States 2009).

Since the 1970s, industrial restructuring and racially selective mass suburbanization across the urban American landscape, popularly known as “White flight” (Kruse 2013), have occurred alongside the development of punitive social control enforcement measures. Economic restructuring has arguably hollowed out vital resources from inner-city neighborhoods and older inner-ring suburbs, and subsequently created entrenched conditions of racial housing segregation that are characterized most pointedly by Massey and Denton’s epochal work on modern urban residential arrangements as “hypersegregation” (Massey and Denton 1993). Conditions of concentrated poverty and accompanying economic and social distress linger into the twenty-first century (Jargowsky 1997; Kruse 2013; Wilson 2012). Put another way, frustrations with law enforcement among urban minorities in contemporary times are compounded by and intertwined with larger historical forces and spatial contexts of social and economic marginalization (Holmes and Smith 2008). For instance, beyond citizen and government reports detailing systematic police abuses, one consistent theme underlying the fraught situations in Ferguson, Baltimore, Chicago, Baton

Rouge, and other cities is that these settings are also characterized by deep economic and social distress and relative urban dereliction and alienation (Wilson 2012).

Criminal justice research consistently demonstrates that these distressed urban contexts matter to police–citizen interactions and outcomes. In particular, research shows that policing behavior can turn more aggressive and broadly punitive in high-poverty and high-crime urban contexts—disproportionately inhabited by racial minorities—where psychological and physical “threats” toward police officer safety are more apparent (Holmes and Smith 2008). At the same time that minority civilians experience targeted hostility and sweeping aggressiveness from law enforcement in these areas, research shows that police officers simultaneously tend to “under-police” these same neighborhoods and often lack effective frontline responsiveness to routine citizen’s needs for day-to-day attention and protection (Holmes and Smith 2008; Alexander 2010). That is, there is likely both aggressiveness in profiling and responsive action toward potential suspects, and also indifference to routine citizen’s needs and concerns. In turn, distrust and dissatisfaction toward police runs significantly higher among minority citizens than in other groups (Weitzer and Tuch 2005; Skogan 2005). These experiences can directly influence minorities’ willingness to consider a career in law enforcement (Gupta and Yang 2016).

While there is some scholarly contention around the scale and motivations of discriminatory police practices that exist, a myriad of contemporary studies demonstrate that, across a wide variety of policing and criminal justice outcomes, racial discrimination remains widespread and pervasive from persistent racial profiling. These disparities are especially pronounced among African-American and Hispanic males on outcomes such as stops and searches, as well as differential sentencing and executions (Rios 2011). When surveyed, African-Americans and Hispanics are more likely to report experiences of police abuse and excessive force, and consistently exude attitudes of broad distrust of police and the criminal justice system, much more so than other racial groups that are relatively trusting of law enforcement (Weitzer and Tuch 2004; Tyler 2005). In short, historic racial exclusion and systems of social control, and more recent muscular law enforcement regimes directed primarily in poorer communities of color undoubtedly challenge the attractiveness of policing as a profession for many racial minorities, likely exacerbating bureaucratic unrepresentativeness across local US policing agencies.

## 2.4 HISPANICS AND POLICING IN AMERICA

While existing scholarship directs at least modest attention to the general relationship between African-Americans and criminal justice in America, much less research has been devoted to the history and experience of Hispanics and US law enforcement. Researchers often overlook the unique experiences of Hispanics by maintaining a Black/White dichotomy or White/minority dichotomous approach to their study of race and policing in America (Urbina 2012). While Blacks and Hispanics share contemporary problems such as heightened likelihood of experiencing racial profiling and police abuse (Holmes and Smith 2008; Rios 2011), their unique historical pathways shape these problems in distinct ways. Additionally, the issue of immigration further distinguishes the experience of police-Hispanic interactions. Urbina and Alvarez (2015) suggest, “Of all people who have migrated to the US, perhaps no other group has experienced the constant hostilities that Hispanic immigrants have endured over the years (16).” The limited scholarship devoted to Hispanics is particularly noteworthy given their recent population growth, surpassing that of African-Americans in the early 2000s.

As Urbina (2012) notes,

Again, even though ethnic minorities have been in the United States since 1565, bypassing African Americans in the general population in 2000, making them the largest minority group in the United States, the academic literature on Latinas and Latinos, whose experiences with the criminal justice system differ from those of African Americans and Caucasians, remains limited and inconclusive. To this day, most studies that have analyzed the experiences of male or female offenders in the criminal justice system, whether it’s in the area of policing, courts, or corrections, have focused almost exclusively on race, following a dichotomous “Black-White” approach; that is, Blacks versus Caucasian, excluding both Latinas and Latinos (5–6).

Research that does address Hispanics and policing often aggregates them with African-Americans, examining the overall experience of racial minorities and police in America. This approach has obvious limitations as the historical experiences of Hispanics are distinct from those of African-Americans. This approach also ignores the unflattering social constructions and identity issues which underlie police interactions with Hispanic citizens specifically.



A recent illustration of this important distinction is the political debate over immigration enforcement and how it shapes Hispanic encounters with law enforcement. Arizona's controversial 2010 Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act, colloquially known as the "Show Me Your Papers" law, highlights the unique concerns of Hispanic citizens (Crawford 2012). The Safe Neighborhoods Act made it illegal for an immigrant to fail to carry papers proving their legal residency status and required that the law enforcement officers attempt to determine any citizen's immigration status during contact if there was a reasonable suspicion that they might be in the country illegally.

Despite gaps in the literature surrounding the relationship between Hispanics and law enforcement, this topic holds great historical and academic significance. Crawford (in Urbina 2012) highlights the historical context framing the relationship between Hispanics and police in America. Similar to Blacks, the racial contours of this complicated relationship date back centuries. There is also an element of informal, vigilante justice surrounding the early treatment of Hispanics by law enforcement. For example, propagandist imagery from the Mexican–American War of 1848 supported the perception that Mexicans possess individual pathology and dissocial values (Durán, in Urbina 2012). By the early 1910s, there were consistent historical accounts of brutality directed against Hispanics from border patrol agents such as the Texas Rangers and Arizona Rangers. Early reports from this era, such as the Wickersham Commission (officially known as *US National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement*), recognized discrimination toward Mexicans and the resultant disproportionate use of force and police brutality toward this population. Later, the Zoot Suit Riots of the 1940s in Southern California and the surrounding imagery reinforced the popular notion that Mexicans were inherently criminal in nature. This type of inflammatory imagery created the perception that White servicemen were properly ridding Los Angeles neighborhoods of "miscreants" and "hoodlums" which justified an aggressive and punitive police response with little concern for equal treatment or minority protections (Durán 2012).

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, there was continued documentation of inequitable treatment by law enforcement directed toward Hispanics. In its report, *Mexican Americans and the Administration of Justice in the Southwest*, the US Commission on Civil Rights (1970:i) argued, "There is widespread evidence that equal justice is being withheld; Mexican Americans are reportedly subject to unduly harsh

treatment by the law enforcement officers, often arrested on insufficient ground, and receive physical and verbal abuse and penalties which are considered disproportionately severe” (Durán 2012, p. 50).

Beginning in the 1970s and accelerating into the 1980s and early 1990s, the War on Drugs had a similar effect on Hispanics as it had on Blacks. Drug enforcement activities disproportionately targeted Hispanics in low-income urban communities (Alexander 2010). In another parallel to the Black experience with American policing, scholars suggest that Hispanic communities are simultaneously under- and over-policed. Citizens’ contacts with law enforcement are characterized by harassment at the same time as the police fail to provide desired services like public safety. These historical events create a backdrop that shapes contemporary interactions between Hispanics and law enforcement. Contemporary issues of Hispanics center on the racial profiling and its subsequent influence on police behavior, including harassment and the inappropriate use of force (Alexander 2010).

What little attention existing research pays to Hispanics and law enforcement is largely restricted to the Southwest. While the heaviest concentration of Hispanic populations is in New Mexico, Texas, and California, there are also substantial populations in Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Nevada, and New York. There are, of course, exceptions. Chaney (2010) studies a growing Hispanic population in Nashville, TN. He argues that this community perceives discriminatory policies from local police, leading to self-segregation to avoid police harassment. This segregation creates cultural and linguistic divisions that serve to further complicate police/citizen interactions within these communities. Chaney’s study and others like it underscore the need to consider the relationship between Hispanics and law enforcement in a much wider geographical context.

Racial profiling and use of force are the two current issues of concern in the interaction between Hispanics and law enforcement which have been understudied. Scholarship in both the areas tends to focus on Blacks or minorities as a whole while ignoring the unique experience of Hispanics. The limited research into this area suggests that Hispanics face similarly higher rates of traffic stops and searches than Whites, despite being less likely to possess contraband when searched (Muchetti 2005). Similar to African-Americans, Weitzer and Tuch (2004) found through extensive survey data that Hispanics are more likely to report having experienced excessive force by police and express distrust toward police.

The post-9/11, political environment, the more recent 2016 presidential campaign, and the election of President Donald Trump have further increased the importance of directing scholarly attention toward Hispanics. Despite the recent rise in attention toward illegal immigration, Posadas and Medina (in Urbina 2012) illustrate the historical significance of this issue. The extension of these communities beyond the Southwest has heightened the awareness of the White population, increased attention, and subsequently led to an increasing demand for strict legislation to address illegal immigration.

Sweeney (2014) argues that this shift in attention toward immigration enforcement creates a “shadow immigration enforcement” in which state and local law enforcement directs their attention and resources toward pursuing those they perceive to be “foreign” despite their lack of authority in the immigration enforcement policy arena. This shadow immigration enforcement leads law enforcement to target these vulnerable populations, essentially increasing racial profiling against these communities. As noted by scholars in the field, “the criminalization of immigrants, in turn, has resulted in the criminalization of non-criminals and, in essence, the criminalization of Mexicans and the whole Hispanic community” (Urbina 2012).

In addition to the historical context and more recent salience around immigration dimensions, social factors also shape interactions with police. Urbina and Alvarez (2015) note Hispanics, particularly those of Mexican origin, face significant gaps in all areas of their social lives. Police–community relations just happen to be one of the most visible aspects of being and underserved population. While the Hispanic community faces many issues similar to dynamics with Blacks, interactions with police are further complicated by linguistic barriers. Indeed, Culver (2004) identified four distinct factors of Hispanic communities nationally that shape police interactions:

1. Language barriers, resulting in confusing and tense interactions;
2. Fears of the police, due to negative interactions in their home countries;
3. Immigration status concerns, resulting in a non-desire to contact the police due to fear of deportation;
4. The nature of contacts—the primary method for interaction between the police and the Hispanic community was through traffic violations, providing an unequal form of interaction to build rapport.

Urbina and Alvarez (2015) argue that, like African-Americans, increasing passive representation of Hispanic police officers may alleviate some of these problems.

## 2.5 CONTEMPORARY EFFORTS AT MINORITY REPRESENTATION

While there have certainly been episodic instances of minority police officers serving on local US police forces throughout America's history, it was not until the 1960s and the more modern push for equal protection under the banner of the Civil Rights Movement that racial representation in law enforcement captured national attention (Gupta and Yang 2016). Due to the historic systems that centered on perpetuating White supremacy and law enforcement's prominent role in enforcing racial hierarchy and segregation, local police forces across the United States have systematically excluded and underrepresented racial minorities (Gupta and Yang 2016). In turn, increasing racial diversity and representativeness within law enforcement—most directly through hiring and retaining more minority frontline police officers—has become a regular goal put forth by elected officials, racial advocacy associations, and civil rights groups.

Since the civil rights efforts of the 1960s, contemporary efforts at equal employment in law enforcement for racial minorities have followed. In late 2014, President Barack Obama signed Executive Order 13684, *Establishment of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*, which highlighted racial diversity in policy agencies as a promising avenue for increasing trust between police and minority citizens. A key area identified by this task force was a lack of diversity among law enforcement agencies. In 2015, the US Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division and the US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) launched *Advancing Diversity in Law Enforcement*, an interagency research initiative aimed at finding and implementing ways of recruiting and retaining more minority police officers, with the ultimate goal of improving trust and accountability between citizens and officers (Gupta and Yang 2016).

The integrative promises found in landmark legislation such as The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and The Voting Rights Act of 1965, along with more contemporary efforts, have broadly increased the political participation of African-Americans and other racial minorities within elected and administrative positions, including the law enforcement

bureaucracies (Gupta and Yang 2016). Generally speaking, a greater total number of racial minorities are employed within US police agencies in the post-Civil Rights Era than prior (Gupta and Yang 2016), but that eschews important variation in racial representativeness across both space and time. As we demonstrate in Chap. 3, patterns of police representativeness in America do not necessarily follow a consistent upward trajectory and are uneven and complex in more recent decades, requiring in-depth and nuanced investigation.

Critical research questions remain unaddressed and set the stage for rest of the book project. First, despite historic and contemporary challenges to integration and equal protection, racial representation on local US police forces has doubtless improved in a general sense over time, with more racial minorities serving on local police forces than in the pre-Civil Rights Era (Gupta and Yang 2016). However, knowledge about differences in passive representation across different agencies remains limited. Furthermore, our understanding of the determinants of law enforcement representativeness is limited to anecdotes and lacks a basis in systematic evidence. Documenting a general rise in minority representation masks an important variation at the municipal level across space and time. Second, we know little about the consequences of law enforcement representativeness on agency policies and police–citizen outcomes. Policy experts suggest that enhancing police representativeness should improve police–community relations and policing outcomes, for example, reducing claims of excessive use of force (Gupta and Yang 2016). Even with the increasing visibility around race and policing incidents, scant systematic research examines the consequences of enhancing racial representation.

## 2.6 THE ORIGINS OF REPRESENTATIVE BUREAUCRACY THEORY

Because bureaucrats like law enforcement officers are not elected, their democratic legitimacy in the eyes of citizens is perpetually in question. Public administration scholars developed the theory of representative bureaucracy as a way to enhance democratic legitimacy and ensure accountability from unelected bureaucracies. This theoretical approach as coined by Kingsley (1944) and refined by subsequent scholarship suggests that a bureaucracy which more accurately matches the demographic makeup of its constituents will provide higher quality, more

democratic, and more responsive outcomes for members of the community. Proponents of representative bureaucracy theory argue that shared demographic characteristics reflect shared social experiences and therefore may translate into more responsive public policy outcomes. Through this policy and administrative responsiveness, the representative bureaucracies can possess legitimacy and accountability despite the absence of direct electoral accountability mechanisms (Mosher 1968; Krislov 1974; Selden 1997; Meier 1993).

Mosher (1968) distinguishes between the two types of representative bureaucracy: “passive” or demographic representation and “active” or policy/administrative representation. According to Mosher, passive representation, similar conceptually to descriptive representation, refers to the bureaucracies mirroring demographically the public that they serve. Mosher states, “The passive (or sociological) meaning of representativeness concerns the source of origin of individuals and the degree to which, collectively, they mirror the total society” (p. 12). Active representation occurs when bureaucrats translate group interests into policy decisions in favor of the groups they passively represent. Mosher explains, “There is an active (or responsible) representativeness wherein an individual (or administrator) is expected to press for the interests or desires of those whom he is presumed to represent, whether they be the whole people or some segment of the people” (p. 12).

There are potentially inherent, symbolic benefits from passive representation as well as potential tangible benefits of active policy and front-line representation. Symbolically, passive representation reflects equal access to power and confers legitimacy on bureaucratic institutions (Selden 1997). In addition to symbolic benefits, scholars argue that there may be a link between passive and active representations, whereby under-represented groups receive more equitable service provision as passive representation increases (Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006).

## 2.7 EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON REPRESENTATIVE BUREAUCRACY

Early scholarship in the field of representative bureaucracy focused on measuring passive representation—in other words, measuring the extent to which group employment in the public sector agency mirrored that of the population being served. This research provides important descriptive information about the changing composition of bureaucratic

agencies. Understanding the extent to which various groups are represented and the distribution of representation across agencies and levels is critical for scholars as well as policymakers. The findings suggest that while representation for women and minorities in public organizations has increased since equalizing measures under the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s, they remain underrepresented both vertically and horizontally, with most women and minorities concentrated in lower-level positions and limited in certain functional categories (Selden 1997). For example, Newman (1994) finds females concentrated in redistributive human service agencies, with fewer women in distributive and regulatory agencies. Similarly, studies suggest that racial minorities tend to be underrepresented on local police forces (Lewis 1988; Riccucci 1987).

While early scholars focused on measuring passive representation, contemporary scholars have shifted attention toward active representation. Following on Mosher (1968) distinction, scholars attempt to measure the extent to which passive representation influences policy and administrative outputs. They have found that increasing representation among minorities and females is related to substantive changes in administrative outcomes favoring these groups in certain policy areas (Meier and Stewart 1992; Hinderer 1993; Selden 1997). For example, Meier and Stewart (1992) examine the link between the race of school teachers and administrators and various discretionary decisions made on behalf of students. The findings suggest that as the number of minority teachers and administrators increases, there are positive outcomes for minority students in terms of ability grouping and discipline decisions. These are both discretionary administrative choices that have been subject to litigation based on racial bias. Ability grouping is the classification of students to different categories based on the perceived abilities which may include educable mentally retarded, trainable mentally retarded, and gifted. Several discipline measures are also studied, including corporal punishment, in-school suspension, out-of-school suspension, expulsion, and court referrals. The findings suggest that across these two sets of measures, increasing the number of minority teachers and administrators leads to positive results for minority students.

Other studies have found similar evidence of the potential link between passive and active representation, further supporting the claim that descriptive representation can lead to favorable policy and administrative outcomes. For example, Selden (1997) examines the possible link

between passive representation and favorable frontline outcomes in the Farmer's Home Administration's Rural Housing Loans program, finding that increasing minority loan officers leads to increasing numbers of loans awarded to minority applicants. Hindera (1993) examines the relationship between the minority officers at the EEOC and the number of charges filed on behalf of minorities. The evidence from this study similarly suggests that increasing the numbers of African-American and Hispanic officers led to an increase in the numbers of charges filed on behalf of these groups. These early findings prompted scholars to further explore what conditions are necessary for passive representation to translate into active representation.

### 2.7.1 *Assumptions of Active Representation*

Following the advent of representative bureaucracy theory, scholars debated and outlined the preconditions and organizational contexts likely to foster benefits from passive and active representations. These premises suggest that law enforcement agencies and policing activities are an appropriate bureaucratic context to analyze passive and active representation. First, scholars point to the street-level bureaucrat as an important instrument of demographic representation due to their discretionary powers (Meier 1993). As Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) explain, "Street-level bureaucrats frequently interact with the general public. Because street-level bureaucrats exercise discretion, their attitudes, values, and predispositions are important in understanding policy implementation" (p. 851). Notably, Lipsky (1980) who coined the phrase "street-level bureaucrat" originally applied this term to police officers as he argued that police exercise considerable discretion and flexibility in dealing with the public on a daily basis.

In addition to allocating frontline bureaucratic discretion, scholars argue that certain criteria must be met in order to study active representation. In particular, the policy and administrative decisions must have direct relevance to the passively represented group or demographic characteristic. Finally, there must be a way to link the street-level bureaucrat to a specific policy or administrative output (Selden 1997; Meier 1993; Meier and Stewart 1992). In certain areas of law enforcement, these conditions could arguably be met. For example, due to the historically contentious relationship between local law enforcement and racial minority groups as well as the current salience of profiling and



disproportionate police brutality aimed at minorities, this current project is relevant and timely for representative bureaucracy, public administration, and criminal justice scholars, along with racial advocacy groups, law enforcement organizations, and policymakers alike. Furthermore, extensive original data collection allows us to analyze and compare police demographics as well as the influence of police representation on policy and administrative outcomes occurring at the municipal department level.

### 2.7.2 *Translation Methods of Passive to Active Representation*

One important area of consideration is the exact mechanism(s) by which the passive representation translates into active representation. Lim (2006) explains several ways this can occur. First, bureaucrats may use their discretionary power to make decisions that benefit the minority group. This is the most commonly studied form of active representation. However, Lim (2006) argues there are several other mechanisms by which passive representation may translate into active representation. Increasing the number of minority bureaucrats may induce positive changes in constituent behavior, known as coproduction. These behavioral changes may then lead to more positive interactions and outcomes. For example, increasing female officers may lead to increased trust and perceived legitimacy which may then lead to increased reporting of sexual assault crimes which then leads to increased arrests (Meier and Nicholson-Crotty 2006).

Lim (2006) also argues that the presence of an increasing number of minorities in the organization may also affect change by influencing the behavior of non-minority bureaucrats. Minorities may alter the influence of non-minorities by challenging or exposing discriminatory behavior. In another scenario, labeled “prior restraint,” the non-minority bureaucrat may reduce or restrict discriminatory behavior from fear of exposure or disapproval from minorities within the organization. Finally, increasing the number of minorities may eventually lead to resocialization of non-minorities in the organization. These distinctions will be highlighted in the review of pertinent literature studying passive and active representations in policing.

Lastly, more recent studies have also explored the notion of potential mediating factors, such as geographic region. For example, Grissom et al. (2009) examine the potential influence of region, arguing that it

alters the salience of racial considerations and may condition its influence on policy outputs. The study examines teacher race and student performance outcomes, controlling for region. Their findings suggest that active representation practices involving race may be more prevalent in the South because of the increased salience of race in that particular region. Due to the unique history of racial oppression within the southern region, we believe that the relationship between representative bureaucracy and excessive use of force might be strengthened within racially underrepresentative police departments operating within the southern region specifically.

## 2.8 REPRESENTATIVE BUREAUCRACY RESEARCH AND AMERICAN POLICING

While much of the scholarly work in the representative bureaucracy tradition has focused on schools and the EEOC, recent scholarship has expanded its scope to include law enforcement agencies (Selden 1997; Kennedy 2013). Scholarship in this area has examined passive and active representations in the context of both race and gender. These studies include the traditional focus of active representation as a product of responsive bureaucratic discretion, but there are also several studies that analyze coproduction and/or indirect methods of active representation.

### 2.8.1 *Passive Representation and American Policing*

Early literature in the field of representative bureaucracy focused on measuring passive representation or analyzing the extent to which various public bureaucracies reflected the demography of their communities (Kennedy 2014). There is much literature to this effect (Subramaniam 1967; Nachmias and Rosenbloom 1973; Kellough 1990). However, surprisingly little research has examined passive representation among local police departments. Much of this research was conducted in the 1980s and early 1990s. By the mid-1990s, the focus of representative bureaucracy literature had almost completely shifted toward examining the effects on active representation and administrative outcomes.

Extant studies assessing passive representation among police departments are dated and/or rely on a relatively small number of cases. For example, Cayer and Sigelman (1980) examine passive representation across federal, state, and local agencies during 1973–1975, including

police protection. While minority representation grew in police departments across the years measured, broad patterns of underrepresentation remained across the American landscape. More recently, Stokes (1996) examines the extent of minority representation among nineteen municipal police departments. Looking specifically at Hispanic and Asian employment, Stokes finds that in 1990, only Buffalo, NY, had adequate representation of Hispanic officers. No cities had sufficient representation of the Asian population among sworn officers. Beyond these modest efforts, scholarly investigation into passive representation in US law enforcement contexts remains decidedly understudied.

A parallel literature has sought to identify explanatory variables to understand differential representation among groups across government agencies. These studies suggest a variety of economic, organizational, demographic, and political factors might influence the extent of passive representation of minorities in general as well as the racial composition of police forces in particular. We endeavor to incorporate these earlier studies in a comprehensive empirical framework to examine the determinants of US police force representativeness.

Economic factors posited to influence minority representation include unemployment rates and agency growth in positions (Kim and Mengistu 1994; Cornwell and Kellough 1994; Warner et al. 1989; Guajardo 2014; Mladenka 1989; Stein 1985). Warner et al. (1989) examine the factors associated with increasing employment of women in policing agencies. We posit that these factors would apply equally to racial minorities, as they have also been largely excluded by an occupation filled primarily with White males. One key factor is the state of the economy. While women and minorities have seen growth across various occupational categories due to government regulations and affirmative action programs, budgetary shortfalls may disproportionately and negatively influence the state of minorities in agencies. Warner et al. (1989) argue that economic downturns, following the usual trajectory of last hired, first fired, would likely lead to a disproportionate number of females and minorities being let go unless agencies went decidedly out of their way to let go a higher rate of White male officers. General municipal fiscal strength is also an influencing factor. Thus, agency growth and the overall unemployment rate are expected to influence the ratio of minorities in these law enforcement positions.

Demographic factors include the size of the minority population, minority education levels, city size, and region (Dye and Renick 1981; Eisinger 1982; Stein 1985; Meier 1993; Kim and Mengistu 1994;

Cornwell and Kellough 1994; Warner et al. 1989; Selden 1997; Mladenka 1989). The size of the minority population can have varied effects. On the one hand, cities need to reach a threshold in order to expect the minority population to influence employment (Dye and Renick 1981). On the other hand, there may be a point of diminishing returns where cities with high minority populations fail to attain parity in minority hiring. Increased minority education levels may lead to increased representation as the minority population becomes more competitive for employment. Warner et al. (1989) argue that larger cities have more acceptance of affirmative action programs and therefore should have higher numbers of minority officers. Similarly, regional variation may occur due to regional differences in social and cultural acceptance of affirmative action policies.

Organizational factors include agency size, union presence, and residency requirements (Kim and Mengistu 1994; Cornwell and Kellough 1994; Stein 1985; Mladenka 1989). Agency size may have a negative relationship to minority representation. This stems from a similar logic to the diminishing returns discussed previously. For larger agencies, each minority hire makes a smaller contribution to the overall representation of minorities, making it harder for larger organizations to maximize representation. The presence of collective bargaining has long been considered a hindrance for minority employment in police forces as unions have been thought to successfully block the implementation of affirmative action policies.

There is disagreement about the expected effect of residency requirements on minority employment. On the one hand, some scholars argue that residency requirements may enhance minority representation by forcing the agencies to hire from the immediate community population. Conversely, some argue that this may diminish minority hires by placing artificial limits on the hiring pool, encouraging potential nepotism or political favoritism to operate above merit considerations (Kim and Mengistu 1994).

Political variables include the representation of minorities in state and local political office such as the legislature, city council, mayor, and police chief (Dye and Renick 1981; Stein 1985; Saltzstein 1989; Eisinger 1982; Mladenka 1989; Selden 1997). The presence of minority political officials is also found to influence the ratio of minorities in local police forces. According to Warner et al. (1989), this can occur both directly and indirectly. Minorities in elected positions may directly oversee the increased hiring of minorities. Also, they may indirectly play a role by

shaping generally inclusive attitudes across local agencies, encouraging more minority hires. Thus, increasing minorities in elected offices in local offices such as mayors are expected to positively influence minority employment on local police forces.

### 2.8.2 *Potential Trade-offs Between Minority Groups*

Questions of representative bureaucracy are further complicated by the presence of multiple minority groups. One prominent question is whether increasing passive representation is mutually beneficial for all minority groups? In other words, do we see agencies that increase diversity across all groups or do the groups compete for increased representation? Meier et al. (2004) examine the relationship between Hispanics and African-Americans in multiracial school districts. They find that when resources are scarce, such as the case with available positions in teaching and administration, the groups compete with one another so that gains to one group result in losses to the other.

In contrast, Kerr et al. (2000) examine interracial competition for municipal jobs by functional category of the agency. While they do find competition among Blacks and Hispanics in non-managerial municipal positions, these same patterns do not hold for fire and police protection. In these positions, it appears that Whites and minorities compete for jobs rather than minorities competing with other minority groups.

## 2.9 ACTIVE REPRESENTATION IN AMERICAN POLICING

Recent literature has analyzed active representation in policing using both gender and race as independent variables of interest. For example, Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) examine the relationship between the gender of police officers and sexual assault reports and arrests. The study finds that police forces with larger numbers of female officers file more sexual assault reports and make more sexual assault arrests. This study confirms an empirical relationship between passive representation of females and active representation of outcomes in the field of policing. However, the linkage is complex. As Meier and Nicholson-Crotty note, there may be a variety of factors at work in this process. First, the increase of female officers may lead victims to be more willing to report sexual assault. Second, both directly and indirectly the presence of

women officers may lead to increased prioritization and pursuit of sexual assault reports resulting in more arrests. In other words, female officers may be more likely to pursue arrest, and they may also transfer this prioritization indirectly to their male counterparts through the resocialization process.

Active representation has also been applied to the area of race and policing. Wilkins and Williams (2008) examine whether increasing minorities decreases racial profiling in traffic stops. Wilkins and Williams (2008) caution that the unique socialization of police departments may hinder passive representation from translating into responsive active representation. Within representative bureaucracy theory, increasing Black officer representation should arguably decrease racial disparity in traffic stops, with all rival variables held constant. In counterintuitive fashion, their study finds that increasing Black police officer presence *increases* racial disparity in vehicle stops. They argue that socialization processes within police departments may account for this unexpected finding by hindering the translation of passive representation into responsiveness to minority group interests of more equal protection. The core socialization argument, echoed by more recent work on police fatalities by Nicholson-Crotty, et al. (2017), suggests that individuals within policing agencies replace their own values with those of the dominant organizational culture. Therefore, an organizational identity and norms of traditional power structure likely replaces their minority identity and group concerns of equal protection, subsequently preventing the translation of passive into active representation.

Although the Wilkins and Williams (2008) study reports that increasing Black representation in local police departments yields less representative outcomes and greater racial disparity in traffic stops, we are not entirely convinced that this relationship necessarily extends to other agency outcomes such as civilian complaints policies, along with the number of excessive force complaints and arrest-related deaths. Because excessive force and police-involved homicides entail more extreme iterations of physically and verbally abusive practices than routine traffic stops, we believe that underrepresentation of minorities within local police forces will decrease administrative responsiveness to group concerns of accountability, increase the incidence of excessive force claims as well as increase the number of arrest-related deaths. Improving racial representation and shared cultural identities and empathies might not yield responsive outcomes as it pertains to routine traffic stops (Wilkins

and Williams 2008), but should more readily enhance responsiveness as it pertains to agency policies and reduced inclination to pursue more punitive, maximal use of excessive force toward minority citizens.

Some work in the field of active representation addresses the issues of coproduction and indirect representation. For example, Theobald and Haider-markel (2008) examine police officer race and perceived legitimacy. This study analyzes survey results asking respondents about interactions with police. The results indicate that both Blacks and Whites are more likely to perceive the police actions as legitimate if the officer is of the same race. This racial dimension to perceived legitimacy may be a factor in the coproduction process as increased legitimacy can lead to changes in behavior on the part of the citizen when interacting with police.

Using survey data to measure attitudes of police officers, Lasley et al. (2011) finds that minority police officers' attitudes toward the communities they police differ from those of White police officers. The study analyzes panel data occurring in two waves. The initial results indicate both African-American and Hispanic officers are more willing to engage and interact with minority communities. Additionally, minority officers' positive attitudes increased significantly over time. Importantly, White officers' attitudes toward community involvement also improved over time, indicating the possibility of indirect representation or resocialization of non-minority officers as a result of their interaction with minority colleagues.

In this project, we use multiple measures of active representation in US police agencies—both policy and administrative outcomes. While we examine typical street-level outcomes including excessive force complaints and officer's use of deadly force, we also examine two specific department policy choices—adoption of written policy to handle citizen complaints and adoption of civilian review boards that independently investigate accusations of police misconduct. Both coproduction and indirect representation are important considerations for the current study. A positive association between racial representation and likelihood of adopting favorable agency policies regarding citizen complaints, or a negative relationship between racial representation and excessive force complaints may suggest translation into active representation by the officer or indirect socialization mechanisms as a result of minority officers' presence on the force. Conversely, a positive relationship with excessive force complaints may arise from coproduction, whereby we see

an increase in excessive force complaints by minority citizens because of increased efficacy and comfort reporting. Using these two measures simultaneously should allow us to parse these effects out.

## 2.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter reviews preeminent scholarship in the field of representative bureaucracy literature. Based on the assumptions of passive and active representations, we make the case that the area of policing is consistent with the conditions necessary to study under this framework. Further, recent events underscore the critical nature and timeliness of this work. We provide a brief overview of the existing literature examining policing from a representative bureaucracy lens. Based on this, we contend that many important questions remain. Throughout the following chapters, we seek to build on this literature by providing a more thorough and up-to-date analysis of passive representation as well as a comprehensive analysis of the potential for active representation.

## NOTES

1. The first documented African-American police officer on the New York City police force was Samuel J. Battle, hired in early 1883. Other municipalities were farther behind in terms of including racial minorities. For instance, the first African-American officers on the Atlanta police force were not hired until 1948.
2. In the 2016 election, Republican President-Elect, Donald Trump pushed similar themes of “law and order” in response to urban riots that occurred in Ferguson and Baltimore, along with high-profile murders of police officers in Dallas and Baton Rouge. Similar to conservative elites from decades prior, Trump arguably constructed immigrants and minorities in unflattering frames of criminality and behavioral deviance, with an underlying assumption that more aggressive and punitive police response toward these populations is warranted.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, M. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of color-blindness*. New York: The New Press.
- Blackmon, D. (2009). *Slavery by another name: The re-enslavement of black Americans from the Civil War to World War II*. New York: Anchor.



- Cayer, J., & Sigelman, L. (1980). Minorities and women in state and local government: 1973–1975. *Public Administration Review*, 40(5), 443–450.
- Chaney, J. (2010). The formation of a Hispanic enclave in Nashville, Tennessee. *Southeastern Geographer*, 50(1), 17–18.
- Chang, T. F., & Thompkins, D. E. (2002). Corporations go to prisons: The expansion of corporate power in the correctional industry. *Labor Studies Journal*, 27(1), 45–69.
- Cornwell, C., & Kellough, J. E. (1994). Women and minorities in federal government agencies: Examining new evidence from panel data. *Public Administration Review*, 54(3), 265–270.
- Culver, L. (2004). The impact of new immigration patterns on the provision of police services in Midwestern Communities. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(2), 329–344.
- Dye, T., & Renick, J. (1981). Political power and city jobs: Determinants of minority employment. *Social Science Quarterly*, 62(3), 475–486.
- Edge, L. B. (2009). *Locked up: A history of the U.S. prison system*. New Haven, CT: 21st Century Publishing.
- Eisinger, P. (1982). Black employment in municipal jobs: The impact of black political power. *The American Political Science Review*, 76(2), 380–392.
- Epps, G. (2006). *Democracy reborn: The fourteenth amendment and the fight for equal rights in post-Civil War America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Grissom, J., Nicholson-Crotty, J., & Nicholson-Crotty, S. (2009). Race, region, and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, 69(5), 911–919.
- Guajardo, S. (2014). Workforce diversity: Downsizing in the NYPD and its effect on minority integration. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 16(2), 155–167.
- Gupta, V., & Yang, J. (2016, October). *Advancing diversity in law enforcement*. United States Department of Justice, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. <https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/interagency/police-diversity-report.cfm>.
- Hindera, J. (1993). Representative bureaucracy: Further evidence of active representation in the EEOC district offices. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(4), 415–429.
- Holmes, M. D., & Smith, B. W. (2008). *Race and police brutality: Roots of an urban dilemma*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Jargowsky, P. A. (1997). *Poverty and place: Ghettos, barrios, and the American city*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Katznelson, I. (2005). *When affirmative action was white: An untold history of racial inequality in twentieth-century America*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Kellough, J. E. (1990). Integration in the public workplace: Determinants of minority and female employment in federal agencies. *Public Administration Review*, 50(3), 557–566.

- Kennedy, B. A. (2013). Sorting through: The role of representation in bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 23(4), 791–816.
- Kennedy, B. A. (2014). Unraveling representative bureaucracy a systematic analysis of the literature. *Administration & Society*, 46(4), 395–421.
- Kerr, B., Miller, W., & Reid, M. (2000). The Changing face of urban bureaucracy: Is there interethnic competition for municipal government jobs. *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(6), 770–793.
- Kim, P., & Mengistu, B. (1994). Women and minorities in the workforce of law enforcement agencies. *American Review of Public Administration*, 24(2), 161–179.
- Kingsley, J. D. (1944). *Representative Bureaucracy: An Interpretation of The British Civil Service*. Yellow Springs: Antioch Press.
- Krislov, S. (1974). *Representative bureaucracy*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kruse, K. M. (2013). *White flight: Atlanta and the making of modern conservatism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lasley, J., Larson, J., Kelso, C., & Brown, G. C. (2011). Assessing the long-term effects of officer race on police attitudes towards the community: A case for representative bureaucracy theory. *Police Practice and Research*, 12(6), 474–491.
- Lawrence, R. G. (2000). *The politics of force: Media and the construction of police brutality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lewis, G. (1988). Progress toward racial and sexual equity in the federal civil service? *Public Administration Review*, 48(3), 700–706.
- Lim, H. (2006). Representative bureaucracy: Rethinking substantive effects and active representation. *Public Administration Review*, 66(2), 193–205.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- López, I. H. (2015). *Dog whistle politics: How coded racial appeals have reinvented racism and wrecked the middle class*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maguire, E. R. (1997). Structural change in large municipal police organizations during the community policing era. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(3), 547–576.
- Massey, D. S., & Denton, N. A. (1993). *American apartheid: Segregation and the making of the underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mauer, M. (2006). *Race to incarcerate*. New York: The New Press.
- Meier, K. J. (1993). Latinos and representative bureaucracy testing the Thompson and Henderson hypotheses. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 3(4), 393–414.
- Meier, K., & Nicholson-Crotty, J. (2006). Gender, representative bureaucracy, and law enforcement: The case of sexual assault. *Public Administration Review*, 66(6), 850–861.
- Meier, K., & Stewart, J. (1992). The impact of representative bureaucracy: Educational systems and public policies. *American Review of Public Administration*, 22(3), 157–177.

- Meier, K., McClain, P., Polinard, J., & Wrinkle, R. (2004). Divided or together? Conflict and cooperation between African Americans and Latinos. *Political Research Quarterly*, 57(3), 399–409.
- Mladenka, K. (1989). Barriers to Hispanic employment: Success in 1200 cities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 70(2), 391–407.
- Mosher, F. (1968). *Democracy and the public service*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Muchetti, A. (2005). Driving while brown. *Harvard Latino Law Review*, 8, 1.
- Nachmias, D., & Rosenbloom, D. (1973). Measuring bureaucratic representation and integration. *Public Administration Review*, 33(3), 590–597.
- New York Civil Liberties Union. (2016). Stop and frisk data. <http://www.nyclu.org/content/stop-and-frisk-data>.
- Newmann, M. A. (1994). Gender and Lowi's thesis: Implications for career advancement. *Public Administration Review*, 54(3), 277–284.
- Nicholson-Crotty, S., Nicholson-Crotty, J., & Fernandez, S. (2017). Will more black cops matter? Officer race and police-involved homicides of black citizens. *Public Administration Review*, 77(2), 206–216.
- Pew Center for the States. (2009). One in 100: Behind bars in America 2008. [http://www.pewtrusts.org/%7e/media/legacy/uploadedfiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/reports/sentencing\\_and\\_corrections/onein100pdf.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/%7e/media/legacy/uploadedfiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/reports/sentencing_and_corrections/onein100pdf.pdf).
- Reiss, A. J., Jr. (1992). Police organization in the twentieth century. *Crime and Justice*, 15, 51–97.
- Riccucci, N. (1987). Female and minority employment in city government: The role of unions. *Policy Studies Journal*, 15(1), 3–16.
- Rios, V. M. (2011). *Punished: Policing the lives of black and Latino boys*. New York: NYU Press.
- Saltzstein, G. (1989). Black mayors and police policies. *Journal of Politics*, 51(3), 525–544.
- Selden, S. (1997). *The promise of representative bureaucracy: Diversity and responsiveness in a government agency*. New York: Sharpe.
- Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 298–321.
- Stein, L. (1985). A representative protective service: Concept, demand, reality. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 5(3), 78–89.
- Stokes, L. (1996). Affirmative action and selected minority groups in law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(1), 29–38.
- Subramaniam, V. (1967). Representative bureaucracy: A reassessment. *American Political Science Review*, 61(04), 1010–1019.
- Sugrue, T. J. (2014). *The origins of the urban crisis: Race and inequality in post-war Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sweeney, M. (2014). Shadow immigration enforcement and its constitutional dangers. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 104(2).

- Theobald, N., & Haider-Markel, D. (2008). Race, bureaucracy, and symbolic representation: Interactions between citizens and police. *Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19, 409–426.
- Tyler, T. R. (2005). Policing in black and white: Ethnic group differences in trust and confidence in the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 322–342.
- Urbina, M. G. (2012). *Hispanics in the U.S. criminal justice system: The new American demography*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- Urbina, M. G., & Alvarez, S. E. (2015). *Latino police officers in the United States: An examination of emerging trends and issues*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- Wacquant, L. (2009). *Punishing the poor: The neoliberal government of social insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Warner, R., Steel, B., & Lovrich, N. (1989). Advent of representative bureaucracy: The case of women in policing. *Social Sciences Quarterly*, 70(3), 562–578.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2004). Race and Perceptions of Police Misconduct. *Social Problems*, 51(3), 305–325.
- Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly*, 8(3), 279–297.
- Wilkins, V., & Williams, (2008). Black or blue: Racial profiling and representative bureaucracy. *Public Administration Review*, 68(4), 654–664.
- Wilson, W. J. (2012). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Race and Representative Bureaucracy in American  
Policing

Kennedy, B.A.; Butz, A.M.; Lajevardi, N.; Nanes, M.J.  
2017, V, 127 p. 9 illus., 7 illus. in color., Hardcover  
ISBN: 978-3-319-53990-4