Routledge Critical Studies in Crime, Diversity and Criminal Justice

SEXUALITY IN THE SWEDISH POLICE

FROM GAY JOKES TO PRIDE PARADES

Jens Rennstam

ROUTLEDGE

"This is a very readable and well-written book that tackles a pressing issue in an accessible manner. With a clear and relevant conceptual apparatus and a wealth of empirical material, Jens Rennstam makes visible the issue of exclusion and inclusion of gay sexualities within the Swedish police. Rennstam demonstrates how these issues have implications for those working in the police. Perhaps most obviously for those who self-identify as LGBTQ+, but it is significant for everyone in the police force because the narrow frames of action that exclusion generates affect everyone in the organization.

An important lesson of the book is that issues of inclusion and exclusion are collective processes. Rennstam shows that in these processes the voice of LGBTQ+ people is important, but other voices and support are also needed, not least among managers and leaders. The police as an organization can greatly benefit from the book in the continued work of change towards inclusion and away from exclusion. In this work, the book is not limited to LGBTQ+ issues but provides a broader knowledge of the work on issues of inclusion and exclusion, and the book's grounding in organizational theory makes it relevant to organizations other than the police."

Tove Pettersson, Professor of Criminology,
Stockholm University.

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

Sexuality in the Swedish Police

Sexuality in the Swedish Police is based on the experiences of lesbian, gay, and bisexual police officers and the author's observations of police work. Written at the intersection of organizational, gender, and police studies, the book analyses how processes of exclusion and inclusion of LGB sexuality coexist in the Swedish police, how these processes are related to the culture and characteristics of police work, and how police management attempts to create an inclusive organization.

How and under what conditions does the exclusion and inclusion of LGB officers and LGB sexuality take place in the Swedish police? By delving into this question, the author seeks to answer, among other things, how it is that there are so few openly gay male police officers and how barriers to inclusion can be understood. The book contributes to a better understanding of the problems and activities associated with diversity issues, particularly with a focus on sexual orientation, but also more generally; many of the insights in the book can be used to understand the inclusion and exclusion of other groups in society. A key insight from the book is that inclusion and exclusion are collective processes characterized by struggle, a struggle that according to the author can be understood through the concept of "peripheral inclusion".

Sexuality in the Swedish Police will be of great interest to scholars and students as well as practitioners with an interest in diversity issues and policing. The book is also relevant to those working in or interested in diversity, inclusion, and equality in other similarly "masculinized" organizations, such as the armed forces and certain sports organizations.

Jens Rennstam is Associate Professor of Business Administration at Lund University, Sweden. He has long experience of qualitative inquiry into organizations and his previous work has been published in esteemed outlets such as Gender, Work and Organizations, Human Relations, Marketing Theory, Organization, and Organization Studies.

Routledge Critical Studies in Crime, Diversity and Criminal Justice

The works in this series strive to generate new conceptual and theoretical frameworks to address the legal, organisational and normative responses to the challenges that diversity and intersectionality present to criminal justice systems. This series aims to present cutting edge empirically informed theoretical works from both new and established scholars around the world.

Drawing upon a range of disciplines including sociology, law, history, economics, and social work, the series encourages different approaches to questions of mobility and exclusion with a cross-section of theorists, empiricists, and critical policy researchers. It will be key reading for scholars who are working in criminal justice, criminology, criminal law and human rights, as well as those in the fields of gender and LGBTI studies, migration studies, anthropology, refugee studies and post-colonial studies.

Edited by Patricia Faraldo Cabana, University of A Coruña, Spain
Nancy A Wonders, Northern Arizona University, USA

Race, Recognition and Retribution in Contemporary Youth Justice
The Intractability Malleability Thesis
Esmorie Miller

Legal Professionals Negotiating the Borders of Identity
Operation Streamline and Competing Identity Management
Jessie K. Finch

Campus Sexual Violence
A State of Institutionalized Sexual Terrorism
Sarah Prior and Brooke A. de Heer

Sexuality in the Swedish Police
From Gay Jokes to Pride Parades
Jens Rennstam

For more information about this series, please visit: https://www.routledge.com/criminology/series/CDCJ

Sexuality in the Swedish Police

From Gay Jokes to Pride Parades

Jens Rennstam
Translated by B.J. Woodstein

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in English 2023
by Routledge
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Translated by B.J. Woodstein

Published in Swedish by Författaren och Studentlitteratur 2021,
studentlitteratur.se

Studentlitteratur AB, Lund.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN: 978-1-032-15179-3 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-1-032-15181-6 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-24287-1 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871

Typeset in Times New Roman
by KnowledgeWorks Global Ltd.

Contents

Acknowledgments viii
Note to the reader ix

1 Introduction 1

2 The judiciary and homosexuality 19

3 Exclusion 39

4 The struggle between exclusion and inclusion 62

5 The macho image and the inclusion of homosexuality 88

6 Policing and the inclusion of homosexuality 104

7 Not real police work: On managerial work for inclusion 124

8 Conclusion 162

Afterword 183
Bibliography 186
Index 200

Acknowledgments

There are a number of people and organizations that I am grateful to. First of all, I want to thank all the gay and bisexual police officers who graciously allowed me to interview you. It was unbelievably generous of you to talk to me about such a personal subject. In addition, some of you helped me with contacts and information. Without you, this book would not exist. Thank you! I also wish to thank the police officers and civilian employees in Malmö, Sweden, who allowed me to interview you and to observe your diversity training.

Furthermore, I want to thank those of you who contributed to the book by making comments and/or reading it: Jon Bertilsson, Emma Jeanes, Susanne Lundholm, Sofie Petersson, Katie Sullivan, Peter Svensson, Åsa Sterner, Nadja Sörgärde, Malin Wieslander, and David Wästerfors. Peter and David, I owe you even more thanks because you spent hours reading and giving feedback on different versions of this manuscript. That has helped me so very much! Authorship of course requires a certain amount of solitary work, but dialogue with good readers and commentators is, at least for me, central to the quality, progress, motivation, and self-confidence involved in my work. My American colleague Katie Sullivan also deserves extra thanks. Katie, our joint work on the Swedish police makes up the fundament of this book.[1] Many, many thanks for our rewarding discussions and our co-authorship and our long-standing collaboration!

Thank you, too, to Routledge for publishing this book, especially to Lydia de Cruz and Medha Malaviya who provided great support. And many thanks to B.J. Woodstein, who skillfully translated the Swedish version of the book into English.

Finally, I want to thank those who funded my research project: Thank you, Jan Wallander and Tom Hedelius Foundation, which financed the research project *Managing diversity in the Swedish police*; it was as part of this project that this book was written. Thank you for your belief in this work! I am also grateful to Magnus Bergvall's Foundation and Åke Wiberg's Foundation, both of which financed the translation of the book.

Note

1. See Rennstam & Sullivan (2016, 2018) in the bibliography.

Note to the reader

As the reader, you will notice that the book has relatively comprehensive endnotes. It has been my ambition to write a book that is clear and accessible, without too much theoretical apparatus, and that can be understood without reading the endnotes. The endnotes are for those of you who are more theoretically interested, want more in-depth information and want to know which texts I am referring to. This way of writing allows the book to be read in (at least) two ways: as an empirically illustrated textbook (in this case, the endnotes are of secondary importance) and as a report of a research study (in this case, the endnotes are important). Choose the way that suits you best!

Taylor & Francis
Taylor & Francis Group
http://taylorandfrancis.com

1 Introduction

In 2010, I sat in on diversity training for part of the Swedish police force, and I interviewed Susanne,[1] one of the course leaders, who had worked as a police officer in Skåne, the southernmost region of Sweden (often called Scania in English), since the beginning of the 1990s. Partway through our conversation, Susanne mentioned that she was a lesbian. She also said that she had been active in LGBTQ+[2] issues within the police force for many years, but still did not know a single openly gay male police officer in all of Skåne. At the time, and even today, Skåne has around 2,000 male officers.

At the time, my research project was not focused on sexual orientation, but I nonetheless could not let go of Susanne's claim. Even though she obviously did not know all the police officers in Skåne, it still seemed a little strange that such an experienced police officer, who was actively working on LGBTQ+ issues within the police force, did not know of a single openly gay male police officer in her own region. She said she knew around ten in Stockholm – so surely she would know about those who were out in Skåne as well? She also said that she knew of two gay male officers in Skåne who were *not* open about their orientation. They ought to be harder to find than those who were open. I left our interview feeling thoughtful, but I did not do anything more about it.

A few years later, I started to think more and more about the interview with Susanne. If there was some truth in what she was saying, then how could it be that there were so few openly gay *male* officers? Even the ten or so that were said to work in Stockholm seemed like a small number, given that Stockholm has well over 3,000 police officers. A hundred would seem more accurate, if it were to reflect the percentage of gay people in the population. Of course, I could come up with lay explanations for this, but I thought the topic was worth a more systematic exploration in order to understand the exclusion and inclusion of gay officers and gay sexuality in the police force. Not least because, *formally*, there are no obstacles – the police force welcomes everyone, formally. Any obstacles reasonably exist at the informal level, I thought.

It would therefore be interesting to learn more about how gay police officers felt about working in the police, but it turned out that there were

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-1

few studies regarding this in a Swedish context. I decided to investigate this further by talking to gay police officers. With the help of Susanne and Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association),[3] I got in touch with some police officers who identified as gay or lesbian. They agreed to be interviewed and through their contacts, I found additional interviewees, and in the end, I had carried out twenty-three interviews with eighteen police officers and one civilian employee who identified as gay or bisexual – eleven men and eight women – and who worked at different places in Sweden. These interviews form the basis of this book. I also interviewed other police officers, whose sexual orientation I do not know, and studied documents from the police force, and observed operative police work, but it is the experiences of the gay and bisexual police officers that make up the empirical core of the book.

From a general perspective, this book is about inclusion and exclusion in the police, with a particular focus on sexual orientation. In a broad sense, inclusion means the process through which someone or something becomes part of a group, in this case a work group.[4] It follows that exclusion means the opposite: the process through which someone or something is kept out of a group. From a historical point of view, it can be said that there has been a movement toward the inclusion of homosexuality within the Swedish police organization. From 1864 in Sweden, homosexual people were viewed as a criminal group that the police had the responsibility to prosecute, but this changed in 1944 when homosexuality was legalized. On the other hand, the stigmatization of homosexuality did not stop and homosexual police officers often kept quiet about their sexual orientation (see Chapter 2). The silence was broken internationally in 1979, when the first organization for gay police officers was formed in New York, but the belief that there were no gays working within the police force continued to dominate in the 1980s and 1990s – not least in Sweden, which did not have an organization that suggested anything to the contrary. At the end of the 1990s, the situation began to change, and in 2000, an organization for gay police officers was formed also in Sweden, which made it harder to assume that the police as an organization was homogenously heterosexual. Soon after this, the formal police organization began to advocate an inclusive view of homosexuality. Along with many other organizations, the police developed equality policies and plans for managing diversity, attended pride parades, and made it clear that they were against discrimination due to sexual orientation and also that the police force was an attractive workplace for everyone.

In formal terms, then, there is an inclusive approach in the Swedish police. And informally, too, there has been a movement toward inclusion. The "voice" of gay police officers has been strengthened, and there is often opposition to attempts at exclusion (see Chapter 4). But at the same time as there is increasing inclusion, there are still exclusionary norms and behaviors behind the scenes, which my study and others show. Managers might still make homophobic comments – that is, they might express negative

views about homosexuality[5] – such as by encouraging officers to terrorize cruising areas (see "The cruising terror" in Chapter 3), or calling a colleague "that fucking fag" in informal situations (see "The sauna" in Chapter 4), and colleagues might call homosexual people a "cancer" on society without any management reaction (see "Cancer" in Chapter 4). Colleagues might also ridicule or sabotage attempts to create networks for LGBTQ+ police officers (see "The poster" in Chapter 4). In other words, there are still attempts to silence and exclude expressions of homosexuality from the police organization.

One of this book's main points is that the Swedish police force's approach to homosexuality can be understood as a struggle between inclusion and exclusion, between silencing and voice, a struggle that takes place in a particular way if you observe police culture as a whole. One can say that what was previously a struggle for the exclusion of homosexuality within the police has now become a struggle for inclusion. It is this struggle that I wish to explore, primarily based on the experiences of gay, bisexual, and lesbian police officers (hereafter called "LGB police officers"[6]).

The overarching question pursued in the book is: *How and under what conditions does the exclusion and inclusion of LGB officers and LGB sexuality take place in the Swedish police?* By analyzing this question in depth, I also seek to answer my query about why there are so few openly gay male police officers and how any obstacles to inclusion can be understood. The aim of asking and trying to answer these questions is to improve the understanding of the problems and activities linked to diversity work, inclusion, and exclusion within the police force. In particular, this refers to sexual orientation, but also more generally, as many of the findings in this book can be used to understand the inclusion and exclusion of other social groups. Additionally, the findings ought to be useful not only for those who work with or are interested in diversity, inclusion, and equality in the police, but also in other organizations, especially in similarly masculinized organizations,[7] such as the military, construction work, or some sports organizations.

The police, democracy, and inclusion

The relevance of studying how the police force relates to the exclusion and inclusion of particular societal groups rests on democratic grounds. According to the first section of the Swedish police law, the police's job is "one part of society's work towards fostering justice and security".[8,9] Justice in a democratic society means, among other things, that everyone has equal access to the police, whether as an employee, a potential employee, or as a citizen.[10]

In regard to citizens, policing is characterized by ambivalence. On the one hand, the police should protect and serve citizens and assure their freedom, but on the other hand, if citizens are thought to have broken law and order, the police can use violence against or surveillance of them and can thereby

limit their freedom.[11] This ambivalence – between protecting and limiting citizens' freedom – is related to the different societal groups that the police interact with. As a citizen, one should neither be subjected to overpolicing (excessive control) nor underpolicing in the sense of getting insufficient protection because of one's membership in a particular societal group.[12]

In terms of employees or potential employees in the police force, group membership should not be an obstacle to applying for a job or working for the police. This emphasizes the importance of the police not developing norms or values that exclude or marginalize particular societal groups, whether in relationship to citizens or their own employees.

One way of limiting the risk of developing an exclusive police force is based on what can be called the *mirroring idea*. The thought behind the mirroring idea is that the police, as a large, central governmental authority, should represent all (legal) societal groups and their interests, and to do this in the best possible way – such as by avoiding the overpolicing or underpolicing of some groups[13] – these groups should be represented in the police force. In short, the police should mirror society. This is to avoid an overly homogenous, and thereby potentially biased, elite group exercising power.[14] Scholars emphasize that in a democracy it is important that the police force is not dominated by particular societal groups. For instance, in his book *Democratic Policing in a Changing World*, Peter Manning argues that the police can contribute to a democratic state by recruiting broadly from different societal groups.[15] Similarly, he points out that *non*-democratic countries are characterized by, among other things, a police force that is dominated by particular societal groups and their interests and perspectives.[16]

Aiming for diversity in terms of a fairly even representation of different societal groups links with the importance of the police's social *legitimacy*, which in turn is related to the police's effectiveness. A police force that lacks legitimacy and trust from the population will generally find it difficult to do its job effectively. Police researcher Otto Petersson writes, for example, that the argument for the police to work toward diversity is that "it is considered important that the composition of the police workforce mirrors the society that the police are there to serve. Greater diversity is thus expected to increase the police's legitimacy".[17] If, for instance, gay people (or another societal group) feel that the police treat them in particular in a negative way, then they are less likely to turn to the police to report crimes or to help the police investigate crimes,[18] which makes it harder for the police to carry out their mission to prevent, deter, and detect criminal activity and to protect the public. This means that issues of inclusion are related to a larger social context, in which the struggle for equal rights coexists with the pursuit of effective law enforcement.

The representation of the populace within the police force is also related to a central democratic concern, namely *the control of the police*. This control is characterized by a dilemma. On the one hand, in a democracy, control over the police is needed to avoid the development of a "police state",

in which the police force becomes too autonomous and authoritarian. On the other hand, complex police work requires a relatively high level of discretion, because (just as in other organizations) it is hard to handle complex tasks when one is subordinate to overly strict control.[19] Diversity is relevant in that a democratic representation of the populace within the police might decrease the need for control of the police: the more the police are like (the law-abiding part of) the population, the higher the likelihood that it will work in the interests of the people. As this likelihood increases, people can also trust the police more and decrease the control, which means that the police can independently develop methods for effective police work, and thus the costs of controlling the police will decrease. Even if this logic is somewhat overly theoretical, it still emphasizes the point that in an organization that requires democratic control, there are benefits in terms of legitimacy and effectiveness to having a broad democratic representation.

If we wanted to go one step further in this reasoning around the connection between police legitimacy and police effectiveness in a democracy, we can ask if diversity is needed for the police to be able to act in the people's interest. Can a homogenous police force not be neutral? Can a police force that is, for example, dominated by Swedish-born heterosexual men not work with LGBTQ+ people or immigrants in the same way that a diverse police force could? Individuals could surely do that, but as a group, they probably could not. As brief examples, four different theories can be mentioned:

- The theory of the *contact hypothesis* suggests that people tend to develop more prejudices toward those they do not socialize with.[20] If there is something to this, then a homogenous police force would be at risk of developing prejudice toward those groups who are either not represented at all among their colleagues or who are only represented to a small extent.
- The theory of *homosocial reproduction* suggests that we tend to choose those who are like us, in terms of, among other things, gender, ethnicity, and sexuality.[21] If there is something to this, then a homogenous police force would be at risk of developing social structures that privilege similarity with existing police officers rather than competence, such as during recruitment and promotion.
- *Social identity theory* suggests that we tend to define ourselves in terms of well-established social identities such as gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.[22] In this process, we create so-called *in-groups* and *out-groups*, and we tend to value people higher if they belong to our own group (*in-group*) and to attribute negative qualities to those groups we do not belong to (*out-group*). If there is something to this, then a homogenous police force would be at risk of attributing negative qualities to groups that are rarely or never represented within the police.

- The theory of *spirals of silence* suggests that the views of the majority become dominant over time by individuals becoming more inclined to express their opinions if they think they have support from others, and more inclined to be quiet if they do not think they have support.[23] If there is something to this, then a homogenous police force would have a decreased chance of "whistle-blowing" among the police who do not belong to the majority – for instance, if someone in a minority group feels that they have experienced discrimination – which in turn increases the risk of normalizing structures or behaviors that contribute to discrimination.

These four theories are founded on rather broad generalizations and ought to be viewed as tendencies rather than rules without exceptions. But together, they contribute to the argument that there are good reasons to view an overly homogenous police force – such as in terms of social groups – as a risky project in a democracy.

The organization of the police force and diversity

The aforementioned democratic and freedom-related legitimacy requirements for the police have organizational consequences. The police organization has many requirements to fulfill and one of these is that it ought to be organized in such a way as to promote equal access to the police, both for citizens and potential employees, regardless of sexual orientation, among other things. It should be organized to promote a nuanced and non-judgmental view of different societal groups so that they do not become over- or underpoliced. It ought to be organized so that the "tacit knowledge" that is often employed when police officers make judgments is not biased so that certain societal groups are disadvantaged.[24] And it ought to be organized so that the occupational culture of the police – that is, the norms, values, and meanings that characterize the police as an occupational group and affect its way of working[25] – does not marginalize or make life unnecessarily difficult for minorities within the force. Such an organization is easier said than done.

Formally, there is, as noted, nothing in principle that would make it harder for a gay person to apply to and work within the police force in Sweden. Regeringsformen (part of the Swedish Constitution) states that "public power should be exercised with respect for all people's equality and for the individual's freedom and dignity"[26] and the legislation on discrimination makes it illegal to – both as an authority and an employer – discriminate against individuals because of their gender, transgender identity or expression, ethnicity, (dis)ability, sexual orientation, or age.[27] In the police's policy for equal treatment, their formal position is also stated, which is that they treat everyone equally and that everyone is welcome in the police organization.[28] The police also mention that the organization ought to "mirror

society" in terms of the personnel.[29] In other words, there are, for instance, gay people in society, and therefore they ought to also be represented within the police force.

Informally, it is another matter. It has been well-documented that the police have a tendency to develop their own typologies in terms of which groups are considered respectable or less respectable. Law enforcement "sorts",[30] to use criminologists Abby Peterson and Malin Åkerström's term. This has been found in many studies, both internationally and in Sweden. The Swedish police scholar Rolf Granér, for example, differentiates between the legal perspective on police work, where the law and the policy documents form the primary foundation for how police are to act, and the "autonomous perspective", where the police officers' own general perceptions about what is right and what is wrong are central.[31] The autonomous perspective tends to be rather strong. Police have relatively high levels of autonomy in terms of who they can stop and check, who should be watched, and who should be arrested. Often it is "street justice" that rules, the American police scholar John Van Maanen claims.[32] And in Sweden, the police officer and researcher Gunnar Ekman has shown how the norms that govern police work in general come from police officers' "small talk" and less so from the formal laws and regulations that have been formed to govern their work.[33] A consequence of this is that police work does not only result in the prosecution of deviants (criminals), but it also (re)produces ideas about what a deviant is.[34]

This informal "sorting" is related to the persons who are working as police officers and thereby carry the norms and values that dominate. Even if the police formally welcome everyone, most police officers have historically been Swedish-born men and are still Swedish-born men, even though the percentage of women has increased significantly in recent times; in 2017, 32 percent of the police officers were women.[35] The number of police officers with a foreign background was 6 percent in 2016, while people with a foreign background are around 27 percent of the population.[36]

In terms of sexual orientation among the police, there are no statistics. But my interviews and observational studies in the police indicate that openly gay or bisexual male police officers are rare, while lesbian police officers are more common. For example, as I indicated in the introduction, there are around 2,000 male police officers in Skåne,[37] and none of the gay or bisexual police officers I interviewed – which included people who had worked in Skåne for a long time and had been active in Gaypolisföreningen – knew of any openly gay or bisexual male officers in Skåne. I got similar responses when I interviewed people in other parts of Sweden, with the exception of Stockholm, where my interviewees knew of a handful (not more than ten) of male officers who are openly gay. My research is, of course, qualitative. But the fact that the police officers themselves often do not know of a single openly gay male colleague, combined with the fact that people tend to know one another quite well within the police[38] (as it is a rather intimate job, see Chapter 6), indicates that openly gay male police officers are significantly

more unusual than openly gay men in society in general. In society, it is estimated that around 4 percent identify as gay or bisexual,[39] and 50–75 percent of these people are estimated to be open about their sexual orientation at work.[40] If this were true within the police, then there would be 537 gay and bisexual male officers in Sweden, of whom between 268 (50 percent) and 402 (75 percent) would be open about this at work, and a corresponding figure for Skåne would be around 80, of whom between 40 and 60 would be open about it.[41] My conversations with people employed by the police suggest that it is significantly less than that. I do not know about the number of "hidden" gay and bisexual police officers, but the percentage of *openly* gay male officers appears to be far below 60 in Skåne and 402 in Sweden as a whole.

In other words, it seems as though there is some kind of obstacle that makes gay men either not choose the police as an employer, or that makes them unusually likely to keep their orientation secret. Why is this the case? Considering the fact that there are no formal obstacles, it seems reasonable to look at the informal organization, which brings us back to the question of inclusion and exclusion.

The focus and structure of the book

I will not go into any more depth regarding the composition of the police workforce or the connection to democracy but rather will return – focusing on sexual orientation as an example, in my study represented by gay and bisexual police officers – to focusing on how inclusion and exclusion materialize at the informal level in the police organization, and how obstacles for inclusion can be understood.

It is to bring some more clarity to these questions about the informal organization that I have conducted this study, whose main building block is LGB officers' own experiences from their working lives. The book's focus will move from diversity as "something that is good" to processes of inclusion and exclusion, which means an analysis of how and under which circumstances diversity is (or is not) brought about, rather than on how many people from different social groups there are in organizations.

This book is thus about culture, about how norms and values are expressed, created, and maintained, and how voices are heard or silenced. An increased number of minorities within the police is not enough to create a generally inclusive culture.[42] New recruits are socialized into the organizational culture in all organizations, and this socialization tends to be particularly strong in the police. Socialization has long been a theme in police research, and even if arguments vary – from the idea that socialization should be nearly exhaustive to the view that it is modified as the diversity of the workforce increases[43] – people agree that training and the work itself to a large extent shape the police officers.[44] In other words, to understand how the obstacles for inclusion work, it is not enough to refer to statistics showing that there are "too few" police officers from certain social groups,

but one also needs deeper insight into the culture – the norms, values, and perceptions – that characterizes police work. This study aims to offer such insight, qualitative rather than quantitative.

The rest of the book is organized according to the following overview. Each chapter has a focus and each chapter introduces new key concepts – most of which are well-known from organizational and/or gender studies – and these are then used to make sense of the findings.

Chapter 2 is comprised in part by a brief review of how the Swedish state's relationship to homosexuality has changed over time, with an emphasis on inclusion and exclusion, and in part by a review of research into homosexuality in police organizations. The review concludes that studies on the role sexual orientation plays are in short supply when it comes to the Swedish police, which particularly applies to those based on the experiences of non-heterosexual police officers.

The following two chapters are based on interviews with gay and bisexual police officers. Chapter 3 focuses on exclusion. Two theoretical concepts guide the presentation: *stigma* and *dirt* (the latter is understood as "matter out of place", according to anthropologist Mary Douglas). Experiences are presented that illustrate how homosexuality is constructed as something that does not belong in the police organization, through what I call *stigmatizing leadership* and *collegial stigmatization*. The personal experiences have short names that are referred to through the book: "The hate meeting", "The spy", "The interrogation", "The cruising terror", "The Christmas party", "The picture", and "The code language".

Chapter 4 focuses instead on the interplay between exclusion and inclusion. New concepts are introduced here. I see the interplay between exclusion and inclusion as a *collective process* characterized by a *struggle* between attempts at silencing and attempts to make one's *voice* heard. The relationship between silencing and voice is key. I also introduce the concept of *heteronormativity*, or the assumption that heterosexuality is the normal and preferred sexuality. I show that heteronormativity can be reproduced in inclusionary processes, not only by heterosexuals but also by homosexuals. The personal stories used in this chapter are called "Cancer", "The poster", "The sauna", "The convertor", "The support", "Hype", and "No problems".

After that, the focus shifts from individual experiences to the organizational context. Although Chapters 3 and 4 also touch on police culture, Chapters 5 and 6 go into more depth about the cultural context in which inclusion and exclusion play out. Chapter 5 focuses on the image of the police in society and its relation to the inclusion of homosexuality, and Chapter 6 focuses on the nature of police work and inclusion of homosexuality. In Chapter 5, the data used for analysis are statements from LGB police officers, while in Chapter 6, I also use observations of police work and interviews with additional police officers, whose sexual orientation I do not know (see the section on methodology below). In these two chapters, I use a series of concepts in order to understand the culture, some more and some less theoretically grounded:

macho, *masculinity*, *norm*, *masculinity work*, *the heterosexual matrix*, *jargon*. The point of Chapters 5 and 6 – which could be read as one single unit – is to show that the police culture is not homogenous but rather is characterized by different aspects: macho, corporeal, and intimate, a raw but cordial conversational climate, but also by what I call a *de-heteromasculinization*. In particular, the macho norm combined with the corporeal and intimate, I suggest, accentuates the relevance of sexuality at work – under such conditions, there is more at risk if one breaks with the hetero norm – and this elucidates why homosexual men often are thought to have more difficulty being included, as they "fit less well" into the macho norm.

Chapter 7 is also about the organizational context, but focuses on how the police management is working on diversity issues and how this is perceived by the police officers. In terms of concepts, the key ones for this analysis are *decoupling* and *impression management* but also *recoupling* and *long-term identity work*. In this chapter, the empirical material consists partly of my observations of a diversity training session and partly of my interviews with both LGB police officers and police officers whose sexual orientation I do not know. The main point of the chapter is that diversity work tends to be decoupled from the police's operational work and is constructed in a way that reproduces the belief that it does not count as "real police work". Instead, the police officers' view of the management's work is that it is about impression management, designed to satisfy external stakeholders (government or the media) rather than to seriously integrate issues of diversity into the police's operational work. While I acknowledge the officers' view and point out problems with decoupling, I also argue that initiatives characterized by impression management can also have internal effects. They can provide formalized support and input into the police organization's long-term identity work. The latter is about how initiatives can create expectations that affect the development of new organizational norms and start discussions that in informal ways can be recoupled, that is, that can find their way into the "real" police work.

Chapter 8 is a summary and development of what was discussed in Chapters 3–7. The conceptual apparatus that was used in those chapters is brought back to identify a number of key findings around how exclusion and inclusion work and which obstacles and opportunities I have identified. An overarching concept is also introduced here, namely *peripheral inclusion*[45]; this is a way of understanding both the *process* I have described – the "struggle" between inclusion and exclusion can be understood as peripheral inclusion – and the *result* of the process – peripheral inclusion is a position that denotes inclusion in an organization without achieving full membership. In light of this conceptual apparatus, I also broaden the perspective to discuss how the book's insights around the exclusion and inclusion of homosexuality relate to time and also what implications they have for other occupations that, like policing, can be seen as being "masculinized". Finally, I turn to practitioners – such as police management, police officers, HR officers – and refer to insights from the book that I think could be useful for them.

Methodology

I will finish this chapter with a short description of my method of gathering the material that is the basis for this book.

As I wrote at the start, my interest was piqued during my interview with Susanne, and thanks to her and Gaypolisföreningen, I got in touch with nineteen police employees – eighteen police officers and one civilian employee, eleven men and eight women – who identified as gay or bisexual.[46] In total, I carried out twenty-three interviews with gay or bisexual or police officers, which means that I interviewed some of them more than once. The interviews were carried out between 2013 and 2018 and lasted between one and two hours. Most of them took place at the police officer's workplace, but in two cases, they were carried out in their homes and in two cases at a café. These interviews constitute my main empirical material; that is, they are what I use most in this book.

When establishing contact with the interviewees, I introduced myself as a researcher and teacher of organizational theory at the Department of Business Management at Lund University, with an interest in occupational segregation; that is, that certain groups, such as those based on gender, class, ethnicity, or sexuality, tend to choose certain occupations. I also said that I was carrying out this research as an independent scholar and not on assignment from anyone (such as the police management) and that the interviews would be anonymized to varying degrees, according to the interviewees' needs. All the police officers were satisfied with having their names anonymized. However, in some cases, I also anonymized their geographical locations.

I started all the interviews by asking the respondent to tell me what it had been like to become a police officer and to work as a police officer, with a particular focus on how it had mattered that the respondent identified as gay or bisexual. In most cases, this was enough to bring about long and detailed accounts, often in the form of stories about events in their working lives. This type of interview is often referred to as "narrative", which means that the interview is not about getting answers to a pre-constructed set of questions, but rather that the interviewee can talk relatively freely.[47] The content of the interviews – the stories told, the way they were told, and the concepts used – is then chosen to a large extent by the interviewees themselves.

An advantage of this method is that the interviewer does not control too much what is being discussed and how it is being discussed, which allows one to get a little closer to things that are likely to be important to the subject. Another advantage has to do with the mentioned focus on the narrative, or stories. It is about having an eye for stories, being able to capture them, and if necessary, support the telling of them. Often, as noted, the respondents talked in depth about events from their work lives in detail without me having to ask about it. If they didn't, I encouraged them to go into more detail about what had happened. The point of this – compared to focusing on having the respondents give their opinions about things – is that it gives insights

into activities and events, something that has happened in an organization. One can view these experiences of events as "secondary observations" – "secondary" because they are being told by someone else (they would be "primary" if I had been there when they happened). Or, as organizational scholar Barbara Czarniawska notes, narrative interviews "come near to an everyday account, and therefore to direct observation".[48] It is important to understand that a description of events cannot be said to be *equivalent* to direct observations of events – it is, obviously, the respondent's version of events that is used. However, given that the respondents are not lying or fantasizing, the experiences are based on real events in their working lives. It is, among other things, these experiences of events that I use in order to understand how inclusion and exclusion happen and how it can be the case that there are so few openly gay male police officers. Chapters 3 and 4, in particular, contain this type of experiences, and they have, as mentioned, been named based on the content of the events, such as "The hate meeting", "Cancer", "The Christmas party", and "No problems".

My interviews were not only narrative. I also asked a number of more specific questions, such as whether they thought it mattered if someone was a woman or a man and gay and how they felt that the management worked on issues related to diversity and LGBTQ+ topics. The answers here were less narrative and had more of a reportage quality. These parts of the interviews are explored primarily in Chapters 5 and 6.

In addition to the interviews with gay and bisexual police officers, I also carried out forty-seven interviews with forty-four police officers whose sexual orientation I do not know (three police officers were interviewed twice). I carried out these interviews along with observing a diversity training session run by the police in Skåne in 2010. The interviews were not specifically about sexual orientation but rather generally about police work. For instance, I asked the police officers to describe their work, what knowledge they thought was important, and what demands they experienced. These interviews, together with the interviews with LGB police officers, are used in Chapter 6. I also asked about how these police officers experienced the diversity training and the police's work on core values, and their views regarding these subjects are found in Chapter 7.

As mentioned, I also observed police work. I observed diversity training on four occasions. Each occasion was a three-hour seminar with between fifteen and twenty-five police officers. I use these observations in Chapter 7. I also observed operative police work for around one hundred hours in total. These observations were valuable as they gave me insight into what policing "on the street" can involve. I do not use these observations to any great extent in this book, but there are some elements from them, such as my observation of a wrestling match at the police station and the kidnapping of the boy in Chapter 6. The observational material is also used in the sense that it has increased my proximity to[49] and general knowledge of the police organization and police culture, which made it easier to, for instance,

understand the police officers' jargon and working conditions and to distinguish relevant details from the LGB police officers' narratives.

My study is qualitative. This means that the focus is not on counting, as in a quantitative study, but rather on understanding a phenomenon – such as inclusion and exclusion in the police organization – with the help of data that has been collected through interviews, observations, and/or document studies.[50] The qualitative method is therefore not good at answering questions such as "how much?" and "how many?" However, it is good if the aim is to gain a deeper understanding, rather than a broad overview, of a phenomenon. Using the anthropologist Malinowski's words, the qualitative method offers the possibility of giving "flesh and blood" to phenomena that might seem dead in tables and diagrams.[51] Another advantage is, as noted, that it allows the organization members themselves to tell their stories. This means that you get a different type of data that to a greater extent is grounded in the respondents' world than if the researcher formulates questions and collects answers to them through surveys. The respondents thus retain the right to formulate their experiences themselves, instead of their experiences being reduced to answers to pre-formulated questions in a survey. A further advantage is that this method can invite the reader into situations, or events, which is particularly obvious in Chapters 3 and 4 in this book. There is thus the possibility of a certain amount of empathy,[52] which is not possible with tables. In brief, the method I have used strives for in-depth rather than a surface understanding and proximity rather than distance to the phenomenon explored.[53]

With all this being said, I do not wish to minimize quantitative data. I use plenty of numbers to argue for the importance of my study (see Chapter 2), and the surface knowledge they convey can complement the depth that you can reach with interviews and observations. In other words, it is beneficial to combine different sources of knowledge. I argue that other researchers' quantitative and qualitative studies (which I refer to throughout the book), combined with the experiences (which dominate in Chapters 3 and 4) and the views (primarily in Chapters 5–7) that I have gathered, my observations of police work and the management's handling of diversity-related issues (Chapter 7), together with a historical awareness (Chapter 2), create a good basis for generating insights into what sexual orientation has meant and means in policing contexts.

Notes

1. Susanne is actually named something else. The names of all the people I interviewed or who are mentioned in the interviews have been changed.
2. LGBTQ+ stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer. Throughout this book, I use the accepted term LGBTQ+ (as in LGBTQ+ issues or LGBTQ+ people) as a general description for issues regarding sexual orientation and sexual expression. Sometimes I also use the term LGBT, but that is when I am referring to interview subjects or other authors who have used

this designation. I only interviewed people who identified as lesbian or gay or bisexual, so I also use the term LGB when referring specifically to my respondents. See endnote 7 for more on this.

3. Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association) was founded in 2000 and disbanded in 2016. The then-chairman of the organization commented on their disbanding as follows: "Those of us on the committee felt that the country's largest governmental authority should handle these issues itself, with its own staff and on mandate from the authority." (*Polistidningen* [The police newspaper] 2016). Gaypolisföreningen was a volunteer-run organization, independent from the Polismyndigheten (The Swedish Police Authority), although the Authority allowed some police officers to decrease their working hours in order to carry out work for the organization.
4. Therefore, I see inclusion as a process or activity. See, for example, Doerfel et al. (2020, p. 13) or Tyler (2019) for a similar point of view. One can also understand inclusion as an individual experience, based on how much a person feels included. Shore et al. (2011) describe inclusion as, among other things, the extent to which individuals feel that they belong in a group and at the same time are valued for their unique attributes: [inclusion is about] "the notion that individuals want to feel a sense of belonging, as well as feeling valued, for their unique attributions" (p. 1271). Here, I focus most on the activity, or how inclusion works, while the extent to which specific individuals feel included is not emphasized as much. I will return to this in Chapter 4.
5. The term "homophobia" here and throughout the book refers to behaviors and actions that in different ways express negative views about homosexuality or gay people. I view homophobia as a social phenomenon, which means something created through interaction between people, rather than as an individual attribute. But if one understands the term homophobia literally, it would mean an individual fear or a sort of illness (phobia). That is what it meant when the term was developed – the psychologist Weinberg (1972, p. 4) defined homophobia as "the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals". But the concept got a more expansive meaning, as Swedish gender studies scholar writer Eva Borgström (2011, p. 13) writes in her book, *Den nya homofobin* [The New Homophobia]: "today the word is associated with prejudice, aggression and oppression rather than fear". Borgström defines homophobia as "different types of opposition to LGBT people" (ibid.). This broader definition is accepted in English too. A scholar of the police and of gender, Heather Panter (2018, p. 37), describes homophobia as "negativity toward gay sexualities in general", and *New Oxford American Dictionary* defines homophobia as the "dislike of or prejudice against gay people". Alternative terms could be homonegativism or homohostility, but it is homophobia that is used most often.
6. My study is based on police officers who identify as gay or lesbian, and in two cases bisexual. Therefore I use the term "LGB police officers" to indicate when it is about these people. The more accepted terms LGBT or LGBTQ+ would be misleading, as no trans people participated. But, as I noted earlier in endnote 3, I use LGBTQ+ as the general term to discuss issues about sexual orientation or sexual expression.
7. The phrase "masculinized organizations" refers to organizations that are associated with traditional masculinity, particularly those that contain elements of physical work and risk (Collins 2015). I develop the concept of "masculinized" more fully in Chapter 8.
8. SFS 1984: 387, 1 §.
9. All translations from Swedish-language or Norwegian-language research or legal text, as well as translations of the interviews, which were conducted in Swedish, are by the translator of the book. To read the original Swedish quotes, please contact the author or read Rennstam (2021).

10. Equal access to and the chance to participate in the institutions of a society relate to the basic freedoms and rights all citizens have, which is central in a democracy. The Swedish government states this in depth in Regeringsformen [part of the Constitution] (SFS 1974: 152, and see sections 1 2 § about the foundations of statehood). For discussions about the police force's role in a democracy, see Loader & Walker (2007), Manning (2010), Sklansky (2005, 2008), and Skolnick (2011).
11. See, for example, Nyzell & Larsson (2016) for a description of this ambivalence in the police's use of power. Also see Loader & Walker (2007) for a discussion of the state and the police's role as legitimate users of violence. There are different ways of understanding this role, where the extreme positions are comprised of the perspective that the police's use of power is a *condition* for security versus the perspective that the same use of power is the *cause of insecurity*.
12. See Finstad (2016) about overpolicing and underpolicing as potential consequences of a biased police force. Overpolicing is about how the police use coercive measures too much and not in accordance with the law. Underpolicing could be, for example, how the police do not provide the same protection to all groups, or that they do not investigate crimes against members of certain groups as carefully as they do when it comes to members of other groups.
13. See Finstad (2016) about overpolicing and underpolicing as the bases of problems in regard to the legitimacy of and trust in the police.
14. See, for example, Loader & Walker (2007), whose book *Civilizing security* highlights, among other things, the risk that the police will become biased and thereby reproduce unjust social relationships and promote certain (often already privileged) groups' interests. For example, this is often connected to the fact that there have been so few women in the police, especially in roles that have strategic influence, along with the issue that violence in intimate relationships, until recently, has received disproportionally little attention (see, for example, Sklansky 2005).
15. Manning (2010, p. 22).
16. Manning (2010, p. 62).
17. Petersson (2016, p. 136). Also see Goldsmith (2005, p. 444), who writes: "When the public views police as legitimate (or trustworthy), public co-operation with the police in ways that assist effectiveness is more likely." And see Finstad (2016) about the importance of the police's legitimacy in a democratic society. For a current legitimacy-related example, see Eterno et al. (2017), in their analysis of the New York police's strategy of fighting crime by stopping and checking (*stop and frisk*) young men, mainly to find weapons. The study showed that ethnic minorities in particular neighborhoods felt unfairly treated and that trust in the police decreased as a result of this strategy. The authors concluded that the police's legitimacy was threatened by this strategy and recommended that the New York police should in the future focus on regaining their legitimacy and they also emphasized how important good relationships with society are for a functioning police force. Or, as Eterno said, when he was interviewed in a reportage series on SVT (Swedish television), *Den svenska välfärden* [Swedish Welfare]: "Policing can't be done without having a partnership with the community" (SVT 2018).
18. See, for example, Colvin (2012, p. 11), who claims that the cost of not having a diverse and inclusive police force is the "inability to effectively, efficiently, or equitably conduct police work".
19. This tension between law-abiding and discretion is central to police work. Professor of law Jerome Skolnick (2011, p. 5) writes: "This tension between the operational consequences of ideas of order, efficiency, and initiative, on the one hand, and legality, on the other, constitutes the principal problem of

police as a democratic legal organization." In other words, the police should follow the law, at the same time that their work demands a relatively large amount of self-determination and initiative. The latter emphasizes the need for police work to be viewed as legitimate. Also see Sklansky (2008, chapter 4) and Johnston (1988, p. 52), who calls the conflict between following rules and discretion a "key dilemma" when it comes to the control of the police.

20. See, for instance, Allport (1954/1979).
21. For example, Kanter (1977) and Lipman-Blumen (1976).
22. See, for example, Ashforth & Mael (1989) and Tajfel & Turner (1979).
23. The concept of *spirals of silence* was coined by Noelle-Neumann (1974). See Bowen & Blackmon (2003) for an application of this concept to LGBTQ+ issues.
24. See Wieslander (2014, pp. 25–6) and many others who have written about the large extent to which police work is steered by silent knowledge (for instance, Ekman 1999, Granér 2004, and Van Maanen 1974).
25. Culture is a concept with varying meanings, but in this book, *occupational culture* is understood to mean the norms (what is considered normal), values (what is considered good or bad), and meanings (what things mean) that characterize the police force as an occupational group. See, for instance, Kunda (1992, p. 8), who writes that culture is about "the shared meanings, assumptions, norms, and values that govern work-related behavior". Other than Kunda's explicit emphasis on norms, this is in line with, for example, Rolf Granér, who defines occupational culture as "shared ways in an occupational group or parts of an occupational group to understand and value reality as well as their own work and themselves as an occupational group" (Granér 2016, p. 144). Similarly to Granér, Alvesson (2002) suggests that, in an attempt to create a common denominator for the various perspectives on culture, most scholars of culture consider culture to be a collective phenomenon that relates to meanings and understandings of things. Alvesson, along with many others, emphasizes as well that culture builds on history and traditions. These shared, historically produced norms, values, and meanings in turn affect the way that occupational groups work.
26. SFS 1974:152 (section 1 2 §).
27. SFS 2008:567.
28. Polisen (2017a).
29. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2010). Also see SOU (2007:39, p. 125), on "the police of the future", where they write: "A key factor in maintaining a high level of trust [in the police] is that the public feels that the police are rooted in the populace. The employees within the police force should therefore not in any significant way deviate from the population in terms of, for example, gender and ethnic background. The police must therefore in some sense be viewed as representative of the population as a whole. Recruitment to the police must therefore also aim to create diversity within the organization so that all societal groups clearly feel that the police represent their interests. The police will thereby gain the legitimacy that is necessary in order to carry out their duties." Other researchers have also noted this general aim. For instance, Petersson (2016, p. 136) writes about the police's goal to "mirror society's breadth when it comes to recruitment and constitution [of the personnel]".
30. Peterson & Åkerström (2013).
31. Granér (2004, especially Chapter 6) and Granér (2016, pp. 147–8).
32. See Van Maanen (1974, 1979). Van Maanen noted in his studies that the police officers who followed the legal perspective were rather unusual and often were viewed as incompetent, and even stupid, by their colleagues: "In the police world (as perhaps in all organizational worlds), those persons who strictly

adhere to most departmental rules and regulations are unusual and are considered by many others on the scene to be culturally incompetent in the local setting. Patrolmen who always read an accused suspect their rights upon an arrest or patrolmen who answered every call dispatched to their unit were considered by most of their colleagues to be stupid" (Van Maanen 1979, p. 546).

33. Ekman (1999). Also see Granér (2004). And see Abby Peterson & Malin Åkerström's (2013) anthology for studies and arguments around how ethnicity affects the way the police monitor and control.
34. See, for instance, the British criminology professor Robert Reiner (2010, pp. 11 ff.).
35. In 1960, the percentage of women was 1% (100 out of 10,500 police officers) and in 1970 the percentage was 1.7% (250 out of 14,200) (see Dahlgren 2007, p. 40). In 2017, the percentage of women was 32% of the police-trained workforce (Polisen 2017b).
36. Polisen (2017b, pp. 56–7). "Foreign background" means born outside Sweden or born in Sweden to two parents who were born abroad.
37. This number (1,964 male officers, to be precise) is from the police's annual report (Polisen 2014, p. 120), from the time when there were still 21 police authorities (and Skåne, or Scania, was one of them) and they reported on the number of employees.
38. See Forsberg et al. (2003, p. 137), who describe the police as a rather "gossipy" occupational group, who "keep tabs" on one another.
39. It is not known exactly how many people identify as homosexual or bisexual, but research has been carried out where people are asked to say which sexual orientation they identify with. In a comprehensive American study (Mosher et al. 2005) carried out in 2002, of 12,571 men and women between the ages of 15–44, the respondents were asked to identify themselves as heterosexual, homosexual, bisexual, or "something else". A total of 2.3% of the men replied homosexual, 1.8% bisexual and 3.9% "something else", so 4.1% were homosexual or bisexual and a total of 8% did not consider themselves to be heterosexual. The equivalent figures for women were 1.3% homosexual, 2.8% bisexual, and 3.8% "something else", so 4.1% homosexual or bisexual, and a total of 7.9% did not consider themselves to be heterosexual. In other words, around 4% of the respondents identified as either homosexual or bisexual.
40. See Ljunggren et al. (2003, p. 122) and Diskrimineringsombudsmannen's (The Equality Ombudsman) website (2018).
41. Based on the police's annual report (Polisen 2017b), the police have 19,741 employees who are police-trained, of whom 68% are men, that is, 13,424 men ($19{,}741 \times 0.68$). If 4% of these were gay or bisexual, that would be 536 people. If 50% of them were open, there would be 268 openly gay or bisexual male police officers ($13{,}424 \times 0.04 \times 0.5 = 268$). If 75% were open, the equivalent figure would be 402 people. In terms of Skåne, I use the same principle of calculation, but based on the fact that there are 1,964 male officers in Skåne (Polisen 2014, p. 120; see endnote 38).
42. See, for example, Boogaard & Roggeband (2010) or Wieslander (2018); both texts emphasize that "broadened recruitment" is not a simple solution for creating an inclusive culture.
43. John Van Maanen (1975, p. 215) has noted that "the police culture can be viewed as molding the attitudes – with numbing regularity – of virtually all who enter". Other, more recent studies (such as Paoline 2003, Paoline et al. 2000) have suggested that police culture is influenced by new social groups becoming part of the organization, even if there is no direct connection between, for example, being a woman and advocating a particular attitude or opinion.
44. Paoline (2003).

45. The concept of *peripheral inclusion* was previously explored in Rennstam & Sullivan (2018).
46. Yes, I am guilty of simplification as I do not treat bisexuality separately, though bisexuals' experiences can be different from gays'. For example, bisexuals sometimes say that they receive negative reactions from their gay friends if they have "heterosexual" relationships, or have sex with someone of the opposite gender (Norrhem et al. 2015, p. 158). In my interviews, this distinction was not expressed and it was the same-sex aspect that was the focus, including in the interviews with the two bisexual police officers. It is also notable that I have not explored trans or queer or other sexualities, in the term LGBTQ+. This is a limitation, but also one that – just as in all empirical studies – defines the scope and relevance of the study. A methodological point of my study is to base the analysis of the police primarily on the non-heterosexual police officers' experiences, and the people I interviewed identified as lesbian, gay, or bisexual. For a study of police officers who identify as transgender, see Panter (2018).
47. See Czarniawska (1998).
48. Czarniawska (1998, p. 29). Organizational scholar Yiannis Gabriel (1998, p. 156) says something similar when he writes that he views interview subjects' narratives as "poetic elaborations on actual events".
49. The primary strength of observations is that they allow a scholar to come closer to the organizational life. See, for instance, Dingwall (1997) or Silverman (1993).
50. Together with David Wästerfors, I have written more in-depth about qualitative data analysis in another book, Rennstam & Wästerfors (2018).
51. Malinowski (1922, p. 17).
52. It is worth noting that "empathy" here does not mean that I (or qualitative analysts in general) claim to understand "how it feels" or what it means to be a police officer, or gay and a police officer, or be in any other position described in this book. The point is that the respondents' experiences are used as *starting points* for analysis and that this makes it possible to get insight, but that the insight comes from the outside. I cannot, for example, understand what it is like to be a police officer in the same way that a person who actually is a police officer can.
53. For example, see Prasad (2018).

2 The judiciary and homosexuality

In order to analyze and understand the inclusion and exclusion of homosexuality in the police today, a historical review is helpful. Understanding what it was like in the past helps us to understand what it is like today. It gives us perspective and the ability to identify historical patterns, and it helps us to identify changes, improvements, and deteriorations. This chapter aims to provide a historical understanding of the approach to homosexuality, focusing on inclusion and exclusion and the relationship to the judiciary, and to provide an insight into what research on homosexuality in police organizations has shown.

The state and homosexuality – From stigma and exclusion to formal inclusion

Historically, the law has been primarily concerned with excluding and discouraging homosexuality. The first elements of legislation concerning the sexual orientation of persons probably date from Roman law, around 500 AD. According to this, same-sex sexual relationships, along with other sexual sins such as extramarital sex, were punishable by death.[1] In Swedish law, sexual orientation appears for the first time in the *Äldre Västgötalagen* (the Westrogothic law, the oldest Swedish legal text) from the 13th century through the concept of *nid*.[2] *Nid*, the act of making offensive remarks about another person, was seen as serious and could lead to severe punishment. Calling another man *ergi* was a way of committing *nid*. *Ergi* could mean unmanly and referred to a man who took an interest in other men or who "allowed himself to be the passive one in a sexual encounter with another man; he took the woman's position".[3] Here, then, it was not the sexual act itself, sex between men, that was condemned and punished. Rather, it was that passivity in intercourse between men constituted a basis for offence, since passivity was associated with femininity. This was seen as a stigma, something for which one could be discredited (see Chapter 3 for more on stigma).

Toward the end of the Middle Ages, the influence of the Christian Church in Scandinavia increased, which affected the judicial system. Although the

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-2

Church is not the same as the judiciary, religion has had a strong position in determining what is "right" by actively condemning what it considers unnatural or against God's will.[4] This included same-sex sexual relations, one of many sexual activities that the Church considered deviant and which were grouped under the term sodomy.[5] Sodomy was thought to make God wrathful and therefore it required severe punishment: sodomites could be punished by death after repeated offenses and in some cases burned alive.[6]

The attitude of the legal system in Sweden between the 16th and 19th centuries appears to be somewhat more cautious and implicit than that of the Church. While the Church openly condemned all extramarital and non-reproductive sex, the legislature seems to have chosen silence as its strategy. This was reflected in the ambivalence that characterized the legislation. Sodomy was indeed illegal under the 1608 law, but this prohibition was later removed. In the preparatory work for the legislation of 1734, there was a proposal to reintroduce the prohibition, but it was voted down. The legislator's justification for this indicates how the ambivalence was due to a strategy of silence: they felt it was best to not spread knowledge of such a sexual practice because people would then come up with the idea to try it out.[7]

In 1864, however, a ban on sodomy and same-sex sexuality was reintroduced, and the issue of sexual orientation thus formally became a matter for the police.[8] Sweden banned same-sex sexual relationships between both men and women, but the law was applied almost exclusively to men – from 1880 to 1944, 1,400 men were prosecuted[9] but only ten women. The reason – write historians Norrhem, Rydström, and Markusson Winkvist – was partly that women were not visible as much in the public domain and therefore could not be observed by the police, and partly that male homosexuality was considered more problematic because it could pose a threat to the patriarchal order.[10] Regardless of the reason, it is noteworthy that the police's history of combating homosexuality has mainly been characterized by a relationship between men: supposedly heterosexual police officers have prosecuted other men who perform homosexual acts.

"Homosexual" became an identity – From criminalization to illness and moral panic

Around the same time that same-sex sex became illegal in Sweden, the term homosexual was minted as part of the scientific understanding of sexuality. The establishment of the category "homosexual" had at least two consequences.[11] First, the category enabled stronger identity work related to sexual orientation – people who fell in love with people of the same sex could understand themselves in new ways. Whereas the earlier category of "sodomy" denoted primarily a forbidden act that could be performed by anyone, "homosexual" denoted something deeper, more all-encompassing and stable, and thus more strongly linked to identity.[12] Secondly, it became possible to develop knowledge of, and control, same-sex love, to study it as

something deviant and as something with which "normal" heterosexuality could be contrasted. The clearest expression of this was that it was possible to construct homosexuality as a disease, a disease that could be cured. If the disease theory became a reality, homosexuality would no longer be a police matter, but a matter for the healthcare system.

But the road from criminal act to disease was relatively long. At the beginning of the 20th century, there was certainly a growing struggle for homosexual liberation, not least in Germany, but this was crushed by the Nazis.[13] In Sweden, some voices were raised in favor of decriminalization, but the issue was blocked. Among other things, there was a fear that homosexuals would begin to behave more openly, and that older homosexuals would seduce young men.[14]

During this time, the police began to fight homosexual acts more actively. The police had long known that some parts of big cities attracted homosexuals, but they had done little about it even though it was illegal. But after 1935, they began to arrest and interrogate people more carefully about anyone they had sex with and to disrupt homosexual networks, as Norrhem and others describe, using Stockholm as an example:

> [F]rom the mid-1930s, the number of court cases increased exponentially. This was entirely due to the fact that the police began to act differently around these crimes. In Stockholm, the area of Humlegården was guarded at night and the police even installed a surveillance room in a side room by one of the urinals. Through a gap in the door, officers could see what was going on in the urinal and if they saw men engaging in indecent acts, they were arrested.[15]

In 1944, however, the bill to decriminalize homosexuality was passed. But this did not mean that the stigma was lifted, only that the management of homosexuality was transferred from one institution (the police) to another (the health care system).[16] In other words, the idea of disease took over. More and more homosexuals were put in mental hospitals. The idea of disease was combined with increased homophobia and the exclusion of homosexuals on moral grounds, which brings to mind the Church's condemnation of what was "unnatural" and against God's will. However, faith in God had shifted to faith in the nuclear family, and deviations from this could cause great outrage and attempts at silencing.[17] In Sweden, for example, the court went to great lengths to cover up the fact that Gustav V had had an affair with a man, and in the so-called Kejne affair,[18] conspiracy theories were created that both the police and the judiciary were infiltrated by homosexuals.[19]

In other countries, there was a similar moral panic. For example, in the United States communism and homosexuality were often linked (although homophobia also prevailed in the Soviet Union, where homosexual acts were seen as individualistic and anti-social and therefore capitalistic), and

in the 1950s attempts were made to purge the public sector, the army, and the FBI of homosexuals.[20] The stigmatization was probably fueled by scientific studies – not least the Kinsey report from the US[21] – which showed that many people were covertly homosexual, which (because of society's stigmatization of homosexuality) meant that they were considered a threat to national security because they could be blackmailed. Soviet agents, for example, could threaten to expose closeted homosexual American officials if they did not cooperate.

As part of this development, police monitored society based not only on what was illegal but also on what they considered indecent behavior. According to historian Dominico Rizzo, this was a general trend in the 1950s: "Notwithstanding different countries' penal codes, police attitudes on the subject of 'indecency' and deviations from a vague concept of 'good behaviour' facilitated widespread surveillance and intervention."[22]

A voice for inclusion emerges, followed by conflict with the police

At the same time as homosexuality was stigmatized in mainstream culture, social movements for gay rights emerged. In 1950, the RFSL was formed in Sweden.[23] In the beginning, their position was rather discrete; there was, for example, acceptance of the idea of disease and that homosexuals did not live openly.[24] However, this low profile ceased in the 1960s and 1970s, decades characterized by sexual liberation, political activism, and demonstrations. This brought with it police involvement. Homosexuality was not illegal, but the police still raided gay clubs. One such club is The Stonewall Inn in New York, which was raided by the police in 1969.[25] But the people at the club – who had previously only passively resisted but felt they were being subjected to police brutality – did not come out voluntarily but resisted. This led to several days of demonstrations and unrest. Stonewall is often seen as a starting point for the development of more activist gay organizations, both in the US and in other parts of the world.

The Stonewall incident was also an expression of the tense relationship between the police and gay groups in the 1960s and 1970s. Studies in the US showed that homosexuals were strongly disliked by the police at this time[26] and were particularly liable to both *overpolicing*, which is when the police excessively control a specific social group, and *underpolicing*, in the sense of the police giving a specific social group insufficient protection (see Chapter 1 where I discussed these democracy-related problems).[27]

Similar tendencies of "disapproval" were also found in Sweden. Rolf Granér, for example, writes in his dissertation that homosexuals – especially until the late 1990s – were one of the groups that were not considered by police officers to fit in with the "good and respectable" and therefore did not deserve the same service.[28] I found examples of this in my research too. For instance, one gay police officer said the following about his father, who was a police officer in the 1950s:

> My dad, he's dead now. But he used to be a cop. He once told me … in those days you went home in uniform. He worked in the 50s in the field. Then he told me that there was a man who my father thought was going to pick up his wallet, but then he touched my father by the leg. And he [the father] said: "What the *hell* are you doing?" And then this man had said, "Oh, the officer is so handsome when he's angry". And then he'd gotten off at the same stop and my dad said, "Damn, I kicked the shit out of that motherfucker, you know. Then I had to go back an hour later to see if I'd killed him or not. Because they're *sooo* fucking disgusting." And that's what I grew up with back then.

Whether or not the police/the father actually committed a crime based on the information in this story, I don't know.[29] But the story describes how the interviewee experienced the police as deeply homophobic in the 1950s and 1960s and that this attitude found its way into their family life too.

It is notable that the tense relationship between the police and homosexuals was not just something from the 1950s and 1960s. In Eva Tiby's dissertation from 1999, she found that the fear of being labeled as a homosexual by the police was the fourth most common reason for gay victims not to report a crime (the first three being that the victim did not think that the event was so serious, fear of revenge from the perpetrator, and a lack of belief that the police could solve the case).[30] And in RFSL's survey "Misstro" [Distrust] from 2013, 50–60 percent of LGBTQ+ people said that they had little trust in the police, social services, or prosecutors or that they were unsure of being received well by them.[31]

Another aspect of the tense relationship between gays and the police (and large parts of society as a whole) was that homosexuals in the 1970s began to speak with an independent *voice*. With Stonewall as a stepping stone, more liberationist gay movements were formed, which advocated for openness. As part of these movements, a living, visible, and audible gay culture grew too, with gay clubs in big cities like New York, San Francisco, and Copenhagen. As a result, the monopoly of science and the judiciary on defining and describing homosexuals was dissolved.

Activism and organization brought with it major improvements to homosexuals' living conditions. The 1970s saw the first bills to recognize same-sex relationships and 1973 was the first time that the parliament in Sweden formally stated that "same-sex cohabitation is from society's point of view a perfectly acceptable form of cohabitation" (even if the bill was rejected).[32]

In the 1980s, AIDS affected male gay culture in particular, where casual sexual relationships were more common, especially as many were not open about their orientation but rather lived formally in heterosexual relationships and could express their sexuality through casual contacts.[33] The stigmatization of homosexuality picked up again and the voice of homosexuals was weakened once more. Sweden became known for its particularly heavy-handed approach, tending to identify gay men as the spreaders of the

disease rather than its victims.[34] The media and experts singled out drug addicts and male homosexuals in particular as "risk groups", and homosexuality was pushed to the periphery of society.

The fear regarding AIDS also affected the police. Some of my interviewees were working then, such as Henrik, a gay police officer:

> We were scared to death. Everyone was scared to death. The police were completely panicked about HIV and AIDS. And the drug addicts in the 1980s, every time we had a drug addict locked up in a cell, which was basically every day, they put a big yellow triangle on their cell. And they used Anticimex [a pest control company], so they physically sanitized the cell. And then it was the fags, and there was a lot of talk about that.

Henrik points out that there was "panic" and that they talked a lot about "the fags". Johan, another male gay police officer, describes how this panic and this sort of talk made it hard to tell people that you were gay:

> Well, then it was so unbelievably clear. You had to take all these safety precautions so you didn't get AIDS when you were working as a police officer. It wasn't [the time to say]: "Oh, well, I have a little thing to tell you." On top of that, if someone got a drop of blood on them somewhere, then they had to go into what was more or less quarantine with tests and all that. Everyone thought that everyone would die. It was completely fucking hysterical.
>
> *Jens: So it was death anxiety, then?*
>
> We don't have that now, but it affected things then, and in some ways it casts shadows ahead. I believe it does.

Johan emphasizes that the hysteria calmed down but that the stigma can remain – it "casts shadows ahead".

From the 1990s and forward, new steps were taken toward the acceptance and normalization of homosexuality. In the 1990s, homosexuality had a sort of commercial breakthrough. Eurovision turned into something of a gay gala,[35] and the gay writer Jonas Gardell became one of Sweden's most respected celebrities. In the 2000s, the big change was that the hetero majority embraced parts of the LGBTQ+ lifestyle and began to go to gay clubs and participate in pride parades, and in 2009, the law was changed so that gender no longer had an impact on a person's right to get married. In many ways, there was a clear movement toward the inclusion of gay people and homosexuality.

This historical overview shows that there is a long history of exclusion of homosexuality and gay people, but also that there is a movement toward inclusion on many levels. In light of this, it is important to point out that the movement toward equal rights and greater inclusion is not representative of the whole world. While same-sex subcultures are likely to exist in all parts

of the world, in many places they are neither socially nor legally recognized. In 2019, same-sex marriage was legal in only 25 of the world's 195 countries, same-sex sexual relationships were illegal in 70 countries, in 31 countries it could carry up to eight years in prison, in 26 countries it brought with it a sentence of between ten years and life imprisonment, and in six countries it was even punishable by death.[36] The acceptance and normalization that we observe in Sweden today is therefore new-found, relatively rare, and should not be taken for granted.

It is also noteworthy that, alongside trends toward a more inclusive climate in Sweden, the 21st century has also been characterized by hate crimes[37] and continuing difficulties associated with homosexuality. As more and more LGBTQ+ people have become visible in the public sphere, the number of hate crimes directed at them has also increased. And although the working world today is more tolerant and less prejudiced than it used to be, many gay people still do not feel fully included in their workplaces,[38] which brings us back to the theme of this book.

Homosexuality in police organizations

The above brief history has concerned the relationship of the state and the judiciary to homosexuality in general. But more specifically, how have the police dealt with homosexuality within their own organization? As was shown in the overview, between 1864 and 1944, homosexuals constituted a criminal group that the police were to combat. It was a big step from this to the police openly and formally welcoming gays. In order to understand how this step was taken, it is relevant to start with the entry of women into the workforce, and subsequently into the police organization.

Women as the vanguard for increased diversity

Police researcher Roddrick Colvin argues there is much evidence that women have paved the way for other under-represented groups within the police.[39] Diversity – in the sense of the representation of established social identities such as gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation – in policing has historically been primarily about the relationship between men and women. Until the early 1970s, policing was almost exclusively a male profession, but the first female police officers appeared "already" in the late 1950s.[40] This caused quite a stir, and women could have a tough time, as Inger Johansson – one of the first women to start patrolling in 1958 – testifies when interviewed in *Polistidningen* (the police union magazine): [41]

> There was a certain amount of attention around us when we started patrolling. We realized quite quickly that we weren't popular – there was needling from both colleagues and the union. The union was all men and I guess they had a mission to get rid of us. So when we started,

> they asked if we thought we were really suitable as police officers. They even tried to get us out of the police academy. And later on I know there were some who thought we shouldn't be talked to, that we should be frozen out.

Inger Johansson's point is that the women's entry into the police force was met with resistance from male police colleagues who wanted to "get us out", to exclude the women. But the women stayed firm, and during the 1970s the women's rights movements gained influence in society, which did not leave the police untouched. In the early 1980s, 29 percent of police training students were women, Sweden had its first female commissioner, and since then the proportion of women has increased. In 2017, 32 percent of police trainees in the police organization were women.[42] Being a woman and a police officer in Sweden today can still be associated with problems,[43] but few raise their eyebrows when they see a female police officer. Even though women are still a minority in the police, and even though it took some fifty years, it is fair to say that women have seriously made an entrance into the police organization.

The women's movement and the entry of women have thus challenged the assumption that a police officer has to be a man, thereby creating the conditions for the inclusion of and better working conditions for other under-represented groups within the police force as well. This is true both symbolically and structurally: on the one hand, the image of what was considered to be a good police officer was loosened, and on the other, laws against discrimination were enacted. The fact that a social group (women) that was previously considered unsuitable as police officers gained legitimacy opened the door to other groups previously labeled as unsuitable. Gays are one such group.

Homosexuality in the American and British police forces

Swedish studies of homosexuality in the police are rare, but there are a number of studies from the US and the UK that depict national contexts that are relatively similar to Sweden in terms of views on homosexuality. These studies show how the relationship between homosexuality and policing was long characterized by a tacit assumption that police officers were simply heterosexual. However, this assumption was challenged in 1979 when the first gay police organization – GOAL: Gay Officers Action League – was formed in New York.[44] Later, in 1990, the Gay Police Association (GPA) was formed in the UK, and the Swedish Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association) was established in 2000.

So, of course, there were gay police officers, but they were not talked about much and their working conditions were not studied until the 1990s. At that time, Stephen Leinen and Marc Burke, among others, conducted interview studies with gay police officers, respectively in the US and the UK.[45] The main themes then were dual identities and double lives (as both

straight and gay, depending on the context) and fear of exposure. Gay police officers were rarely open about their orientation but presented themselves as heterosexual at work, while in their private lives, or parts of them, they were out as gay.

The same research (Leinen, Burke) indicates that there were clear elements of homophobia and the exclusion of homosexuals within the police. For example, Burke writes that there were police officers who claimed that they would quit if the police started openly employing homosexuals, and that homosexuals were seen as representatives of social disorder that the police were there to combat.[46] Leinen describes how political attempts to open up the recruitment of homosexuals were met with strong opposition both from the union and managerial organizations within the police, who felt that homosexuals did not belong in the police force and fought against their right to become police officers:

> Police union and fraternal organization leaders in some cities have also vociferously opposed hiring gay cops. In New York City in 1984, shortly after the police department embarked upon a program to hire gays, Phil Caruso, head of the powerful 25,000-member Patrolman's Benevolent Association (PBA), vowed to fight, in court if necessary, any effort on the part of the NYPD [New York Police Department] to recruit from the gay community.[47]

More recent studies show similar trends, but of a more subtle nature. Public anti-gay demonstrations became less frequent and call for bans disappeared and were replaced by more informal mechanisms of exclusion. For example, research from the US and UK in the early 2000s onwards shows that formal police policy was equal treatment, but informally there were negative rumors about gay colleagues, homophobic jokes and comments, and a perceived expectation among gay police officers that they must fit into a heteromasculine culture.[48] For example, a large study of British police noted that "[w]omen, gay and lesbian officers, in all sites, reported feeling excluded by a predominantly male, heterosexist culture".[49] Similar insights were made in an American study where the researchers found that "[e]very officer in the sample indicated that they had heard or been the target of anti-gay or lesbian jokes or derogatory slang and that they had seen anti-gay graffiti or cartoons around the station house, particularly in the locker room or on bulletin boards".[50]

At the same time, the US and UK studies indicate that the climate within the police has become more inclusive. For example, an interview study in the UK found that most of the interviewees had positive experiences of coming out,[51] and similar trends were found in a study from the US.[52] Although these studies also show that gay people have negative experiences – such as homophobic comments and the feeling of being outsiders – the general impression from international Anglo-Saxon research is that the climate is much more welcoming today than in the 1990s.

It should be stressed that the experiences of the gay police officers in these studies are mixed. There are, of course, many different experiences – from marginalization and homophobia to unproblematic inclusion. The local context plays a major role. Bethan Loftus, a British criminologist, observed that the police's formal drive toward greater diversity tends to divide the force into two camps with very different perspectives.[53] One – more often represented by white, heterosexual males – is characterized by resistance to and irritation with the strive for diversity and "political correctness", as well as a sense of being discriminated against when "diversity" makes its way into the organization. The other perspective – more often represented by women, gays and lesbians, and ethnic minority police officers – instead affirms the aspiration to diversity and, in Loftus's study, argues that the police are still characterized by an arrogant, white, heterosexist, and male culture. The experience of the police organization will, of course, be very different depending on which of these perspectives is most salient in an individual's local, informal working context.

The Swedish police and homosexuality

Studies from the US and UK thus suggest a trend toward greater diversity and a more inclusive culture, while pointing out that the police still have a long way to go before they can be considered inclusive of homosexuality. So what does it look like in Sweden? As I mentioned, there are not many studies based on the experiences of gay police officers, but there are some studies that touch on the subject. Before I refer to these studies, I will first briefly describe the formal changes for inclusion that have taken place, which frame (but by no means define) the informal organization.

Formal

On the formal level, there have been major changes to counter discrimination and to create a more diverse and inclusive police organization. This is of course not unique to the police but part of a general and rather rapid development in Swedish law and culture. As recently as the 1990s, it was unusual to have any type of policy regarding equality of treatment, and most homosexuals chose not to be open about their sexuality.[54] In the early 2000s, however, legislation was passed on discrimination in the workplace, and Swedish authorities were expected to work actively against discrimination.[55] From around 2005 onwards, it can be said that diversity and/or equal treatment has been high on the agenda in the Swedish public sector, which was clearly expressed in a 2007 public inquiry entitled *Mångfald är framtiden* (Diversity is the Future).[56]

The police are thus part of this legislative and cultural development. Today, the police, like all other public organizations, have equality policies, and it is fair to say that *formally* there is no doubt that the police as

an organization want and work for inclusion and equal rights. As noted in Chapter 1, the police themselves say that the organization should "mirror society" in terms of composition of the workforce.

In addition to this stated aspiration to "mirror society", police chiefs participate in various formal diversity events (such as pride parades) and state in the media that "there is zero tolerance for xenophobia, homophobia and sexist remarks" and that they are "disappointed" when indications to the contrary emerge.[57] Not least, they express their commitment to a diverse and inclusive workplace in formal documents, such as their 2010 Diversity and Equality Plan:

> The Police should be an attractive workplace with methods of working that suit all employees, regardless of sex, gender identity or expression, ethnic background, religion or other belief, dis/ability, sexual orientation, and age.[58]

However, the formal is rarely the same as the informal. What the police (or other organizations) write in their policies and police chiefs say when interviewed by journalists often reflects what they *want* to be the case, and at worst what they think journalists want to hear. As I indicated in the first chapter, the discrepancy between the formal and the informal is well documented in organizational research, both in the police and in other organizations. Police officers are often described as "street-level bureaucrats" who, largely because of the complexity of their work, make individual applications of the law.[59] The concept of street justice[60] denotes a similar phenomenon, and researchers have noted that conflict between the formal bureaucracy and the informal professional culture is inevitable and a central dilemma in the governance of the police.[61] When it comes to the police furamide management's presentations of the police, Swedish police researcher and police officer Stefan Holgersson has argued that police management tends to describe formal "scenery" has little to do with the informal organization.[62] I have also made a similar analysis based on how the police leadership handled the "*apejävel* [the fucking ape] incident" in the area of Rosengård in the city of Malmö in 2009.[63] A police officer referred to a riot maker as "fucking ape", and what the police management communicated formally to the outside world after the incident was quite different from what was said informally in the organization.

On a more general level, organizational researcher Nils Brunsson has long argued that what is said in organizations is rather loosely connected to what is actually done, partly because leaders do not necessarily say things because they believe in them or know they are feasible. Rather, they have limited knowledge of how to implement policies and say things to avoid control from above, Brunsson argues.[64] Related ideas have been put forward by organizational researcher Mats Alvesson, who argues, among other things, that organizations' representations of themselves are generally

characterized by "emptiness".[65] And in a study of how organizations work with diversity training, Pushkala Prasad and her colleagues show how the training work was largely a result of following fashion rather than a real commitment to creating a more inclusive workplace.[66] I will return to this in Chapter 7. Here I simply want to emphasize that research shows that formal policies and statements should not be taken too seriously as representations of what is really going on in organizations.

This discrepancy between the formal and the informal is important for understanding the relationship between LGBTQ+ issues and policing. The discrepancy means that one can hardly expect formal rules or policy documents on how police officers should treat LGBTQ+ people – both when dealing with citizens and when dealing with their own colleagues – to govern what police officers actually do. The informal norms that develop in police organizations are likely to be just as influential. Studies do show that informal life in police organizations has changed as well. But it is not quite as inclusive and diverse as suggested by the formal façade.

Informal

When it comes to the informal situation in the Swedish police organization, as noted, there has not been much research focusing on sexual orientation. But there is some. Among other things, there are general statistical attitude surveys in which police employees have participated, and there are qualitative studies of police culture and diversity in which homosexuality appears as an aspect, and then there are a small number of interview studies in which researchers have actually talked to homosexual police officers.

In terms of attitude surveys, in 2003 *Statistiska centralbyrån* (Statistics Sweden) carried out a comprehensive survey to identify and combat discrimination or discriminatory treatment on the grounds of sexual orientation.[67] The survey was sent out to employees in the police and the military, among others. It did not separate the police and the military, but analyzed them together as examples of "male-dominated areas". A total of 1,188 people from the police and 1,235 from the armed forces responded. Although we do not know exactly which were from the police and which were from the military, the responses offer an approximate indication of how employees in the police perceived attitudes to homosexuality and bisexuality. Some findings from the study are reproduced below. The first figure shows what employees from the police and military answered, while the figure in brackets shows what a random sample from the register of the total population of Sweden answered to the same questions (responses were received from just over 10,000 randomly selected people in the Swedish population):

- Twenty-six percent (28) stated that the following statement completely or partially described their workplace: "Homosexual and bisexual colleagues can be open about their sexual orientation."

- Thirty percent (10) stated that the following statement was completely or partially true: "I have colleagues who believe that homosexual and bisexual men are not suited to working in my field."
- Twenty-nine percent (16) stated that they felt that there was a very negative or rather negative attitude toward homosexual and bisexual men at their workplace; 19 percent (11) stated the same regarding homosexual and bisexual women.
- Thirty-three percent (13) stated that they felt that there was a very negative or rather negative attitude toward homosexual and bisexual men in their field (that is, within the police or military in general); 23 percent (10) stated the same regarding homosexual and bisexual women.
- Twenty-one percent (9) stated that there was discrimination/harassment based on sexual orientation at their workplace through derogatory or ridiculing comments about homosexual or bisexual people in general, and 4 percent (2) stated that there had been discrimination/harassment of that type through derogatory or ridiculing comments directed at a specific colleague.

Some commentators went quite far when drawing conclusions from this study. For example, Carina Bildt, the investigator, wrote the following when presenting the study to the government: "Homophobia is greater in male-dominated workplaces. Crude jokes about homosexuality are a common feature of everyday life in, for example, the military and the police."[68] I think we should be a bit more careful. These figures should be taken as an indication and not as an unquestionable reflection of the conditions in a workplace. A very high number of respondents answered "don't know" to the questions – about half said they had no view on attitudes toward gay and bisexual people – which indicates that there is relatively little experience of and understanding for questions around sexual orientation (for example, the "don't know" rate was lower for questions about attitudes toward women and men). Nevertheless, it is reasonable to draw the following minimalist conclusions from the study:

- There were negative attitudes toward gay people and bisexuals, and heteronormativity[69] (the assumption that heterosexuality is the normal and preferred sexuality) characterized the police and the military as workplaces.
- These negative attitudes were more common within the police and the military than in the average Swedish population.

In addition, the quantitative insights give rise to questions of a more qualitative nature: How are these "negative attitudes" expressed, and how do they affect the conditions of inclusion and exclusion?

To answer these kinds of questions, surveys are rather blunt tools. Deeper insight requires talking to people and/or observing how they work. This is

what Rolf Granér did in his 2004 dissertation on the professional culture of patrolling police officers. Based on interviews and field studies, he focused on identifying collectively held values, norms, and attitudes within the police. Although the view of homosexuals is not a main theme in Granér's book, it comes up from time to time. Among other things, there are references to homosexuals in a discussion of the police's relationship with the public. Granér's studies show that for the police, "the public" does not mean all the people the police are supposed to serve (as it does in the law), but rather the part of the population that represents "the good and respectable". Above all, it was criminal elements that did not fit in as "the public", but also others who were perceived in one way or another as deviating from what was seen as "respectable" (indicating that some features of the 1950s tendency to police "indecency" may survive). Among some police officers, this included gay people, Granér notes:

> Consequently, in addition to the identified criminals – who were called *buset* [mischief-makers] – drunks, the homeless and the psychotic cases were also not considered to be members of the public. Neither were groups whose moral character could be questioned according to conventional criteria, such as prostitutes and – for some police officers – homosexuals.[70]

At the same time, Granér notes that the police used to be much more homophobic and that there has been a move "from a strong homophobic attitude to a more permissive one" within the police.[71] Exactly what this more permissive attitude means, however, is not made clear, and given some of the interview responses, one is left wondering. A police officer in Granér's study who is supposed to explain that homosexuality no longer matters put it this way:

> Today no one cares about the homosexuals. You can joke about it a bit, but it doesn't have any meaning. Yeah, of course people talk about fucking fags, but if you were really forced to really respond and think about it, no one would care.[72]

The use of the term "fucking fags" is a bit difficult to reconcile with the argument that homosexuality does not matter. But apart from this contradiction, this police officer is expressing a shift from explicit exclusion to "tolerance"; from "homosexuals do not belong in the police" to "homosexuals are allowed".

Ten years after Granér – in 2014 – Malin Wieslander wrote a dissertation that was not specifically about sexual orientation either, but that nevertheless is about diversity in the police based on culture, religion, and ethnicity. The study highlights how discourses[73] on diversity are expressed,

maintained, and challenged based on an interview and observational study of final-year students in police education. However, homosexuality appears relatively frequently in the study, and two meanings stand out. On the one hand, homosexuality is presented as something rarely talked about, even as something "taboo". On the other hand, when it is mentioned, it is often talked about "as if it were not present in the room".[74] Both of these meanings, according to Wieslander, contribute to "homosexuality" being seen as a "risky position", that is, as something to be avoided because it is associated with outsiderness. This applies not only to "homosexual" but, in Wieslander's interpretation, to anything that stands out:

> No participant in the study wants to appear as prejudiced. Not as a racist or a *Sverigedemokrat* [member of the [conservative] Sweden Democrat political party]. Nor do they want to be positioned as an immigrant, as religious, or as a homosexual. These are the risky positions of this context.[75]

According to this insight, then, it is what is generally perceived as extremes that do not fit in. It thus appears difficult to be both homosexual and homophobic. And if one is to compare with Granér's study, the silence seems to have increased. In Granér's study, homosexuals were tolerated but at the same time, people thought it was normal to openly make "gay jokes", while in Wieslander's study, it is as if joking has moved from openness to what Wieslander calls *safe spaces*, or places where one believes or knows that there are no people who might be critical of the joking.[76]

When it comes to studies that have actually looked at how gay police officers see things, these are few and quite limited. Ingrid Lander has studied students in police training and found that what she calls the *peak performance-man* represents an ideal: you should be male, white, strong, fit, and heterosexual.[77] Lander argues that this norm must be challenged so that those who deviate from it do not need to feel that they have been accepted due to quotas[in Swedish, this is *inkvoterad*]. Her study is about diversity in a general sense, but includes some comments on sexual orientation. For example, Lander interviewed a gay man who explained that he did not want to be open about his orientation during recruitment because "[I] wanted to get in because of who I am, not because I'm gay". The example suggests that the man thought that his suitability as a police officer might be questioned among the other students at the police academy if they knew that he had told recruiters that he was gay, as he would then be seen as "*inkvoterad*" [i.e. as person who got in through quotas]. Lander's study is thus similar to Wieslander's in that being gay is presented – in this case by a police student who is himself gay – as a "risky position".

However, Lander's study contains few statements from gay police officers. I had to turn to student theses to find more data and Linda Höglund and

Matilda Schwan – in a bachelor's thesis from 2005 – investigated how gay police officers themselves experience discrimination in the workplace.[78] They conducted five interviews with gay police officers in Stockholm. The interviewed police officers emphasize that there is a "macho culture" and a "narrow-minded jargon" that is considered problematic, but that this is becoming less prominent as more and more women are entering the occupation. On the other hand, they also say that they feel that there is a positive attitude toward homosexuals in their own workplace and that they have very rarely experienced direct discrimination. Nevertheless, they have felt offended, as this police officer explains:

> They [my colleagues] haven't said it *to* me, but that I have been talked *about*, that I have understood. Within the police, there's so much fucking talk. […] Derogatory comments directly from people…I don't hear that today. But *about,* towards … being homosexual, I do hear that. I think that's pretty widespread in the police, unfortunately. Not so much when I'm around. They know about me, so they're quiet then.[79]

The study suggests that the interviewees rarely or never experienced derogatory comments directed directly at themselves as individuals, but that they heard negative talk about homosexuality in general. The thesis thus shows similarities with previous studies in terms of the existence of an ideal of a certain kind of masculinity ("macho culture") that includes condescending talk about (male) homosexuality, even if it is not directed directly at openly homosexual individuals.

To sum up, it can be said that changes toward tolerance and inclusion are not only formal window dressing, but similar changes have also taken place at the informal level. At the same time, all studies – both Anglo-Saxon and Swedish – are quick to point out that there is quite a long way to go before full inclusion is reached and that gay police officers often still experience greater difficulties than their heterosexual counterparts. There are thus elements of both inclusive and exclusive forces. But when it comes to the Swedish police, these forces have been described mainly based on studies of heterosexual police officers.

There are few studies based on the experiences of gay police officers in a Swedish context, which is one of the reasons I have written this book. In the following chapters, I draw on their experiences to create a better understanding of how and under what conditions the inclusion and exclusion of homosexuals and homosexuality happens. I begin, in the next chapter, with experiences characterized by exclusion.

Notes

1. Bullough (1979/2019, p. 46).
2. Norrhem et al. (2015).

3. Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 46).
4. See, for example, Chapter 2 on homosexuality and religion in Vern Bullough's *Homosexuality: A history*. Bullough writes (1979/2019, p. 29): "Historically the most important force in setting western attitudes toward homosexuality has been religion, and in both Judaism and Christianity homosexuality has been regarded as a sin."
5. "Homosexual" did not exist as a term at that time. "Sodomy" was employed as a label for deviant sexual behavior. Often the word was used about anal sex between men or oral sex between opposite-sex partners, but also for bestiality (see Aldrich 2007, p. 10 and Bullough 1979/2019).
6. Norrhem et al. (2015, pp. 78 fwd.).
7. Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 95).
8. Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 95).
9. Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 120). Aldrich (2007, p. 22) also noted that the judiciary did not pay much attention to lesbian sexual behavior: "Since women were not arrested for lesbian actions, there is as lack of judicial documentation." This is also one of the reasons why we know less about female homosexuality.
10. Norrhem et al. (2015, pp. 120 fwd. and pp. 187–88). In terms of male homosexuality being considered a threat against the patriarchal order, the logic went that men had (and have) a raised position in society, and being a man was – and is – closely linked to the desire to have sex with women. If a man did not want to have sex with women, he was "less of a man" and therefore stepped down from this privileged position. This could be difficult to understand, and so it was seen as a threat against patriarchal society.
11. Aldrich (2010, Chapter 8) and Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 118).
12. The French philosopher Michel Foucault (1976) describes this shift in depth and explains how this new category, and the knowledge around it, made "homosexual" into an identity that was thought to permeate the entire person: "The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species. […] Nothing that went into his total composition was unaffected by his sexuality" (p. 43). Simultaneously this was a production (through naming) and a marginalization (through the development of knowledge that defined homosexuality as a disease, a form of deviance, etc.) and of homosexuality that is central to Michel Foucault's view of power. This type of power, Foucault says (1976, p. 47), works not through prohibiting (legal power) or making something a taboo (normative power), but rather by producing different sexualities that on one hand discipline their subjects by defining them and linking them to particular knowledge about what that sexuality means, and on the other hand create the possibility for them talk and act as a specific sexual being – *as* a homosexual, *as* a heterosexual, *as* a transsexual, etc. This knowledge creates the conditions for both silencing and voice, concepts that are used extensively in this book.
13. This was not just in Germany. In Aldrich (2010, Chapter 8), the period between 1870 and 1940 is called "the homosexual age", which partially was connected to the scientific developments and the minting of the term "homosexual". But it was also linked to the fact that the first activist homosexual groups and an active gay culture rose in that time period and also to how homosexuality was expressed in media and literature.
14. Norrhem et al. (2015, pp. 139 fwd.).
15. Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 141).
16. Norrhem et al. (2015). Also see Richardson & Monro (2012, Chapter 1) about how in the 1950s, homosexuality was viewed as a threat against the moral order.

17. See, for example, Rizzo (2010, p. 202), who writes, "All Western societies in the 1950s witnessed an increase in homophobia, a result of the idealization of the nuclear family as the dominant social model, which was based on marriage and a rigid division of gender roles." Also see Lindholm & Nilsson (2005), who write about the "1950s as hostile to homosexuals".
18. Karl-Erik Kejne was a pastor who developed a conspiracy theory around a supposed homosexual mafia and who persecuted gay men.
19. Norrhem et al. (2015, pp. 170 fwd.). And see Aldrich (2007).
20. See Aldrich (2010, pp. 204 fwd.). This hunt for homosexuals is often called *The lavender scare*.
21. In the 1950s, Alfred Kinsey carried out a study about women and men's sexual behavior, based on tens of thousands of interviews. It turned out that 19% of the women and 30% of the men had had sexual interactions with someone of the same sex (Norrhem et al. 2015, p. 157), and that they were not open about this.
22. Rizzo (2010, p. 202).
23. RFSL stands for Riksförbundet för homosexuellas, bisexuellas, transpersoners, queeras och intersexpersoners rättigheter, or The Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Rights.
24. Norrhem et al. (2015, p. 146).
25. See, for example, Aldrich (2010) and Colvin (2012, pp. 35–7).
26. See Fretz (1975) for an investigation of the Washington D.C. police's disparaging attitude toward homosexuals.
27. Colvin (2012, pp. 51–3).
28. Granér (2004). Also see Hilton (2005, particularly pp. 261–70), where there are examples of negative treatment by the police of homosexuals.
29. Not much is known about Swedish police officers' crimes against homosexuals. Criminologist Eva Tiby (1999, p. 206) writes that she cannot find any published reports about police attacks on homosexuals in Sweden.
30. Tiby (1999, p. 209).
31. RFSL (2013).
32. Riksdagen (1973).
33. See Ingeborg Svensson's dissertation (2007), *Liket i garderoben* [The corpse in the closet], for a depiction of this time and of male homosexuals' living conditions. Jonas Gardell's fictional trilogy *Torka aldrig tårar utan handskar [Never dry tears without gloves]* also offers insight into the male gay culture and how it was often characterized by sex in secluded places, such as so-called cruising areas, public toilets, or bathhouses, partially since not very many felt able to live openly in same-sex relationships. Bathhouses were places where people came to have sexual relations. They were forbidden in Sweden from 1987 to 2004.
34. Norrhem et al. (2015, pp. 174–6).
35. See Rosenberg (2005b, p. 350) about the relationship between homosexuality and so-called schlager (Eurovision-type pop music) and how different types of popular culture, such as Eurovision, can "harbor emancipatory potential" for LGBTQ+ people.
36. Mendos (2019).
37. Brottsförebyggande rådet (Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention), a Swedish governmental agency, defines hate crime as follows: "Crime against a person, group, property, institution, or representative for any of these, that is motivated by fear of, hostility towards, or hatred of the victim based on skin color, nationality or ethnic origin, religious belief, sexual orientation, or transgender identity or expression that the perpetrator believes that the

person or group has" (Brå 2015, p. 15). Hate crime, as understood by the law, is not a type of crime but rather a penalty rule that means that – regardless of the crime itself (abuse, insult, robbery, etc.) – when deciding on the penalty, it is to be increased if it is thought that "a motive for the crime has been to offend a person, ethnic group, or another group of people based on race, skin color, national or ethnic origin, religious belief, sexual orientation, or other similar circumstance" (Brottsbalken, chap. 29, § 2, point 7). That is, it is the motive for the offence that determines if it is a hate crime.

38. See, for example, Ljunggren et al. (2003). See Sandell (2014) about homosexual academics.
39. Colvin (2012, especially Chapter 5). Colvin sees women as "trailblazers" and notes that to a large extent it is the women's movement from the 1970s and forward that is behind the change to the discrimination acts.
40. See, for instance, Granér (2004, pp. 96 fwd.) or Petersson (2016).
41. Hjorth (2007).
42. Polisen (2017b, p. 56).
43. See, for example, Haake (2018) for an analysis of gender stereotypes within the police. Also see the police's hashtag #nödvärn [#selfdefense], which was part of the #metoo movement: https://nodvarn.files.wordpress.com/2018/01/nc3b6dvc3a4rn-v4-tryck-enkelsidig.pdf.
44. Colvin (2012).
45. Burke (1994), Leinen (1993).
46. Burke (1994, p. 193).
47. Leinen (1993, p. 8). Also see Belkin & McNichol (2002), who carried out a study of the San Diego Police Department and discuss how homosexuals were openly discriminated against from the 1960s to the beginning of the 1980s. Recruits were asked in questionnaires if they were attracted to the same sex and sometimes there were oral interrogations in order to avoid employing homosexuals. This open discrimination appears to have stopped at the end of the 1980s.
48. See, for example, Belkin & McNichol (2002) and Miller et al. (2003) for an American context and Foster et al. (2005) and Loftus (2008) for British examples. Also see Panter (2018), who primarily looked at police officers who identify as trans but who also refers to homosexuality among American, English, and Welsh police officers.
49. Foster et al. (2005).
50. Miller et al. (2003, p. 365).
51. Rumens & Broomfield (2012).
52. Colvin (2012).
53. Loftus (2008, 2010).
54. See Lindholm & Nilsson (2005), Svensson (2007).
55. For information about the discrimination acts, see SFS 1999: 130 and SFS 2008: 657.
56. SOU (2007: 50). The concept of "diversity" has disappeared from the Swedish police's most recent policies, replaced by "equal treatment". There are several possible reasons for this, such as that the concept of diversity is not as attractive anymore, or that it is associated with instituting quotas or affirmative action, or that the police's formal position is actually heading toward standardization rather than diversity. It is outside of this study's focus to take a position regarding this, but see Wieslander (2019) for a discussion of it.
57. This example is from *Sydsvenskan* newspaper (2009c), in an interview with the then-county police commissioner in Skåne.
58. Rikspolisstyrelsen (2010, p. 4).

59. The concept of the street-level bureaucrat comes from Lipsky (1980). To see it applied to the Swedish police, see Ekman (1999) and Granér & Kronkvist (2016).
60. Van Maanen (1974).
61. Johnston (1988).
62. Holgersson (2014, 2018).
63. Rennstam (2013). In this situation, police officers called protestors in Rosengård in Malmö "apejävlar" [fucking apes] and "blattejävlar" [fucking foreigners] and the general public found out about this, which caused an uproar.
64. Brunsson (1993).
65. Alvesson (2013).
66. Prasad et al. (2011).
67. Ljunggren et al. (2003).
68. Bildt (2004, p. 10).
69. See Rosenberg (2005a, p. 11). I will explore the concept of heteronormativity more in Chapter 4.
70. Granér (2004, p. 114).
71. Granér (2004, p. 254).
72. Granér (2004, p. 255).
73. The concept of discourse has led to many debates within social science, but broadly it refers to the way of discussing, talking about, and writing about a subject, which then shapes how we understand that subject. So one can refer to diversity discourse, which means discussion, speech, and writing about the subject of diversity. Wieslander (2014, p. 45) defines discourse in a similar way, writing, "a set of expressions that governs how we perceive specific phenomena in different contexts and eras". Analyzing discourses – according to Peter Svensson (2019, p. 16) in his book *Diskursanalys* [Discourse analysis] – is about "understanding and studying language usage and its effects on society, people, and their relationships".
74. Wieslander (2014, p. 161).
75. Wieslander (2014, p. 285).
76. See Wieslander (2021) for an exploration of this displacement. She uses the term "safe spaces" to refer to places "in which there were no supervisors or potential critics present" (p. 11).
77. Lander (2008, 2013).
78. Höglund and Schwan (2005).
79. Höglund and Schwan (2005, p. 30).

3 Exclusion

This and the next chapter present the individual experiences of LGB police officers that I have collected through interviews. The experiences are situated in the informal life of the police organization and show that the exclusion of gay people and homosexuality – that is, activities that seek to shut out or reject gays and homosexuality – has had, and to some extent still has, a place in policing. To understand these exclusionary activities on a more general social level, I will use the concepts of stigma and stigmatization, based on the sociologist Erving Goffman, and "dirt," based on the anthropologist Mary Douglas.

In short, stigmatization is about constructing groups (such as homosexuals) as carriers of a stigma, i.e. something that is discrediting in a particular social context.[1] Stigma as an analytical tool focuses on how dominating groups build and retain their dominance by using stigma to discredit the bearers of the stigma.[2] Stigma is not stable and universal but something that is changeable and created in social relations.[3] Thus, for homosexuality to constitute a stigma, norms, and values that enable the stigma needs to be produced and reproduced. It is this (re)production that is called *stigmatization*. In organizational contexts, carrying a stigma is a basis for exclusion and a barrier to inclusion.[4]

"Dirt" in turn represents, in Douglas terms, "matter out of place".[5] Dirt, then, is not to be understood literally but as a symbol of what is constructed as "incorrectly placed" in a system, of what is rejected because it is considered inappropriate or deviant. For example, shoes are not dirty per se, but shoes on the table are considered out of place even if they are new and clean. Where there is dirt, there is a system, and understanding what is considered dirty is central to understanding how we produce order in our world, according to Douglas.

Stigma and dirt are similar, and it may be appropriate to explain the value of using both concepts. Both highlight exclusion, and both are social in the sense that it is the social context that defines what is stigma or what is dirt. But it is clear that dirt was developed by a structurally oriented anthropologist (Douglas) and stigma by a sociologist with a social psychological bent (Goffman). Douglas' "dirt" is a more structural and less individual-oriented

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-3

concept, and she makes greater claims to universality. She sees "dirt" as a symbol of a kind of organization that humans have engaged in since our beginnings. What anthropologists call the "taboo" among indigenous peoples is very similar to what modern societies regard as "dirt". Douglas's point is that both taboo and dirt are constructed because we want to create order, and they are created when ideas and things emerge that create disorder in or contradict our existing categorizations,[6] as in the incident of "The picture" (see below), where a colleague expresses disgust at the sight of an expression of homosexuality, or when the commander of the "The hate meeting" (also see below) becomes frantic because his group was associated with homosexuality and he behaved as if he and his entire group had been "dirtied" by the event. "Dirt" is thus useful when trying to understand the exclusionary behavior of the police in a wider social and historical context.

There is a risk that the use of "dirt" is interpreted as a "naturalization" of the exclusion of homosexuals from the police. One could refer to Douglas and say that "this is the way humanity has always done it, so it's not strange". But that misses Douglas's main point: there is nothing inherently "dirty" about it. We ourselves construct what is to be considered dirt – matter out of place – and so must ask ourselves whether our categorization of something as dirt is good and relevant. It is to answer this question that Goffman's stigma becomes illuminating. Stigma highlights the problematic consequences of categorizing things as dirty. Goffman focuses on the interpersonal dynamics that are created around stigma, dynamics that he describes through the concepts of discredited and discreditable.[7]. A person is discredited when the stigma is overt, a person is discreditable when the stigma is covert. Stigma is therefore useful when trying to understand what it may mean in a particular social context for people to carry a stigma, and in particular how these people need to engage in controlling information about themselves and the consequences of this. In other words, dirt and stigma complement each other. When dirt becomes stigma, it is not good. Dirt highlights a general human phenomenon; stigma highlights the problems that can result from it.

I will elaborate on the relevance of these concepts as they emerge in the chapter. But the point can be communicated now. The concepts provide a framework for understanding how exclusion can occur. In the chapter, I show how homosexuality can be excluded through stigmatization, both by managers and by colleagues, and thus constructed as "dirt"; that is, as something that is seen as misplaced. I will make this concrete by presenting seven experiences of events in the police organization. "The hate meeting", "The spy", "The interrogation", and "The cruising terror" are mainly about management-based stigmatization, while "The Christmas party", "The picture", and "The code Language" are about collegial stigmatization. I present the experiences in a fairly raw format – they are quotes, and not edited other than to increase readability somewhat. Obviously, all the interviews were conducted in Swedish, so these quotes are translations.

Stigmatizing leadership

The hate meeting

This event takes place in Stockholm in the mid-1980s. It was told to me by three different police officers who were all working in Stockholm at the time. One of them was Arvid,[8] the gay policeman who experienced the incident: a hate meeting organized by a SWAT police commander after he heard rumors that a member of his squad had had sex with another, gay, policeman – Arvid. Arvid describes how he tried to get his superiors to act, to stop the meeting. But to no avail. The only concrete action came from a superintendent named Nils Karlsson, who called the prison priest for some unclear reasons. "There was no more civil courage than that," says Arvid.

As I sat and listened to the story, I first didn't quite understand why the commander got so angry, but apparently the association between his squad and homosexuality was extremely problematic for him. Although the commander is not the only actor in this incident, he played a central role. The story is therefore an example of what can be called *stigmatizing leadership*; that is, when the formally appointed leader carries out actions that stigmatize and seek the exclusion of a particular group, in this case homosexuals.

What follows is Arvid's version of events. Arvid is, as noted, the gay police officer in the story. We were sitting in a restaurant in Stockholm and Arvid told me about a time when he was involved in arresting a known criminal and heard someone say, "Imagine that that fucking nancy got him." Derogatory language seemed common, I thought. Then Arvid suddenly changed focus and told me about "the hate meeting":

> The worst thing I experienced was probably, sometime in, I think, 1986, it was. A group of us were at Vickan.
>
> *Jens: Vickan? Viktoria?*
>
> Viktoria, yeah. That's right. Restaurant Viktoria, "café and dining room". And then a bunch of them came back to my place for an afterparty. And then one of the guys there, all of them went [home], but one of the guys came back and rang my doorbell. And said, "Arvid, I want to try," he said. He was in the SWAT team in Södermalm [a neighborhood in Stockholm]. Suuuuch a hot guy. And I hadn't even had a thought of, like…right? But then we had a sort of rendezvous there. And…then I told Arne or Åke [two colleagues who are also gay] that: "Oh yeah, so, I got a going-over," or something like that, I said. And they laughed and all that.
>
> But then it came *out*. And then it was such a fucking *fuss*. So, what's he called, well, a guy, he's still there, the SWAT commander there, he definitely didn't like gays, and he still doesn't. But he gathered the whole briefing room full of, there must have been thirty cops, into a *hate meeting*. I asked myself: "Are you going to beat me up or not?" […] But it was so

serious that I went to the boss, Nils Karlsson, who's now dead, and said that this was a work environment issue. "Now you have to fucking do something," I said. "I'm not putting up with this."

And now, afterwards, I spoke recently with the former police priest [about this incident]. And he told me that: "Then Nils Karlsson called me, and asked me to come …" Of course, he didn't know what to do, the inspector [Nils Karlsson], that is. He had one of his sergeants, a future inspector, for the police, who got so worked up that they almost beat up a colleague. And it was like, "those fucking faggots", and all that.

And I know that Annika Fred, who was in my drug group then…I'd been the boss of one of those street trafficking groups, and she thought it was terrible, because she was gay too. […] But the others took it harder than I did myself.

[…]

[Arvid returns to the situation when he was telling his boss Nils Karlsson about it.] So I went in to the boss and demanded, now you have to do something, it can't be like this. And then, there was no one who dared to go in and stop that meeting. Even though it was swarming with inspectors at the station. They all just went in and closed their doors. And I sat firmly in my office with another inspector. And he was so angry about it, about that meeting.

But, so now I have found out afterwards that inspector Nils Karlsson phoned the police priest: "Can you come and talk sense into them, because there are some homosexuals in that group, and they can't really get along," he said. "And now one of my inspectors has called a meeting and it's a little turbulent."

[…]

Jens: But what was he thinking, what was he called, Nils, that the priest would going to talk to them…

…yeah, talk some sense into them.

Jens: Who, the gay police officers?

Mm.

Jens: So that they would stop being gay? Because that was a belief at that time, that you could…

Yeah, mmm. In part. And then they tried to figure out, if they could calm things down. But there was no more civil courage than that in those police officers, those who could break up demonstrations and fight rowdy people on the streets. But when something happened in their own immediate sphere, when they find out that someone is gay, and then I dare to go in and demand they do something about a work environment issue … No one has anything to do with what I do between the sheets, and it *definitely* shouldn't be discussed at a meeting like that, by one of your highest-ranking commanders.

So he [Nils] was about to … he didn't know *what* he should do. So he called a police priest. I mean. That tells you about the mentality of the time. There was no regulation to follow. But for me it doesn't matter. *No one* can hold a workplace meeting like that without someone going in and slamming their fist on the table and saying, "What are you doing in here?" Regardless of whatever it is, if it's sexual, or if it's something religious, someone Muslim or…yeah, whatever.

But that was probably the worst thing I experienced. Like…and everyone who was at that meeting, they have come to me several years afterwards. They remember it, and like: "I can't imagine why I didn't leave" [they say]. And they regret it and they don't know *how* they should, like, apologize and all that. So, this is probably what's left the biggest mark [on me]. But I know that my colleagues were so upset that some of them took sick leave after that. They thought it was so horrible.

Jens: After that?

Yeah, that's right. And they were gay, you see. So they thought: "What if it happens to me, I'd kill myself, I'd die." So they were, they thought it was so awful. But of course, it depends what you're like as a person, how badly you take things like this.

I wouldn't have been afraid to enter that meeting. To show, like…even if I hadn't thought it was the most fun thing to do. But I wasn't afraid, you see. I just thought that there was no reason to go on and fight about this. And that wimp who was at my place, he didn't even have the guts to say boo [laughter].

Annika, who is mentioned in the story and was part of Arvid's drug group, told the story in a similar way when I interviewed her. In her version, however, the rumor had been blown out of proportion. The rumor claimed that Arvid had "banged" the whole squad, in a sauna. Annika brings up this rumor when we talk about what her thinking was when she chose not to come out as a lesbian but to pretend to be straight, including by calling her partner by a man's name:

Jens: So you thought there'd be negative consequences [if you came out]?

Yes, yes, yes, yes, there were, everything was so incredibly negative. In this G-group, the SWAT team in the G-group, it was, as I said, "the Gay group", they said that one person had banged the whole group, in a sauna. And that's of course wild, to bang a whole SWAT team. They're all men you know, "he-men", and that they'd be banged by a gay man.

Jens: It was a rumor, you mean?

Yeah. We even heard it at the academy when we were there, taking classes sometimes. "Oh yeah, you're from the sooouuuth, fucking gay-groouuuup" [said in a parody of the Stockholm dialect]. It was completely crazy really, because the boss of the SWAT team came in to a briefing, and looked for the guy who was supposed to have banged

> everyone. Luckily he [Arvid] wasn't there [at the meeting], because he would have killed him, openly. And he's an even higher boss now. So I don't think much of bosses, if I can put it like that. Not those from my neck of the woods.

This experience has many dimensions. First, it illustrates how stigmatized and "dirty" (in the Douglas sense) homosexuality was. It could cause a boss to engage in hate meetings and persecute colleagues because of their sexual orientation. After all, it was a formal meeting, not some informal gossip. The "dirtiness" becomes almost literal here, as illustrated by the commander taking such strong action to identify and punish Arvid. The process resembles a purging ritual where the commander was potentially suspected but purified himself by attacking Arvid: if Arvid were identified as the guilty party, then the responsibility for having "soiled" the G-group is passed from the commander to Arvid. The "dirtiness" is also indicated more subtly by Arvid's positioning of the man who wanted same-sex sexual relations as a "wimp" – a miserable creature – who "didn't have the guts to say boo".

Secondly, it points out how other managers did not know how to deal with this and allowed the meeting to go on. Although the station was "swarming" with commissioners, there was "no one who dared to go in and stop" the meeting. There were no guidelines or knowledge about how to handle these types of issues, which is emphasized by how they got help from a priest (!) In other words, the role of the silent collective in making exclusion possible is underlined, illustrating one of the main insights of this book, namely that exclusion and inclusion are collective processes.

Thirdly, it points out how rumors were widespread and took on rather absurd proportions ("that one person had banged the whole group, in a sauna"), which stigmatized gay police officers and made many feel very bad ("my colleagues were so upset that some of them took sick leave after that."). It is likely that the spread of rumors also contributed to the SWAT commander's strong need to clear his name.

Finally, it should be noted that the incident is an example of a phenomenon within the police that has been addressed by other police culture researchers, namely the unwritten law that open criticism of colleagues (in this case, criticism of the SWAT commander) should be avoided and that discriminatory language and actions are allowed as long as it is internal.[9] Police scholar Bethan Loftus calls the latter *white spaces*, a term which refers to places where members of majority groups feel that they can act in ways that contradict the agenda of the formal organization in regard to inclusion and diversity.[10] I will return to this theme in Chapter 6.

The spy

One theme in "The hate meeting" was that the commander appeared to think that it was important to identify and do something about possible

homosexuality. The next experience has the same theme. Annika – who worked in Arvid's drug squad – tells about how the leadership wanted to find out if she was a lesbian, and therefore instructed a colleague to spy on her. Annika came on to this story when we were talking about how her street patrol group, of which Arvid was the leader, was not particularly well received. She said that she was not allowed to use any of the civilian cars and had to take her own: "I had a yellow VW bug. Can you imagine it? Damn, how we had to fight when we went out to arrest people." I did not understand if Annika meant that they were treated this way because of their sexual orientation, so I asked if their bosses knew that she was a lesbian and that Arvid was gay:

> I think…No, I would never say anything about someone else [for example, tell someone that Arvid was gay]. They can find out for themselves. But they might have gotten that impression in different ways. Why did I end up in Arvid's group [for instance]…? Because I hadn't been a police officer particularly long then. That street patrol group is something you should work towards, you see.
>
> In any case, then they suddenly changed it so that I was to drive with a girl. So we sat in that old VW bug. And finally, I said: "But" – it was a Friday shift – "fuck, Anna, *why* are you and I sitting here together? It's the wrong set-up" – it's always good to have one guy and one girl, for different reasons. "*Is* it the case that you've been asked to go with me?" "Yes," she said, that was how it was. Because they thought I was going to grope her. You know … so I said: "That's ridiculous," I said. It was, I think, demeaning. Among other things, because it was like they didn't think I had *any* taste. Any. Just because someone was the same sex [I'd hit on her]. The whole thing was just crazy really, all of it. A lot of shit.
>
> […]
>
> *Jens: They wanted to check if you were gay, is that it?*
>
> Yes.
>
> *Jens: Why?*
>
> Only the birds know.
>
> *Jens: General interest?*
>
> Nah, maybe they were going to make things up. I don't know really. But she didn't. But I was surprised when she said how it was. The highest boss then, Nils Karlsson was his name, he had ordered it.
>
> […]
>
> *Jens: So somehow they must have felt that this was a potential threat or problem or something?*
>
> If we rewind even further, it could be a threat in the sense that you could be blackmailed by another state, like the Russians. That's been talked about. At that time. That you would leak something from the

> police. […] At that time, or earlier, they could take advantage of you being gay, because you can't say it at your workplace, for example. Then they can get a lot of information out of you.

So the boss wanted to know if Annika was a lesbian. The reason is somewhat unclear. Perhaps it was related to the intelligence-related threat that Annika mentions. The fact that homosexuality was illegal until 1944 meant that homosexuals could be exploited by enemy states. "The enemy" therefore could find out if a person who held important information was homosexual, and use this as blackmail to force that information out of the person.[11] Homosexuality was not illegal in the 1980s, but it was stigmatized and this story shows that the stigma could produce an organizational risk, while internal espionage also reproduced the stigma.

The idea of Annika being a real threat in this sense is rather doubtful. It is more likely that there was the idea that homosexuals were, in Douglas's words, in the wrong place, "dirt", if they were in the police force. "The hate meeting" event also suggests this. In that story, the managers seemed certain that homosexuality was a bad thing, but were not sure why, and they did not know what to do (one called a "hate meeting" and the other phoned a priest).

"The spy" event illustrates how existent stigmas affect the organization and its members. It means that organizational risks can arise and that colleagues bearing the stigma can be persecuted and singled out, which reproduces the stigma. As I noted in the introduction to this chapter, the sociologist Erving Goffman differentiates between visible and invisible stigmas and how the bearers of visible stigmas are *discredited*, while the bearers of invisible stigmas are *discreditable*.[12] Homosexuality, as it appears in "The spy" story, is an invisible stigma, and Annika is therefore discreditable. Discreditability is key when a person carries an invisible stigma. The consequence is that the person in question has to control information about themselves (and not reveal their orientation, in this case) in order to appear as if they belong to the norm, and to thereby be accepted in the organization. Usually, it involves having to choose whether to tell about one's orientation, whom to tell, whether to lie or not to lie, and feeling compelled to lead a double life.[13]

The next story adds more insight into how bearing a hidden stigma – and thereby being discreditable – can affect life as a police officer. In this story, too, the formally appointed leaders play a key role in the reproduction of the stigma.

The interrogation

I meet Susanne at a café in Malmö in southern Sweden and I ask her to tell me what it had been like to become a police officer and to work as a police officer. She tells me that she entered the police academy in 1989 and how "it was not the atmosphere for telling" that she was a lesbian, even though she

was open about her sexuality in private. So she kept it to herself during her training. And then she thought she was the only one who was gay. But then she met others and, she says, "I realized that I wasn't the only one to have hidden my orientation there [at the police academy]."

After her training, Susanne came to Malmö, and she tells me about the following event, which took place during her time as a trainee. It sheds light on how the hidden stigma and the discreditability that comes with it made her feel that she had to lie in order to stay in the organization, and how the stigma could be a resource for superiors' exercise of power, for stigmatizing leadership:

> I came to Malmö in 1992. Or rather, I was a trainee in 1990, so I was here in 1990 and 1991. And what happened was that I was … I wasn't particularly secretive then, I should say, because I had been open about it for a few years, for five or six years [in my private life], so then it felt dead strange to go into the closet. So I went out with my girlfriend in town and, yeah, there was nothing weird about that. But I know that when police cars drove by, I didn't hold hands and that sort of stuff, because it felt as if it was probably not okay.
>
> Then one day I was called into my supervisor, who wanted to have a talk with me. It was really uncomfortable when they called me, because we were sitting in a car and driving around Malmö, carrying out errands. And then suddenly they called our car and wondered if I was in it, and I was. So I had to go to his office, up in Kronprinsen [a building in Malmö]. And he narrowed his eyes at me and then he said that he had heard a rumor that I had a preference for women, and he wondered if it was true.
>
> And I understood quickly that that [being a lesbian] was nothing that was in my favor. I could tell from his facial expression that this wasn't good for me. So I questioned where this rumor had come from, and he said that several independent sources had said it, and he absolutely wouldn't reveal who they were.
>
> And I didn't have a permanent post then, since I was a trainee and still had to be approved. And I understood there and then, and I have no doubts about it but this is just how it was, that if I had told then, I wouldn't have gotten a job. So I said no. "No, that's not true." And he tried in different ways to get me to admit it, but I didn't. So I sat there for an hour, and finally he said, "Well, we're not getting anywhere. But I just want you to know one thing. If this is true, then you will have a hellish time here."
>
> So I had those words in my head when I went out and completed my trainee position. And I was approved. And I told the girl in my class [who was also a lesbian] what had happened, and that meant that she didn't tell the truth either. So it took, oh, four or five years after that until we had the guts to come out. Or at least me anyway, until I came out about my orientation. So those were my first experiences with the Malmö police.

Just as in "The hate meeting" and "The spy", homosexuality here is reproduced as a stigma, as something that does not belong in the police organization – "if this is true, you will have a hellish time", as Susanne was told. It is depicted as something problematic and undesirable and something that ought to be identified and – at least in "The hate meeting" and "The interrogation" – removed. Homosexuality is made into "dirt", in the anthropologist Mary Douglas's sense. "Dirt" for Douglas is, as noted, "matter out of place".[14] Douglas argues that we have a tendency to create systems that build on certain things being in particular places, and when they are in the wrong place, they become "dirt". As previously pointed out, "dirt" is not to be understood literally but symbolically and contextually. Nothing is dirty in and of itself, but it is created in different ways in different contexts. Dirt, Douglas suggests, is also connected to danger – when things are in the wrong place, we get a sense of chaos and a loss of control. In light of this, these experiences do not necessarily mean that the various managers are promoting the removal of homosexuality from society, but rather that they are reproducing the belief that homosexuality is unsuitable system of the police organization. There, in the police organization, homosexuality is "out of place". The experiences thus express a moral dimension that asserts that within the police organization, heterosexuality is "right/clean/harmless" and homosexuality is "wrong/dirty/dangerous".

In the experiences I have presented up until this point, the stigmatization and exclusion are strikingly powerful and aim more or less openly to identify and remove individual homosexual police officers and to "purify" the rest of the organization from an association with them. Other experiences, including the forthcoming one, illustrate how leadership-based stigmatization does not need to aim at individual police officers but rather at homosexuality as a general phenomenon.

The cruising terror

We meet at Ludvig's home. He came to Malmö after police school in the early 2000s and has been working there ever since. At school, he was open about his orientation, but when he came to Malmö he didn't want to be out. He had learned at the police academy that he would be "labeled" as gay if he was open about it when he came to Malmö: "When you went to the academy, you understood that if you came down [to Malmö] and people knew you were gay, you wouldn't be Ludvig the police trainee but the *gay* police trainee Ludvig. I didn't want that label."

Ludvig continued to keep his orientation to himself, in part because he had bad experiences initially in Malmö. He told me about his first day:

> No, so I chose to come down [without being out]. And then it [my view] was confirmed that first day, actually. It sounds like a tall tale but… I got a locker next to an older gentleman, and I'm standing there, about

> to hang up my things. It was my first day. And so he says: "Do you want to know my worst memory from my police career?" "Well, tell me" [I said] and I continued to hang up my things. "It was when a fag spat on my boots. They fuck monkeys and stuff like that, you know." So then it was: "Shit, welcome to the police in Malmö, Ludvig." So instead of saying anything, I just said: "Okay, but that wasn't so bad, just a little spit." But he was like: "Yes, it was, but fags are so fucking disgusting." […] I thought then: "Shit, I definitely can't say anything."

Ludvig's first impression of his new workplace was not great, in other words. He points out how this welcome made the police seem to be a homophobic workplace, which made him think it was best to remain silent about his sexual orientation. But then Ludvig says that he ended up in a good working group where he was "rather open" and that generally things worked out with his colleagues. At the same time, he has a number of opinions about the culture and the specific jargon within the police force, and when he told me about that, he shared the following experience:

> Well, but the culture and jargon are not, I don't know. It's not so damned pleasant. You know, in Kungsparken [King's park], or on Kung Oskars väg [King Oskar's road], in the bushes, between the Mariedal football pitch and the turbine, there's a bit of a cruising area. And someone had biked [through the park], lots of people who live in the areas of Västra hamnen or Slottstaden biked there.
>
> Then there was this a colleague who was a slightly higher rank who thought he'd been attacked because someone had said something like: "Do you want to come in?" or he'd seen something, I don't know what. So when we got to the briefing, he says: "Yeah, tonight so…", because we always had the briefing where the commander said: "Tonight we're going to check cycle lights or stop signs", or whatever it was he chose. But then he chose: "We're going to terrorize the fags" that were in Slottsparken or in Kung Oscars park there. Because it was unpleasant and creepy. So we were supposed to interrupt them, drive in with our cars and headlights and this and that.
>
> And I was just like: "Yeah, what is it, like, does it bother anyone if they're there? As long as they clean up after themselves and don't throw condoms and papers and shit so what the hell does it matter if they're in the bushes?" "Yeah, they're so fucking disgusting, so they have to be interrupted. So tonight we're going to interrupt all the fags in Kung Oscars park" [he said]. And then I felt a little: "What the fuck?" But I didn't say anything more, nothing more than asking why, if they were bothering anyone. But it was just because someone who was like a half-commander had seen something, or maybe he was scared of his own sexuality. If he'd gotten that question when he biked past one night, I don't know. But the bottom line was that we were going to go there and disturb them.

Jens: How long ago was this? It must be after 2000 anyway.

Yeah, 2008 maybe. So then someone said: "You're not running there are you, Ludvig? [in the bushes]" "No, and if I had then I wouldn't have told you anyway."

Jens: This commander, did he know you were gay?

Yes, I think so.

Jens: Honest at least … But didn't anyone else say anything?

No.

Jens: Was there any activity there [on Kung Oskars väg [King Oskar's road]] from the police?

I can say that I didn't go there at any rate.

Jens: No, no, I can understand that. So you don't know.

No idea, really. I just remember that briefing. Because that's the kind of thing you remember, that's been engraved in your mind.

Ludvig's experience of exposure (and also of his first day at work) expresses general and indirect stigmatization. The way the officer reacts to the approach in the park is related to stigma at the societal level, but it has consequences in the police organization.

First, it shows how exclusion can happen when a stigma is used by a leader as a resource for the exercise of power. Ludvig is excluded because he carries the same stigma as the person who approached the commander in the park. It's unclear if the commander knew that Ludvig is gay, but if he knew, then it discredits Ludvig, and if he didn't know, then Ludvig found out that he was discredit*able*, in Goffman's terms. In both cases, an exclusionary pressure is created.

Second, the briefing illustrates that stigma can affect the way the police work. During the briefing, the commander chose for them to focus on interrupting any activities in the cruising area. The experience shows the problem of "overpolicing" of certain societal groups, which was mentioned in Chapter 1, and brings us back to both the period of criminalization and the 1950s' focus on "indecency". Spending time "terrorizing the fags" is, to say the least, a doubtful use of police resources both judicially and in terms of efficiency, and it is not hard to understand that homosexuals' trust in the police would decrease if they experience this sort of treatment.

Third, the belief that homosexuality is seen as "dirt" is expressed in the briefing, "dirt" that creates disorder both in public society (the park) and within the police. In common with "The hate meeting", the commander's order to "terrorize the fags" in the park seems like a purification ritual, which the commander sets in motion with the aim of restoring order. The very existence of the ritual is a manifestation – a concrete expression – of the conception that homosexuality is "dirt". If this conception did not exist, the ritual would not be possible. The ritual may make the commander feel "cleaner", but the stigma associated with homosexuality is reproduced.

And fourth, the briefing is an illustration of how homophobic behavior can go unchallenged, despite the commander acting as if homosexuals do not exist in the organization, as if they should not exist there, and as if they should not exist openly in society either. Just as in "The hate meeting", the silence of the collective makes exclusion possible. Ludvig did question the point of interrupting (homo)sexual activities in bushes, but his comments did not seem to have any great effect and no one else appears to have protested. "The LGBTQ+ voice" – which I will discuss more in the next chapter – was not particularly strong, the commander's homophobic behavior was allowed to go largely unchallenged, and the stigma was allowed to live on.

Collegial stigmatization

The examples mentioned up until this point have been about "stigmatizing leadership", about how people in leading positions within the police can behave in ways that stigmatize homosexuals. But stigmatization is not created only by leaders within the police but also by colleagues at the same hierarchical level. What follows are two experiences that illustrate this. The first shows how colleagues distanced themselves from Henrik when he chose to come out, and the second is about how a colleague's actions in regard to homosexuality in police work contributed to Johan choosing not to be open about his orientation at work.

The Christmas party

Henrik works in Stockholm. He is around 50 years old, a manager, and has worked for the police since the middle of the 1980s. He wanted to be a police officer since he was a child. But he did not know that he was gay when he became a police officer, and he figured that being gay and being a police officer didn't go together: "I was so determined to become a police officer, and then you *cannot* be gay. So I decided not to be that [gay]." Henrik, however, figured out that he was gay when he had been a police officer for a couple of years, at the end of the 1980s. He was chatted up by a guy on a bus, and then he understood, and broke up with his girlfriend. But it was not until 1995 that he decided to tell his workplace that he was gay:

> But it took many years. In 1995, I decided at Christmas party to tell my colleagues. So basically I told everyone at once, at a party at the police station. I told all my shift buddies that I was gay. It was because, or a lot because, I'd met a guy then, and I had a pretty serious relationship. And I couldn't be quiet anymore. Everyone was talking about their relationships, and I never got to talk about David. And we'd bought a summer home and everything. Eventually it just became too much.
>
> At this Christmas party, I can say I wasn't totally sober, I decided to do it. There were two reactions that I remember. One was my boss, who

took me aside and asked if this was really a good idea. And he said: "I'm the one who's going to have to take the shit for this, I'm the one who's going to have all the difficult conversations," Robban, my then-boss, said. And then another guy, named Magnus, who was a dog handler, or rather he's still a dog handler, and he said: "I'll never shower with you again," he said.

And that was really strange, because Magnus and I had spent a lot of time together. I'd been at his house a few times and we got on well. But… he actually never showered with me again [laughs], if I think about it. Magnus called – as I said, it was a Christmas party – the day before Christmas Eve, he actually called me. And in his own way, I guess he apologized, because he said that, or he talked about everything else but that. And I was just waiting for him to say something, and apologize, or say something about it, but he never said anything but ended the conversation: "So, listen. Now I have to go take a shit. Bye." So that was it. I remember that word-for-word. And then he hung up. And we haven't had any contact since then. He moved to another place and worked… and…well, he took it hard, I guess.

Robban, my boss, who said that he was going to have a hard time, he called me up a few years later. And he was drunk, and it was three in the morning, and he was crying on the phone, and he was so fucking regretful. He'd been thinking about it for all those years, that he hadn't supported me but rather that he thought it was difficult for *him*. And this must have been ten years later. I'd been best man at a wedding. So the night after the wedding, I was totally exhausted, and then he called and wanted to talk about it. I didn't have the energy to talk about it, because I was so damned tired. I said: "Don't worry, it doesn't matter. It's history." But he gets in touch regularly. He emails me and wants me to come and visit.

The reactions from Magnus and Robban illustrate how homosexuality is constructed as dirt by presenting it as an organizational problem to be avoided. Robban, the boss, almost overly explicates the "dirt" when he refers to Henrik's open sexuality and the consequences of him coming out as "shit" that he has to clean up. And Henrik's colleague Magnus's behavior also shows this by physically distancing himself from Henrik ("I'll never shower with you again"). In terms of stigma, this story highlights how a person can go from discreditable to discredited. Magnus and Robban's response to Henrik coming out indicates that his value has decreased, from a regular police officer to a problematic police officer.

A point that Henrik raises is that both Magnus and Robban regret their actions. In their own ways, they try to tone down the stigma. But Henrik emphasizes how hard it was for them to express that. One, Robban, waited ten years and then chose to phone when he was drunk. The other, Magnus, never really managed to express an apology at all but instead talked about

"everything else but that". Henrik interpreted this as an attempt at an apology, but a rather unsuccessful one. Henrik's way of talking about the attempt shows that he felt the conversation was not serious ("'So, listen. Now I have to go take a shit. Bye.' So that was it. I remember that word-for-word."). Robban's apology – in the middle of the night – was also unserious. These attempts to tone down the stigma certainly indicate that the people in question are regretful. But their method of offering apologies – hidden in drunkenness and "shit-talk" – emphasize how problematic homosexuality in the police organization was for Magnus and Robban, and the stigma thus tends to be reproduced rather than toned down.

Initially, coming out was a negative experience for Henrik. When he was not out, he felt more like one of the gang: "During the time when I didn't live as a gay man, I didn't think it was particularly hard. I went along with the talk they had." When his sexuality was exposed, Henrik became "a police officer and gay", and not just a police officer: "Because suddenly I wasn't one of them anymore. Suddenly I was something else, which they didn't understand. Which I thought was hard." This exposure is particularly evident within the police, according to Henrik, because it is normal to talk a lot about each other:[15]

> We have a culture where we talk a lot about each other within the police. It happens very, very quickly. If you've said once that you're a certain way or if you've made a mistake in some way, it's with you all…If I were going to apply for a job in Skåne, for example, then they'd know within a week who I am, and that I'm gay and all that.

Henrik expresses something that relates to the spreading of negative gossip that was depicted in "The hate meeting". Whether it is about negative gossip in Henrik's case is not clear, but thinking of Magnus and Robban's reactions, it is reasonable to suspect that it could be here too. Collegial gossip can be stigmatizing, which is illustrated by the next story, which comes from Johan.

The picture

I meet Johan at his workplace in Stockholm. He started working as a police officer in the early 1990s and he is one of two interviewees who are not out about their orientation. I knew before the interview that Johan was not open because he was the only person to respond to an advertisement I placed in *Polistidningen* (The police union magazine), looking for respondents who were police officers and LGBTQ+ people, but not open about it.[16] Johan probably felt the need to explain why he had not come out, because his response when I asked how it had been to work as a police officer was characterized by how he had felt that it was obvious for him not to tell.

I will let Johan tell the story in his own words, as his tale is unusually coherent and rich in detail. He explains how it came about that he did not want to be out about his orientation and he offers insight into a non-heterosexual person's experience of police work in Stockholm at the early 1990s. The story starts with Johan's general impressions of coming to Stockholm and it culminates, one could say, with an incident in which a good colleague, Johan's best buddy, expresses homophobic views when he catches sight of a homoerotic picture.

> In that world [in the early 1990s], I was probably like most people. I kept quiet about my orientation. Or, well, kept quiet, that's what you did. There were a few, that's how I experienced it when I was young anyway, there were a few who talked. […] For me, it was obvious not to say anything. It was something I never even considered, because you didn't do that. I didn't do that. I'm not one of those who are on the barricades. I just lived my life, so to speak. So I completely separated it. It was like I had two life stories. This came automatically to me. I naturally didn't say anything about what I did in my private life or who I spent time with or that I had a male partner then, which I did. We lived together.
>
> *Jens: When was this?*
>
> 1990. 1990, 1989 were all the interviews and stuff, and then I started in '90. And I didn't say anything. It was like, the atmosphere and the… When I was a teenager and came in to Stockholm and began to be part of this environment, it was often a hateful attitude. I have experienced it, or I experienced it just like everyone else. There was no, there weren't any happy pride parades. It was just a bad atmosphere. And so that meant that you stayed [away], or I did that anyway, I was careful. It was something I'd never tell. It was something I felt it was obvious not to tell. I had a lot of practice at it. So I had no troubles doing it. That's more or less how it was for me.
>
> And sometimes things happened, like people asked [about relationships]. Within the police force, maybe especially then, but maybe now too, there were always loads of people who found partners within the police. Loads of people had relationships. I've never had that. Maybe because I separated [private life and work life]. […] Maybe that was a reason for it being like that. And then in the beginning people sometimes wondered: "But what the hell, bring your girl to parties", and so on. No, can't. You become a master of things like that, playing that game, at that time.
>
> And then I also felt that it depends a little on how things turn out. I want to feel what it is like at work: "Is there a chance [of coming out] or not?" Like that, you know. Almost automatically in some way.
>
> So then I noticed where I worked, here in Stockholm at the police station, I was down in southern Stockholm, with fucking good people. Stereotypical Swedes [*Riktiga svennar]* who were police officers.
>
> […]

But, it was also obvious that this [Johan's homosexuality] wouldn't fit in. I noticed that immediately. No way. There was no one who was out, there was no one, it wasn't talked about, wasn't discussed, it was completely absent. So I felt it's the same thing it's always been. I'll take care of it here on my side, and then, like, never tell. And then it naturally leads to, if you've been going down that path, it's hard to change. Why should I change it? And I'm kind of, I'm very sensitive about my personal integrity, I want to keep certain things to myself, I'm not the type to, like, spew it out. Many of the people I've worked here with for decades, they don't know everything about me. So the result was that I continued on that track over the years.

And then it was also so that, every time something happens that is negative…Say that in the south suburbs, where I was a uniformed police officer for many years. You go there because there's a fight in an apartment, it's that kind of typical thing, in the big housing estates. And sometimes you get there and it's a violent fight, and it turns out that it's two guys who live there. Then immediately it turns into a funny story. I got there, thought it was suspicious when we met them both, we thought immediately, and it turns out it was two gays fighting, you know. So then it was turned into a funny story. Then you understand: "Oh, okay." So I had it confirmed to me. And everything like this, and it's little stings like that, and you get rather sensitive. And every time a thing like this happened, then it's yet another: "Yeah, so I won't say anything. I'll keep this to myself."

And then it's also strange, because in that way it becomes something ugly. I don't think that myself, of course, but it still gets strange: "Why should I [come out]?"

[…]

Then when I moved into the city here in Stockholm, central Stockholm, when was it, '97. Seven years out there [in the south suburbs]. Here in the city the atmosphere was stone hard. It was so clear. Here people talked openly about "fucking fags", and it was like, there are places, places that I knew people could go to in town [gay clubs], places you drove past and pointed out or went into as police officers and it was like: "Here, look here, what fucking trash." So it was unbelievably brutal. They were clear. And it made it like: "No, it's completely out of the question [to come out]."

And I think it was a little shocking for me. Because I was used to sensible people, out in the south suburbs where we worked. And then this, it was a stone-hard attitude. And I felt, there is no way [I will come out]. And I felt that, the team I worked in then, if I'd come out there, it would never have been possible. That was my direct understanding: I would never have been accepted. I would have had to move. Right or wrong, but that was the impression I had.

> *Jens: What were the indications of that? You said that they went to places and pointed out clubs. Was it gay clubs or what?*
>
> Yes, they were gay clubs. "Look at that fucker coming out of there, how fucking disgusting." And for example, we had, now there will be a lot of details but, I was a homicide investigator for many years. That's probably what I still identify with. That was what we were doing. So it happened that we had murders, murders with guys who were homosexual. We were at their house and looking at the apartment, to find traces, like, who is the perpetrator? Then in this case, there were films, you can tell it's a gay guy who lives there. And so then once I was with one of my best buddies at work, he comes into this flat. And he sees a photo of a guy. A picture, an attractive guy, and he says: "Ugh, fuck! Fucking hell! We can't even stand here." And then I know, it's not the time to go, "So, you know, there's a little thing I want to tell you about."

Just as in the earlier experiences, homosexuality is depicted as "dirt", as something undesirable and abnormal, that creates disorder and does not fit into the police. But in Johan's story, as in Henrik's to some extent, it is not primarily superiors but rather colleagues on the same hierarchical level that are behind the homophobia. For Johan, the feeling of exclusion and the decision to remain quiet seems to have been created gradually through negative experiences ("And every time a thing like this happened, then it's yet another: 'Yeah, so I won't say anything. I'll keep this to myself.'"). First it was through the experience of an unspoken norm that homosexuality does not belong in the police (in the south suburb: "it was also obvious that this [Johan's homosexuality] wouldn't fit in"), but then through explicit homophobia (in the city: "Here people talked openly about "fucking fags" […] "what fucking trash."). The discreditability is made clear here. Johan had to learn how to control information about himself and to devote time to doing it ("You become a master of things like that, playing that game") in order to avoid being discredited.

In addition, as in "The cruising terror", this experience illustrates how police work can be affected by the stigma. Given the way the colleague acted when he realized that it was a gay guy living in the apartment – he expressed disgust about being at the scene of the crime because of the victim's sexual orientation ("Ugh, fuck! Fucking hell! We can't even stand here.") – this highlights the problem that certain social groups can be "underpoliced" (see Chapter 1), for example by not investigating crimes against these groups as thoroughly.[17]

Up until this point, I have shown how stigmatization can be exercised by both managers as well as colleagues on the same level. This of course has negative consequences for those who carry the stigma: when you keep it secret, you can feel discredit*able* and when you "come out" you can be discredited. To illustrate possible consequences of the former, the feeling of being discreditable, the last experience in this chapter is about a police

officer who was not open, the consequences this had for him, and how he and some of his colleagues dealt with this.

The code language

When a person is aware that they carry a stigma, but others do not know it, they are discreditable. Goffman writes that things that are routine, things that people without the stigma do not have to think about (such as talking about one's private life) become problems that must be dealt with for the bearer of the stigma. This creates various methods connected to information control,[18] as in "The picture" above. Should you tell or not, lie or not, and who should you tell or not tell?

Lars in the forthcoming story has chosen not to tell and is therefore discreditable, in Goffman's terms. Instead of making his stigma public, Lars tries to "pass"[19] as a heterosexual at work, while living as a gay man in his private life. When these two worlds meet, the consequences of the stigma are expressed. The stigma is always in the background and it affects Lars' existence. The possibility that he might move from discreditable to discredited affects his actions and his relationship to the police force in a rather complex way, as the story shows.

It is Arvid, who told me about "the hate meeting", who also told me the following story. He said that many of his colleagues who were gay were "terrified" of being found out. At the Södermalm police station, there were a handful of gay police officers when Arvid worked there, but it was basically only Arvid who was open. The others worked very hard not to have their sexuality revealed. "They sank into the sofas so they almost disappeared," Arvid told me, and he said that when he and his colleagues drove a police car on Klara Norra Kyrkogata (a street where there are a number of gay clubs), "the closet gays always turned their backs to the police cars, when we came driving, so that they wouldn't be recognized."

This secrecy means, among other things, that these homosexual colleagues, out of fear that they might be found out, could not themselves call the police if they needed help. The risk of being discredited was perceived as too great. If you involve the police, you run the risk of ending up in an investigation and then details revealing your private life could spread throughout the organization. But the gay police officers often had other gay colleagues who knew about their orientation, and Arvid says that they "looked out for each other". They had a secret code to indicate that they needed help, which comes out in the following story, in which Lars, one of Arvid's colleagues, went home with a guy who turned out to be violent:

> When we were out and … Some friends, Lars and I and some others, we had a secret code language. So when he was out and had picked up someone [a man] and took him home, he lived in a house, so if something happened, we'd agreed that we'd have a code. In case he phoned

in the middle of the night, he'd say: "Yeah, I hope the weather is nice tomorrow," and then I'd know.

And on one such occasion, I went out [to Lars's place], and then he'd brought home a guy and it had backfired. He was going to make a call from Lars' phone to his cousins in Japan or whatever it was. And he was sitting naked there, a beefy guy and everything. But he was high on something, I suspect. And Lars, he was so worried. But we threw that guy out, and his clothes after him. And then he was running around the neighborhood, banging on doors. And people called the police and they came and took him. But it was such a secret…we didn't dare, he didn't dare to say: "You know, I've brought home this guy and…"

Jens: So he didn't dare to call the police as ordinary …

No, exactly. Nah, never. He wouldn't do that. Because then he'd, it would be a thing in town, so people would be talking about it.

This story says something about the consequences of being discreditable as part of the stigma, here expressed through the feeling that you should not be open about your sexual orientation. A consequence of this is of course that you cannot talk about your private life at work in a natural way. But the consequence illustrated in this story has implications on the judicial level. Lars does not phone the police when he gets in a tricky situation that risks revealing his sexual orientation. The silence around sexuality could (and can) therefore be linked to a number of problems, and in extreme cases, it could produce an outsiderness that involves not having access to societal institutions in the same way as those who live openly. In extreme cases, it can be about life and death.

Conclusion

Firstly, this chapter offers insight into how the exclusion of homosexuality from the police force can happen through the stigma being used and reproduced as a resource for the exercise of power. I have shown how exclusion can be part of the leadership. In the experiences presented, there has been baiting of homosexuals, negative gossip, and bosses who do not dare to speak up ("The hate meeting"). There has also been the outing of homosexuals and the presentation of them as an organizational problem ("The spy", "The interrogation"), and interrogation regarding sexual orientation combined with more or less direct orders to leave the organization ("The interrogation"). There was also the general stigmatization of homosexuality through the order to "terrorize the fags" in the park ("The cruising terror"). That last story links to the police's historical role of punishing those who engage in same-sex sexual relationships and suggests that a historically constructed stigma can cast long shadows.

Collegial relationships can also be the source of exclusion. Here, too, it can be about constructing homosexuality as an organizational problem,

as in "The Christmas party", where Henrik was told that his boss would have "to take the shit" for Henrik choosing to come out. Exclusion can also come through distancing in the form of expressed homophobia, as in "The Christmas party", where his colleague said: "I'll never shower with you again". Or in "The picture", where the colleague said: "Ugh, fuck! Fucking hell! We can't even stand here" at the sight of a homoerotic picture, and other colleagues talked about "fucking fags". Sometimes the homophobia even expresses disgust, as in "The picture" and "The cruising terror", where on his first day at work, Ludvig was met with the claim that "fags are so fucking disgusting", and that they "fuck monkeys". Together, these stories – both in regard to leadership-based exclusion and collegial-based exclusion – are examples of stigmatization and the construction of homosexuality as "dirt", as something that does not belong within the police.

Second, these experiences emphasize the problematic consequences of the exclusionary processes, at both the individual and organizational levels. On an individual level, these processes can make it difficult for police officers to participate in conversations about private lives, as Henrik ("The Christmas party") noted: "Everyone was talking about their relationships, and I never got to talk about David." It can also encourage police officers to lie, as Susanne ("The interrogation") lied about her orientation out of fear that she would lose her job. In Goffman's terms, the processes of exclusion can make police employees engage in information control, which takes time and is emotionally demanding: Johan ("The picture") said, for example, "You become a master of things like that, playing that game", and Henrik ("The Christmas party") expressed how he "went along with the talk they had" in order not to show that he was gay. The processes of exclusion can even contribute to police officers (and others) avoiding asking for help from the police out of fear that their sexual orientation will be revealed, as in "The code language". At the organizational level, all the experiences show how the processes of exclusion complicate relationships between colleagues. "The hate meeting", "The spy", "The interrogation", "The cruising terror", "The Christmas party", "The picture", and "The code language" all show how the friction that arises in the wake of stigma takes its toll on collegial cooperation. In addition, the processes of exclusion may produce overpolicing of gays, as in "The cruising terror", in which the chief decided that the people on shift should "terrorize the fags" in the park, or underpolicing, as in "The picture", where a colleague's distaste for the murder case because of the victim or perpetrator's sexual orientation made one wonder if the investigation was carried out with the same level of care as it otherwise would have been.[20] Thus, although it is primarily individuals who are affected, the processes of exclusion can also affect police *work* itself.

In this chapter, dirt and stigma have been used as theoretical concepts. In addition to exemplifying the process of exclusion, all the experiences presented illustrate the norm that homosexuality is considered "dirt". Perhaps "The hate meeting" is the clearest example, as the fact that the chief must

purify himself emphasizes that homosexuality is understood not just to be in the wrong place but also as something that "soils" (otherwise he would not have needed to cleanse). Here, the dirt phenomenon is almost literal. Using the concepts of dirt and stigma, the chapter aims to elucidate the processes of exclusion in a more general way. What Douglas and Goffman present as general theories can be seen in these specific empirical examples, in the police organization.

Finally, to be clear, it might be worth mentioning two things. First, the expressions of exclusion that appear here are quite extreme, and it may be worth clarifying that the point of this chapter is not to show that exclusion of this kind dominates the Swedish police, but rather to show that exclusion exists and how it happens. The next chapter is about how exclusion and inclusion can coexist, and it adds nuance to some of the findings discussed above. Second, most of these stories of exclusion take place in the 1980s and 1990s, and that might lead us to think that this is "just" history. There is an aspect of time that should be highlighted: culture in the past allowed stronger expressions of the exclusion of homosexuality, both in society and in the police. At the same time, this change should not be exaggerated or interpreted as meaning that it is time to forget the past. I will comment on this issue of time and the "persistence" of exclusion mechanisms in Chapter 8, but already here three things can be briefly noted:

- *Not all* the stories in this chapter are "old" – "The cruising terror" takes place around 2008.
- Many of the police officers who subjected others to these mechanisms of exclusion in the 1980s and 1990s (and those who were subjected to them) still work within the organization, which many of the interviewees mention, often in passing ("he is an even higher boss now"; "he is still a dog handler").
- Historical events and phenomena still affect today's social life. Historical exclusion provides the basis for possibilities and understanding of exclusion and inclusion today.

Notes

1. The sociologist Erving Goffman (1963, p. 3) describes stigma as an "attribute" that is discrediting. He emphasizes as well that stigma is relational and is created in social contexts, which means that something that is a stigma/discrediting in one context may not be so in other contexts.
2. Meisenbach & Hutchins (2020).
3. Goffman (1963, p. 138).
4. See, for example, Prasad et al. (2007).
5. Douglas (1966, p. 44).
6. Douglas (1966, p. 45). Douglas writes, "In short, our pollution behavior [which she describes as the categorizing of certain things and ideas as "dirt"] is the reaction which condemns any object or idea likely to confuse or contradict cherished classifications."

7. Goffman (1963).
8. As noted, all names are pseudonyms.
9. Peterson & Uhnoo (2012).
10. Loftus (2008, p. 764).
11. See, for instance, Norrhem et al. (2015, pp. 139 fwd.).
12. Goffman (1963).
13. See Burke (1994) for a study of British police officers, in which many homosexuals acted like heterosexuals in the police organization, while they lived as homosexuals in their private lives. Having a double life played a key role.
14. Douglas (1966, p. 44).
15. That people talk a lot about each other within the Swedish police is something expressed in other studies too. In Wieslander's (2016) report about internal conversational cultures within the police, she notes, for instance, that it is a workplace with a lot of rumors. One of her respondents expresses it more poetically: "This is a real fucking hen's house! Rumors and gossip here and there and it's totally hopeless" (Wieslander 2016, p. 21).
16. *Polistidningen* is a magazine for members of Polisförbundet (The Police Union). The Police Union is a union for police officers, of which 94 percent are "active police officers" in Sweden (Polisförbundet 2020). In light of this, it is notable that only one person replied. On the other hand, it is unclear how many police officers read *Polistidningen* and hard to know how many notice an advertisement that only takes up an eighth of a page.
17. See Finstad (2016).
18. Goffman (1963, especially Chapter 2).
19. *Passing* is a term used by, among others, Goffman (1963, pp. 24, 74 fwd.), when he analyses how individuals who bear a stigma handle information about themselves that can reveal the stigma.
20. To be clear, it is worth emphasizing that the colleague's distancing of themselves in "The picture" had no legal grounds. This differentiates it from situations where one could imagine that many police officers might feel "distaste", such as for murder, rape, or child abuse. In these cases, the distaste is about something that is illegal (such as child abuse). That is not the situation in "The picture", but rather it is about the plaintiff and/or perpetrator's (completely legal) lifestyle.

4 The struggle between exclusion and inclusion

When I analyzed my interviews and asked myself if the police officers' stories were about inclusion or exclusion, it was often hard to come up with a definitive answer. The stories were rarely about *either* exclusion *or* inclusion. Rather, it was often that both exclusionary and inclusionary pressures coexisted. The stories in the previous chapter illustrate how sometimes the exclusionary pressure dominates. In this chapter, I offer stories that show how the exclusionary pressures can compete with inclusionary ones. To put it another way, I want to show how attempts at the exclusion of homosexuality are not always allowed to stand unchallenged.

To show this, I introduce new theoretical concepts. This is not because stigma and dirt are irrelevant, but because they are not enough to elucidate the stories presented in this chapter. Here it is less clear whether homosexuality is a stigma or is generally "out of place" (dirt) in the police organization. A better general description of the stories in this chapter is that they express how there is a "struggle" playing out between exclusion and inclusion where *attempts* at exclusion are countered by attempts at inclusion. To capture this more concretely, I use the concepts of *silencing* and *voice*.

Silencing means exerting exclusionary pressure by trying to prevent a particular person or societal group from making their voice heard, in various ways, and thereby preventing this person or group's interests from getting onto the agenda.[1] In the context of this book, then, it is about trying to silence the voice of gay police officers. Voice, as it is described by the economist Albert Hirschman, is in turn about exercising inclusionary pressure by speaking up, expressing dissatisfaction, and speaking for one's cause, directly to those trying to silence or to the leadership, or to other authorities who can affect the leadership.[2]

In this chapter, I also use the concept *heteronormativity*, which, simply put, means the assumption that heterosexuality is the normal and preferred sexuality.[3] Heteronormativity should be understood both as a noun (a norm, a system) and a verb (in the sense that it is something that is done). In terms of the verb, heteronormativity is something that is created and recreated and expressed through actions. Thus, it is about the *ways* in which heterosexuality is presented as the normal, natural, and preferred sexuality.[4]

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-4

This understanding builds on the argument of scholars Candace West and Don Zimmerman that *gender* – in the sense of differences between masculinity and femininity – is something that is "done" and that is expressed through social interactions, rather than something one is born with.[5] (To show the focus on action and "doing", one perhaps should use the term heteronormalizing rather than heteronormativity.) For example, gender is done through how we routinely dress boys and girls differently. This reproduces the norm that boys and girls ought to dress in different ways. In the same way, we can say that heteronormativity is done if we routinely carry out actions that are based on the idea that people are heterosexual, such as assuming that a man's partner is a girlfriend/wife or by joking about gays in a group of people one does not know, as if one knew that there are no gay people present.

In this chapter, I will show how heteronormativity is done and reproduced by several actors, not just heterosexual but also non-heterosexual police officers. Heteronormativity shows how those who are to be included participate in a rather complex way. Not just as "excluded" or "included" but as participants who may subordinate (especially in the previous chapter) or protest (in this chapter), and also participate by "getting used to" heteronormativity and thereby participating in the normalization of a certain exclusionary pressure.

Silencing, voice, and heteronormativity help us think about the phenomena presented in more general terms. Silencing, of course, does not only happen to homosexuals and not only in the police organization, and heteronormativity pervades many social situations. Even if there are particular features and unique aspects in the experiences presented here, they do not only elucidate the experience of homosexuals in these specific situations, but may also have relevance for understanding more general aspects of inclusion and exclusion in organizations.

I will present seven stories here. The first four – "Cancer", "The poster", "The sauna", and "The convertor" – highlight how silencing and voice compete and thereby how pressures for exclusion and inclusion coexist.[6] The last three – "The support", "The hype", and "No problems" – are to a certain extent in contrast to the stories discussed in the previous chapter; namely, they illustrate how the inclusionary pressure can dominate, but also how inclusion tends to take place within the framework of heteronormativity.

Silencing and voice – Inclusion as a collective process

In this section, I will present four experiences. They come from different police officers and different contexts. Their common denominator is that they contain attempts to silence expressions of homosexuality by constructing it as something undesirable, negative, subordinate, or even sick. But another thing they have in common is that there is a strong response, from the gay police officers themselves and sometimes from others in the organization. One can say that the "LGBTQ+ voice"[7] – which I will hereafter use

as a term to describe a non-heterosexual voice – is stronger here than in the stories from the previous chapter. Through this focus on silencing and voice, these experiences also emphasize that inclusion is a *collective process*; that is, a process that involves several actors.

Cancer

This story depicts homophobic behavior within the police in an informal situation. In this way, it is similar to Ludvig's description of his first day at work in the previous chapter (where he was informed that homosexuals fuck monkeys). There is, however, a difference here in that there is clearer opposition to the homophobic act. In other words, the LGBTQ+ voice is stronger.

I meet Susanne at a café in Malmö. This is the second time we meet. (The first time we met, I did not speak to her about sexual orientation but rather about diversity training within the police that I was observing. This will be discussed in Chapter 6.) I ask her how it had been to work as a police officer. She has a lot to tell me. I included one experience, "The interrogation", in the previous chapter. That story was from the 1990s. She also shared the following experience, which took place in 2011. It became something of a news item in Sweden. Here I will present it as Susanne told it to me, and I include more of her words than was allowed in the press. I want to have the entire story here because it expresses both homophobia and silencing and also how actors other than the individual LGB officer (in this case, chiefs and the media) become important for a counter-voice to be expressed:

> *Jens: You know, I was thinking, earlier you mentioned the cancer story. I've read it in the newspaper, but could you tell me about what happened there?*
>
> Yes, absolutely. At the time, I was responsible for hate crime training and that of course includes hate crimes towards homosexuals. So that was sort of my thing, and everyone knew that, because there was a lot of attention around that training, because it was so appreciated and considered to be good and so on.
>
> Yeah, and so I was going to go home one Friday afternoon, my last day before vacation. And it was late, because I'd been sitting there working through everything that needed to be done. It was seven o'clock or something like that. And so I went through the lunch room in the criminal squad. And two people were sitting there. One was an older man in uniform, and then there was a young female police trainee, who was in the academy. So she was there, doing her training. And I knew her a little, because she'd helped me with the hate crime training. So I walked past [them] and waved and it was, "bye bye" and "have a nice vacation" and "yes, you too" and all that. And then I went around the corner and I stopped there, because I was going to leave a note for my boss, who had an office there. So they didn't see me, and I didn't see them either,

but I could hear their conversation clearly. And so the older policeman said to the younger woman, "Do you know her?" "Yes," she said. "I do." "Yeah, that's a brave girl," he says. And so I stand up a little straighter and think, that's nice to hear. Then he says: "Yes, but I don't like the way she lives." "What," the trainee says, "what do you mean?" And the trainee knew how I lived, because we'd talked about it. "Nah," he said, "you know those homosexuals, they are like a cancer on society."

And then I was like, you know, you can hardly believe it. You have to pinch your arm and think: "Did I hear that correctly?" But I know that I heard it correctly, there's no doubt about that. And then he continued to, like, add fuel to the fire and go on about the police's values and this and that. And normally of course I'd have gone in there and said: "What is this, we need to talk about it", but that Friday afternoon, I was tired and needed to go home and we were going to go out to the country, and I just felt: "I don't have the energy to have that fight, I don't have the energy."

So I sneaked out. I had high heels on that day, so I took them off and sneaked out so they would think I'd left a long time before. And when I then got out to the police station courtyard, then…well, also it was Friday afternoon and I thought there's not a boss in the whole building, like, and to stand and take that conflict with him, well, I didn't feel like it. But then in fact the police authority's third-highest chief came out to the yard, a woman, and she looks at me and then she says: "You look strange. Has something happened?" And so I tell her what had happened and then I think: "Oh, it's good that she came now, she's going to take care of this." But she didn't. She just said: "Ah, screw it, Susanne, and go home and have a good vacation." And then she biked off.

But I couldn't. So I phoned my then-boss and then I went home and wrote a formal memo, you could call it, about what had happened, and then I sent it to the authority. And to make a long story short, they have to act then. But it took four days before they wrote a report on it, and they forgot to mark it as a hate crime. And when it then went to the prosecutor, there was rather sparse information in the report, which, is why, I guess, it was dropped. Nothing happened. I appealed at the, what's it called, the unit…the national unit for police cases. But the email I sent had, apparently, so they claimed at any rate, not been received. So it was never appealed. What the authority in Skåne decided in regard to this case was that the police chief in Malmö was going to have a conversation with this colleague. If this ever happened, I have no idea.

He then retired, that man. But before he did, he kept working in the reception. That was his workplace, the reception. Which I think is very scary, because that's where everyone goes to file reports. And that's true also of homosexual men or women who have experienced everything from rape to whatever it might be. And they meet him, who clearly has this view, and I think that's very scary.

So in this story, homophobic statements were made, and Susanne tried to raise her voice in different ways, but it was a demanding process without success. First, she points out that it was hard to "have that fight" directly – "I just felt: 'I don't have the energy to have that fight'". Then she emphasizes how no one seemed to want to do anything: she tried to tell her boss, but the boss did not get involved and just said: "Ah, screw it, Susanne"; she wrote a message but "it took four days before they wrote a report on it" and "there was rather sparse information" in it; and she appealed, but they said that the email had "not been received". Finally, Susanne pointed out that it was "very scary" that the man who made that comment still worked in reception and, potentially, received reports from "homosexual men or women who have experienced everything from rape to whatever it might be". With this story, Susanne also touches on the democratic problem of homophobia in police organizations, which I mentioned in Chapter 1. An implicit point in her story is that if there are homophobic people in the reception, the police run the risk of underpolicing (providing insufficient protection to) non-heterosexual citizens.

Support from her own organization appears to be almost non-existent in Susanne's story. On the other hand, there was – after some time – support from another player: the media. Susanne continues:

> Initially there was no attention paid to it since no one had gone to the media about it, including me. But when the authority's head lawyer was going to announce the Skåne police's decision about it, then there was a commotion, because then Sydnytt [local TV] was there and wanted to know about it, and he announced that no measures would be taken. And *that* was announced on Sydnytt and there was an extreme amount of news around it throughout the country, and there were also some interviews with me.

Finally, then, Susanne's internal efforts (calling her boss, writing a memo, appealing) led to her getting to express her voice, but not in her own organization. Instead, it was Sydnytt (and also some Swedish newspapers, such as Sydsvenskan, Aftonbladet, and Dagens Nyheter) that thought this ought to be addressed, and they became a medium for Susanne's voice.

The moral of this story is that an audience is key for a voice to be heard. In this case, it was the external audience – the media – that acted as voice amplification and inclusive force. Indeed, Susanne points out that internally there was an ideal of silence in the form of a "nothing to worry about"-atmosphere, while the external audience felt that there was a lot to worry about.

The poster

As with "Cancer", this story expresses homophobia and an attempt at silencing in an informal context. It is also similar to "Cancer" in that an

(LGB) officer reacts, resists, and gets support. However, it is different in that the support this time comes from inside the organization.

I travel up to meet Emma, who works in mid-Götaland (central Sweden). We meet at her workplace. The interview goes very smoothly in that Emma talks about what it has been like to become and work as a police officer, almost without me having to ask any questions. Emma finished her training at the beginning of the 2000s, and that was also when she realized that she was a lesbian. Among other things, she was in a relationship with a police colleague. She said that there were a number of unpleasant rumors about them before they decided to say at a formal meeting that they were a couple. After that, Emma says, she personally has not experienced anyone treating her negatively or differently because of her orientation. Just as with several other interviewees, she adds: "But what people have said behind my back, I have no idea about." The hetero norm, with its historical stigma, is lurking in the shadows, one might say.

After recounting this, Emma mentions an event that was not aimed at her personally, but rather at a network for LGBTQ+ people within the police that she started:

> However, I started a network for LGBTQ+ people in 2012. And *there*, I've noticed [laughs], by starting that network, I've noticed *a number of times* that there are colleagues who aren't particularly happy that we exist. That we take space, that we're visible. We don't really take up much space, other than putting up a few posters on notice boards informing people that we exist. And those posters aren't left alone. They've been ripped down. I think it's happened around 15 times since 2012 in different places around the county, both in X city and Y city.
>
> *Jens: At police stations?*
>
> At police stations. That's the only place [where we put up the posters], we're an internal network, so we're there just for police employees. Last summer there was someone, whether it was a joke or serious, I don't know, because we don't know who did it, but there was someone who put up a little advertisement for a lotion called *Buttsaver* in Y city. And I thought my head would explode, I mean. I was so fucking angry that I, I didn't know what I would do.
>
> So I called my boss, I was off that day, or rather, I was going to work that night. Phoned my boss and said what had happened and said: "You should be glad I'm not at work now, because then there would be a fucking tornado around the managers on floor four." I was so angry that I…I mean, now it was fucking enough. Now, we hadn't ignored it, but had informed the bosses that our posters weren't allowed to stay up. We'd put them up twelve or fifteen times, and now we'd had enough.
>
> So I said to her: "I don't yet know how, because I have to calm down a little, but I'm going to act on this." I can't be quiet, not when I know there are people like this at work who are just mocking colleagues, to

put it simply. So she didn't know what I was going to do when I hung up [laughs]. So it was brave of her that she didn't tell me not to do anything before we'd talked again.

So that night I wrote a letter, a rather long letter, to everyone who worked for the Police Authority in Y city. I addressed it to everyone, around eight hundred people. I wrote about what had happened, and I attached a photo of the advertisement where it had been put on our poster. First, I was aiming it at the person who had done it. Then I was aiming it at people who knew about it, who don't do anything, who are sitting next to people who are talking, whether it's about us, LGBTQ+ people, or immigrants, or disabled, or Romany, whatever it is. Therefore: "You know exactly who it is who is sitting there, talking shit, and you don't do anything. Therefore you're just as guilty" [I wrote]. Then I aimed it at those who support [me] and wrote: "Without you, I wouldn't have coped. That's just how it is." And then I aimed it at the bosses and wrote: "If nothing is done about this issue, then I'll go to the media. End of story." And then I concluded by again aiming it at the person who had done it, when I wrote: "Thank you for making my workplace worse for me and others like me."

So it got really, really personal, actually. I'm not known for being personal at work, I'm described at a person with rather high levels of integrity. I think within three or four weeks, I got fifty emails from supportive colleagues. So it was very strong, really. The authority responded the very next day.

I went home and slept, with my heart pounding a little, because I didn't know how it would be received [laughs]. And when I got there in the afternoon, I was working that night again, one of the higher bosses came in, he was even the acting county police chief, because the county police chief was on vacation then. So he said that that day, earlier in the day before I got there, he'd organized an extra management team meeting, with the county police chief on the telephone, where they'd decided they were going to react to this, and that they were going to respond that very week. This was on Wednesday. On Friday they put out a message on our intranet saying that they denounced what had happened and that it was completely unacceptable. They also wrote: "Whoever did this, you should know that you're in the minority, and that there are more of us who support the idea of diversity and equality."

As in "Cancer", "The Poster" is about attempts at silencing the expression of non-heterosexuality in an informal context, and an LGBTQ+ person (Susanne and Emma, respectively) who got sad or angry and decided to make their voice heard by protesting.

The importance of the audience's role is also highlighted in both experiences, but in Emma's story, the internal audience shows more variety. On one hand, the internal organization is a source of exclusion. It was colleagues

who tore down and mocked the posters, and it was colleagues who comprised the silent collective, those who "know exactly who it is who is sitting there, talking shit, and you don't do anything". But on the other hand, the internal organization is also a source of inclusion. Emma emphasized how important those who supported her are – "without you, I wouldn't have coped", she said, and she noted that she got "fifty emails from supportive colleagues". The moral is that collegial silence contributes to exclusion, while collegial voices contribute to inclusion.

The collective aspect of inclusion thus emerges in "Cancer" when external players – the media – join the LGBTQ+ voice, while in "The Poster", it is about internal players, along with the media as a threat (as Emma threatens to involve the media if the management does not do anything). It is also notable that in "The Poster", the entire collective is addressed, while in "Cancer" it is primarily about individual managers who can cover it up. When Emma sent out the letter, it would have been very difficult for the leadership to try the "nothing to worry about" approach.

It is also worth noting that just as in "Cancer", "The Poster" touches on the democratic aspects of inclusion, the risk of providing insufficient protection for certain societal groups. Emma pointed out the problem inherent in people talking (negatively) about "LGBTQ+ people, or immigrants, or disabled, or Romany, whatever it is" and wrote that those who do not speak up are "just as guilty". In the letter that Emma sent out (which I have seen), she, among other things, addressed those who vandalized the posters, and she makes the problem clear. This is what she wrote (she refers to those who ripped down the posters as "YOU"):

> I have stood in front of LGBTQ+ people at RFSL [The Swedish federation for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, and intersex rights] in the same uniform YOU might wear, and I have told them that their distrust and fear of the police is generally unwarranted. I've said that they should report things. That they shouldn't be afraid of turning to us. Do YOU understand how I feel like an idiot now? When YOU can't even be civilized towards your own colleagues and treat them well. HOW will YOU treat those I was speaking to?

Emma's message, obviously, is that the point of view that the vandalism of the posters represents affects police work negatively. Emma feels like an "idiot" for having stood there and claimed that the police treat LGBTQ+ people well. How can she claim that when things like this happen? she says. Or, to use the terms from police research, how could she maintain that they would get sufficient protection and are not "underpoliced"?[8]

A last point about Emma's story is that it highlights how it can be considered unproblematic *to be* homosexual but not *to do* homosexuality. Or, as the anthropologist and gender scholar Fanny Ambjörnsson puts it, homosexuals "become problematic when they manifest or insist on their

'deviance'".[9] In other words, according to this perspective, it is considered okay to be gay as long as it is not noticeable or upsets the heteronorm in any way. Starting a network for LGBTQ+ people within the police insists that not all police officers fall into the heteronorm, which in this case provoked a silencing attempt.

The next story also shows how inclusion and exclusion coexist and that a "struggle" takes place: exclusionary pressure is created in an informal situation, an LGB police officer reacts, and then gets support from other parts of the organization.

The sauna

Henrik – who told the story about "The Christmas party" in the previous chapter – also shared this experience from Stockholm. It is about how one of his bosses spoke badly about him in a sauna. Henrik was not in the sauna, but found out what had happened from colleagues, whereupon he acted to sort it out:

> I've been part of a number of tussles, actually, that have been fucking difficult. One of my bosses, he wasn't *my* direct boss but head of another department. I know he was talking shit about me in the sauna on a beer night. And I have quite a few friends in the police, so it's pretty hard to talk shit about me without me finding out somehow. I knew exactly what he'd said, and he'd said: "That fucking fag, we will make sure he gets out of Stockholm." From his district, that is, I would never work [there again].
>
> And when I heard that, I was so *fucking* pissed off that I went to *my* boss and told her this, said that: "I want you to bring him here and we'll talk about it. The alternative is that I'll report him. I have *never* reported a police officer ever, but now I'll sure as hell do it if that fucking man doesn't apologize."
>
> So actually [my boss] called, it was a woman, she called and said to him: "You need to come here." And he came and I was sitting there and so I said: "I've heard what you said. I just want to know if this is true and what you think." And then he said: "Naah, I didn't say that." "No, well, okay" [I said]. "Two people who were in that sauna heard what you said and have spoken to me, and they're prepared to stand up for me, so you don't have any choice. I will report you and then it's over for you." *Then* he said that he'd been drunk, he didn't mean it and sorry and blah blah blah. He is still one of Stockholm's highest police chiefs.
>
> *Jens: Mmm. When was this?*
>
> It wasn't so long ago. 2008.

"Silencing" is a euphemism in this case. If one takes the police chief's words literally, then this is about a desire to physically exclude someone. But what

I want to illustrate is, first, how the police chief expresses that Henrik's voice should go away, and how his sexual orientation is used to discredit him. It is, in other words, an attempt to stigmatize homosexuality by making visible the norm that a "fag" is not desirable in the police organization. The strength of the stigmatization is increased by the fact that it is a relatively senior officer who makes this statement, by the fact that the Swedish police force is a hierarchical organization where there is a tendency to be cautious of questioning superiors[10] and that others in the sauna reasonably notice the chief's attitude, and such things have a tendency to spread within the police,[11] which has a silencing effect on those who might want to express their own homosexuality or to express something positive about homosexuality.

Second, the story shows what a big difference there is between the "nothing to worry about" attitude – which was expressed by the boss who claimed it was just something he said while "drunk" (and by the manager in "Cancer") – and the LGB police officers' own reactions. Henrik emphasized that he'd been so "fucking pissed off" and that he had never reported a colleague during his many years as a police officer, "but now I'll sure as hell do it if that fucking man doesn't apologize". Emma in "The poster" expressed the same thing: "I thought my head would explode" and "I was so angry that I…I mean, now it was fucking enough", and she referred to herself as a "tornado". For Henrik, Emma, and Susanne, these attempts at silencing are something to worry about, something connected to strongly negative feelings.

Third, in contrast to the above points, "The sauna" shows, just as "The poster" did, inclusion as a collective process and the importance of the audience. Henrik got support from his colleagues. It is unclear whether his colleagues said anything in the sauna, but afterward, they were a resource for inclusion by telling Henrik what had happened and by standing up as witnesses on his side.

Finally, we cannot miss Henrik's last point in the story: "He is still one of Stockholm's highest police chiefs."[12] It is as if he wants to say that he got his apology, but that the police organization still protects homophobes and that the "struggle" between inclusion and exclusion continues. The next story also illustrates this "struggle" between inclusion and exclusion, along with showing how the inclusionary pressure is collective.

The convertor

The following story is from Niklas, who was involved in the Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association) when I interviewed him. Here, the focus is on the relationship between a trainee and a supervisor. It was not Niklas himself who dealt with the supervisor in question, but rather he retold this story, which became known to the Gaypolisföreningen. Niklas told me about it when I asked him whether he knew of gay police officers who were not open about their orientation.

Jens: Have you, if you don't include your own experiences, do you know people who are gay but not open about it?

Yes. But much of what I know is from those who are open. But…since I've been part of the Gaypolisföreningen for twelve years, I've met…but it's actually been more females. It was in Västra Götaland [a county in the west of Sweden], there was a woman who, this was in 2004, when a colleague and I started a network called "Network for homosexuals and bisexuals". Then they formed a local network in Västra Götaland. There were four [people]. They were called "the gang of four" then. So there were four openly gay people in Västra Götaland. So there was a woman, who worked at [a police area in Gothenburg] and she said they'd been really opposed to her, they didn't like her because she was a lesbian.

Jens: When was this?

It might have been 2004, 2005. But then a *new* woman came there [to that police area]. And she told her supervisor that she was gay. And he just said: "That can't be *true*. It's not true. We have *four* openly gay people in all of Västra Götaland, and now I'm to have *two* in our district." And he had said that: "But you're so cute and feminine, so you can't be a dyke. But maybe I can help you to change that in various ways."

When we heard this, I asked the guy who told me about it, because they had a network from school where they talked to each other, so I said: "You talk to her and say that we'll get in touch with the management in Västra Götaland, because it can't be like this." She went under[ground]…she didn't reply to his messages and all that, because she didn't believe she'd pass [the training]. She thought she'd be failed and not be able to be a police officer because she was a lesbian.

Jens: She'd fail as a trainee, that is?

Yes. But then it turned out that this came out, and this person, he can't be a supervisor anymore.

One point that comes through in "The converter" is how homosexuality is presented as an organizational problem: "that can't be true", Niklas emphasizes that the supervisor had said when he realized that he was to "have" in his district two of the four openly homosexual people in Västra Götaland. We can recognize this way of treating open homosexuality from "The Christmas party", where, after Henrik chose to come out, Henrik's boss said, "I'm the one who's going to have to take the shit for this". A related point is that the "problem" with homosexuality can be perceived as so large that homosexuals are scared of not passing their program and they stay away from their supervisors, which we also saw in "The interrogation" in the previous chapter, in which Susan found out that she would "have a hellish time here" if it came out that she was a lesbian.

At the same time, though, "The convertor" contains elements of inclusion. Niklas depicts the network at the school as a resource, where they

could talk to each other and by extension talk to Niklas, who was in the Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association). The collective again appears to be important. The closing comment of the story also shows how inclusion in the shape of formal measures can happen. While Henrik in "The sauna" claimed that the police chief in question is "still one of Stockholm's highest police chiefs", here Niklas says "he can't be a supervisor anymore". In "The convertor", then, the silencing ideal did not win out, and the police organization did not protect homophobes.

In sum, the four stories – "Cancer", "The poster", "The sauna", and "The convertor" – together illustrate how both exclusionary and inclusionary pressures exist, and how they come from various central players. The central players are the LGB police officers themselves, colleagues, managers, collegial networks, and external actors, the latter represented by the media. In "Cancer", the exclusionary pressure dominates and Susanne basically stands alone in the internal organizational context. The exclusionary pressure primarily comes from the colleague who considers homosexuals to be like a cancer but also from the boss who – like the silent collective in "The hate meeting" and "The cruising terror" – acts as an indifferent and complacent *audience* and told Susanne to forget about it, go home, and take her vacation. The chief in "Cancer", in other words, hears "the voice" but does nothing to pass it on. Put another way, the boss fails to use *her* voice and encourages Susanne to remain silent, thereby enabling continued exclusion. However, Susanne does not give up but rather insists that the colleague's comment is unacceptable by writing a memo. This, too, does not receive much of a response from the organization. It is only when an external figure – the media – finds out about the incident that it becomes relevant to talk about some kind of inclusionary pressure, besides that which Susanne herself represented.

"The poster" and "The sauna" also express exclusionary pressures. In the former, it consists of attempts to silence the LGBTQ+ network through vandalism and mockery, and in the latter, it is comprised of the manager's statement that the "fucking fag" should get out of Stockholm, meaning Henrik. But in these stories, the inclusive pressure from within the organization is more prominent than in "Cancer". Emma's boss takes Emma's indignation seriously and makes an official statement, in which he writes that the behavior (tearing down the posters) is "completely unacceptable" and that those who did it should know that they "are in the minority". Emma also received support from her colleagues through email after she wrote her letter. Henrik too received internal support, in part from colleagues, who told him what had happened in the sauna and then were prepared to be "witnesses" if Henrik needed them to, and in part from the chief who called the meeting. "The convertor" is similar to "The poster" and "The sauna" in that the attempt at silencing – which included a denial of the trainee's sexual orientation, the assumption that "dykes" cannot be cute, and the suggestion that the supervisor could "help" the trainee

become hetero – received a response from an "LGBTQ+ voice", empowered by networks in the organization: partly from the police academy network, partly from the Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association).

Although Emma and Henrik were strong proponents of responding to the exclusionary pressures, inclusive pressures would have been relatively weak if it were not for internal organizational support. This is undeniably true of the trainee in "The convertor", who herself played a withdrawn role (which is understandable given her vulnerable position as a new officer, not yet in a permanent post and probably unwilling to speak up against superiors unnecessarily). This also shows yet again the *collective* aspect of inclusion. Inclusion can of course be an individual experience, such as an individual experience of belonging and a sense that one's unique characteristics are valued.[13] But as I wrote in Chapter 1, I rather see inclusion as a process that can develop in different ways. In these stories, the collective process developed through interaction between different actors who exercised both exclusionary and inclusionary pressures through attempts at silencing and "voice" respectively. It is in this interaction that inclusion or exclusion is created.

Even if the stories presented up until this point include inclusionary pressure, the exclusionary pressure has come across as quite strong, characterized by strong negative associations and identifications of LGB police officers. Moreover, the inclusionary pressure has worked reactively; that is, as a response to the attempts at silencing. I will finish this chapter with a number of examples where the inclusionary pressure is more proactive and does not need to be provoked by homophobic actions.

Inclusion and heteronormativity

The experiences presented below illustrate how the police organization can appear to be a source of support for gay colleagues. One could say that they are stories of inclusion. At the same time, they are not without elements of exclusion. In addition to collegial support, these stories also express how inclusion happens within a frame of heteronormative culture that can itself be silencing and that can make inclusion conditional on one "getting used to" the heteronorm.

The support

In this story, it is the trainee's supervisor who is the clearest contributor to inclusivity through supporting the trainee when she was struggling in her private life because of her sexual orientation. The story therefore contrasts with the previously presented experiences, where it was a supervisor who constituted an excluding actor (in "The interrogation", where a supervisor said that Susanne would have a hellish time in the police if it turned out that she was a lesbian, and in "The convertor", where it was the supervisor who denied or mocked the trainee's sexual orientation). That is not the case

here; rather, the supervisor supported Nina when she experienced problems in her private life when she came out. In other words, the police workplace became an inclusive sphere, while her private life was characterized by exclusion or silencing.

I interview Nina at her workplace in Malmö. She is young (under thirty), a member of the Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association), and active in LGBTQ+ issues. Nina is critical of the police organization in a number of ways; above all, she thinks it is still male- and right-wing orientated and she feels that she often has to take the role of "that left-wing feminist". But she also stresses that she has not had any problems because of her sexual orientation. She says that she has heard "some gay jokes and that sort of thing" at the police academy and that she has then said what she thought about "that jargon", but at the same time says that she "didn't feel that there were any problems at the academy…not to the extent that it was difficult." And instead of being "difficult", her closest colleagues were an important source of support to her during a difficult time, which Nina describes below:

> To return to my problem when things were difficult with my family and all that…[she had mentioned it earlier in the interview, but the conversation had moved away from the subject]. At the time, I had, when I was a trainee, two instructors as supervisors in patrol duty. And it was two men in, yeah, they were born at the beginning of the '70s. And I was away from work a lot because of my problems with my family and all that. I felt really bad and that kind of thing. And they were a fantastic source of support for me. So they were quite involved in the problem. And there you could get a sense of whether you were taken seriously or denigrated, but I got a fantastic sense of support from everyone who found out about it.
>
> *Jens: Can you say anything more about how it was, because it's interesting, the opposite, that it was more problematic for you privately. What happened?*
>
> What happened was that I came out to my parents, and I knew before that that it wouldn't be easy. And so maybe you choose to wait until it isn't really working anymore. So it was…well, "it isn't okay" and "how can it be like this" and they were crushed and "our life is ruined" and "it's unnatural" and "it's against God's will" and all that stuff. And "you will never be welcome to bring home the one who you live with, and we will never come to your place when she's there". And "what will people say…?" Like, "How could you become like this?" So in principle I was prepared to lose my family when I came out. And I have lost some of them.
>
> And, at the same time as this was happening, I was in the middle of my period as a trainee, which means that you're already feeling pretty uncertain. There are a lot of new things, you have to perform, because you're being judged all the time. I have a lot of performance anxiety.

You have to do a good job, you have to be strong, secure, forward. At the same time that this was going on, my life was crumbling in some ways, which meant that I couldn't get it all together. It wasn't working. And then I was really honest, and I would never offer any other explanation other than…I just said it as it was. I guess I had a breakdown in the car one time with my supervisor, and we started to talk about it and then it was more that we agreed together that it wasn't working for me to work on patrol just now. Because I said: "I can't take responsibility for my job and how I'm handling it. Both in regard to my safety and your safety and the people we meet, as there *can* be situations where it's about life and death."

And then they thought that it was a very strong thing to do to not just cover it up but actually to open up and take responsibility for it. Because I didn't think I was in the right shape, because I was a security risk. And then we decided that I'd be put on sick leave for a few weeks while waiting for vacation. And then I extended my trainee time a bit after that and caught up with that period. So I was done some weeks later than the others in my group.

But I think that a lot of that is about how you choose to be open. I chose total openness. "This happened, here's how it's going to be, therefore I was late [finishing my trainee time]." To avoid rumors: "Yeah, so she was bad, is that why she was [delayed]?" You know this fear that: "Why wasn't this person finished when all the others were finished?" Because it happens that people get their time extended because they mismanage things or aren't competent.

Jens: But the people you worked with knew that you were gay?

Yes, I worked most with my two instructors and they knew. And I felt that I had great, total support from them. Nothing like this: "But come on, is it so bad?" but just totally: "You are what's most important now. Work, all of that [we'll handle] later."

Jens: Did it feel okay…did it feel, like, natural and good?

Yes, I was probably happily surprised that where many outsiders might think that you'll have the hardest time and get the least support, that's where I felt I got the most support. From my employer, from people closest to me, you know. My supervisor, who has worked as a police officer for thirty years, who was the one most superior to me, [he was] also, you know, totally understanding and no problems. So it was like: "Oh, how wonderful to get such…[a positive response]." So therefore I have in many ways a different experience, while I can also see the negative structures. But it is nice to see that although in many ways they are still there, when you look at individual situations, people, and contexts, there's also a lot that shows that it has changed.

Nina expresses a struggle between exclusion and inclusion, where the inclusionary side is stronger. The exclusionary side is comprised of "some gay jokes and that sort of thing", the presentation of her positive experience

as "different" (she thus notes that the usual are less positive experiences), that she can also "see the negative structures", and her surprise when she received such strong support ("I was probably happily surprised"). The inclusionary side is comprised of support from colleagues, and the presentation of "coming out" as less problematic than to be seen as delayed in her trainee time due to mismanagement or incompetence. As in the previous experiences, inclusion and exclusion coexist, and the collective dimension of the process is clear. But what I particularly want to point out is that the police organization did *not* comprise an exclusionary force in her personal story around coming out. Instead, it was a source of inclusion when Nina's family situation, with its religious aspects, was a source of exclusion.[14]

In the next story, there are also challenges, but here too the police organization is not depicted as the cause of them. Instead, the respondent (Sebastian) portrays himself as the source of exclusion.

Hype

This story is about "coming out" and getting a positive response. As in the other stories, there are both inclusionary and exclusionary pressures. The opening of the story is characterized by how the police force atmosphere was "grabbig" (which is henceforth translated as "laddish" and implicitly includes "not gay-friendly")[15] and intimate, in the sense that they talked a lot to each other about private things, and that homosexuality was perceived negatively in the organization. But then, after Sebastian told his colleagues, the story turns and is characterized by friendship and welcoming, and by presentation of Sebastian and not the organization as the creator of the negative picture.

I meet Sebastian at his office in Stockholm. The conversation started with me saying that I had previously studied the police in Malmö and that the information that there were very few, if any, openly homosexual policemen in Skåne had aroused my curiosity, as I am interested in questions of inclusion and exclusion in occupations, and therefore I am interested in hearing gay police officers' experiences of being police officers. So I asked him, just as I had asked all my interviewees, if he could describe his experience of becoming and being a police officer:

> Hmm. To begin with, this [policing as a career] is something I fell into it. It wasn't my childhood dream or anything. I studied criminology at the university, and that sparked some sort of interest. So I pretty quickly decided to apply, and then I became a police officer. I finished in 1996, and was placed at a smaller police station down in [a part of Stockholm], as the police district was called.
>
> So then I was totally convinced that…it was at the riot police then, in a shift group, and so on. Pretty laddish [grabbig], laddish atmosphere. And I was convinced that there was just one person in all of Sweden

who was gay and a police officer, and it was me. And this was nothing I was going to make public at all.

So a few years passed. Maybe…three years, when I was avoiding and slipping away, answering evasively, changing the subject. Because it's… it's clear that, two men in a police car, a night shift and not much is happening – you talk a lot. So there were a lot of questions. And I was then "single". Even though I wasn't. And there was a lot of talk. Sex talk. Well, yeah, you know, all that.

And it worked for a while to, like, parry questions so no one would discover. Then there was a limit, and I started to feel secure in my shift group, and we began to socialize outside of work, and we became pretty close friends. So then I thought: "Well, I'd better say how it is." And I think I'd hyped it up more than the reaction actually was. I'd imagined a totally different reaction than what it was. I chose [to tell] two the first time, and then another, and another, and so on. And the reaction was more interest than anything else. It was very, as I experienced it, honestly interested questions. Eh, [I] didn't really receive anything negative.

I understood that it would spread at the police station. I am *convinced* that people talked about it a lot. Nothing came to me directly, but I heard about it in a roundabout way. But it wasn't anything from ill will anyway, but rather was just more, they were unsure how to act and how they should tackle it. And they liked me, so "how could they help with this". It was, like, more like that, I felt that it was more consideration than anything else really. But as I said, that was what I heard. I don't know how the conversation was otherwise. So that, for my part, I can't say I've had any negative experiences at all, actually.

Jens: You said that it was different from what you had expected. You had expected another reaction. What reaction had you expected?

Well, more that: "Oh, really, how the fuck are we …", that they would see it as a *problem*. That we exercise together, shower together, more of them distancing themselves, I think. But instead it was more that they came closer. My experience was that they felt they were given trust. That is, that I'd invited them more into my life than I had previously done. And I also got a chance to [explain]…They thought it was strange, like, why was I single year after year, and no stories about girls, never met anyone. So it was that they had been wondering about *that*. So, well, it was a positive reaction.

And then after that I decided I was *never* going to paint myself into a corner by lying if I came to a new workplace. Because it makes things weirder. If you've been going out with a story all this time, and then one day you raise your hand and say: "Well, listen, I've lied for three years, but here's how it really is." So I decided that, maybe not to advertise it so much at first, but if someone asked then I answered. And that was a part of my own process.

> Then, how it is *now*, I'm *totally* open about it. Whether people know about it or not, I talk openly about my boyfriend and so on. And have no problems with it. And I haven't been met by anything either.
>
> *Jens: Hmm.*
>
> Now we have to remember that I work in a big city, I work in a unit with young police officers. Modern police officers. I don't work, I don't want to point out any units, but I don't work at an overly *laddish* unit where it's just men and there's that kind of jargon. Because there are such places still within the police, unfortunately. So that's made it easier, of course.

Similarly to Nina, Sebastian creates a context by mentioning a certain exclusionary pressure. At the beginning and the end of his story, he expresses the belief that there is a "grabbighet/laddishness", a sort of rough "manliness", within the police that is associated with anti-homosexuality. The main point of the story, however, is the surprising inclusion and that it turned out that Sebastian himself was the biggest obstacle for inclusion. Something made him believe that he was very alone, that there "was just one person in all of Sweden who was gay and a police officer" and it was him. And this, in combination with the atmosphere, meant that he was not going to consider coming out "at all". But he began to feel secure with his colleagues and chose to come out. Despite this security, he had expected them to "distance themselves", but "instead it was more that they came closer". And despite the "grabbig/laddish" atmosphere, Sebastian points out, he experienced no problems when he came out. His colleagues were instead interested and affirmative, and it was Sebastian who had "hyped up" the situation. Before I comment on this, I will present a similar story.

No problems

"Coming out" within the police was depicted by Sebastian as an experience characterized by inclusion, and it was colleagues and close managers who contributed to this. Sandra – a lesbian police officer in Skåne – had a similar experience. She told me how during her first period of time working for the police, she met a woman. They became close friends first and after a while became a couple. Initially, Sandra did not talk about this at work, "I laid very low with it", she said, and continued:

> But finally one of the girls in my group said to me: "Hey, there's a rumor that you and [the girlfriend] are a couple. Is that true?" "Yes," I said, "it is." "But why haven't you said?" "Well, it's nothing I stand up and share," I said. "Whoever asks gets an answer, because it's nothing I hide. But I don't stand up a the morning briefing and say, 'Hey, I'm Sandra, and I'm interested in girls.' People who are hetero don't do that."

Sandra's experience is like Sebastian's in that she was received positively and affirmatively when she came out. What Sandra also shares with Sebastian is that on the one hand, she emphasizes that she herself did not have any problems – "At work and workwise within the police, I can say that I have never, never had a problem with my orientation and people reacting" – and on the other hand, she weaves in aspects that indicate an exclusionary pressure. For example, she says, just as Sebastian did, about how before she came out, she had to work hard not to let the truth come out: "It was really pathetic, that poor woman I was with, Malin she was called, God, how she was hidden in closets, pushed into toilets. I've run away from her at Ica [a grocery store] in order not to be seen with her." Also in common with Sebastian, Sandra views herself as the reason behind all this sneaking:

> It was probably more about me than other people, if I'm honest. About how I hadn't really found myself and figured out who I was. So that when we later, or when she broke up with me, it was probably only then that I accepted and wasn't ashamed of who I was. Because I'd been that before, and thought it was a bit weird myself. So it was probably about me and not my work colleagues, if I'm totally honest.

Sandra – just like Nina and Sebastian – also referred to the "jargon", often mentioned within the police, but emphasizes that she has never found it problematic:

> The jargon can be a little like that within the police, with fags and all that, but often it's more that they're joking: "Thanks for having us over. My ass is a little sore." You know, a little silly like that. It's never someone being mean or negative and like: "Oh, fuck, how disgusting", or this or that. I've never experienced that in my twenty-five years. Which maybe you'd expect, given that the police have a reputation for tough jargon. But I've actually never heard anyone talk negatively about this fucker being this or that, because of their orientation, I've actually never heard that. I have probably always been respected for the person I am, not for how I live outside of work.

Both Sebastian and Sandra pointed out that it was they themselves who were the obstacle for inclusion – Sebastian "hyped it up" and Sandra said that "it was probably more about me than other people". This could perhaps be understood as if the homophobia that they experienced, that made them not want to come out, did not exist. An interpretation like that makes them seem a touch paranoid. A more cultural interpretation, meanwhile, leads the analysis in another direction, toward the insight that heteronormativity and inclusion to a certain extent can coexist but that inclusion is then conditioned by a heteronormative culture; that is, by a culture where

heterosexuality is seen as the normal and preferred sexuality. I will develop this argument.

Sebastian and Sandra's stories are primarily stories about inclusion. The moral is that after they came out, they felt included. At the same time, Sandra and Sebastian (and Nina) describe how heteronormativity rules: "The jargon…with fags and all that", "some gay jokes", "grabbighet/laddishness", "a little macho". They do not describe these elements as intentions to exclude – "often it's more that they're joking", notes Sandra, for example. On the other hand, these elements say something about the cultural conditions for inclusion. By depicting the culture as characterized by "some gay jokes", "grabbighet/laddishness", and "a little macho", Nina, Sandra, and Sebastian communicate that heterosexuality is the legitimate sexuality and that it is normal to speak about heterosexuality in a neutral way, without arousing any attention, while it appears normal to speak about homosexuality in an attention-grabbing way, such as through "some gay jokes and that sort of thing".

Sebastian and Sandra also communicate that it was this culture that initially made them keep quiet about their orientation: the "laddish atmosphere", Sebastian described it as, which initially led him to the view that "this was nothing I was going to make public at all". The insight here is that (hetero)normativity can be silencing and disciplining regardless of whether there are silencing intentions. Thus, the silencing resides in the culture – norms, values, and meanings – rather than in the individuals. The silencing effects of heteronormativity have also been noted by other scholars. For instance, the organization and gender scholar Vincenza Priola and her colleagues write:

> [T]he dominant heterosexual discourse reproduces unequal power relationships between the heterosexual majority and non-heterosexual minority groups, in that heteronormativity silences minorities and the act of silencing is an agent of power in its own right.[16]

Thus, instead of assuming that there was no exclusionary pressure, it is possible to argue that Sandra and Sebastian – before they came out – were silenced by heteronormativity.

A last point that I want to highlight is that heteronormativity should not only be understood in terms of silencing and the exclusion of homosexuality. By being normalized by both heterosexuals and homosexuals, heteronormativity can also create heteronormative conditions for inclusion. Nina, Sebastian, and Sandra indicate that they have normalized – or "gotten used to" – heteronormativity. In particular, they have gotten used to not viewing heteronormativity as silencing. For example, the "laddish atmosphere" was initially an obstacle for Sebastian, but after he had come out, it no longer was. He understood that it was not aimed at him. The point is that a condition that facilitates inclusion is being able to participate in "doing"

heteronormativity, such as by viewing "the jargon…with fags and all that" as normal and unproblematic.

Gender scholar Kerstin Sandell found a similar tendency toward heteronormatively conditioned inclusion in her study of gay academics. While they could say that "homosexuality is not a big deal", they could simultaneously also give examples of "everything from subtle negative hints, ostracism, and negotiations about belonging to outright discriminating and threats of violence".[17] "It's crazy to put up with this," one interviewee exclaimed in Sandell's study. So they too had become used to "the jargon". In a similar way, organization scholars Nick Rumens and John Broomfield found that even "gay-friendly"[18] organizations are characterized by heteronormativity, which makes homosexual employees avoid behaving in ways that can be understood as "obviously gay".[19] The sociologist Christine Williams and her colleagues call this the "gay-friendly closet", which describes a situation where homosexuals are welcome, but they are expected to *avoid acting* in ways that are associated with homosexuality, such as a homosexual man acting in an exaggeratedly feminine way, or objecting to a gay joke.[20] Participating in heteronormativity can therefore be a source of inclusion in the group, but at the same time, heteronormativity is thereby reproduced, which creates limits for which expressions of homosexuality are legitimate. In other words, inclusion is conditioned by heteronormativity.

With this said, it is worth emphasizing that the point is not that LGB officers such as Sandra and Sebastian are "really" silenced or really did not feel included. As I noted, the point of these stories is that they were included after they came out, and in Nina's case, that she got support from her colleagues. But their stories are dynamic and also offer insight into the culture that frames inclusion. In regard to this culture, the insights are that:

- their initial need to be silent shows that there was a heteronorm that contributed to the need to be silent;
- gay people may need to get used to heteronormativity;
- this habit can lead to inclusion but also to behaviors that maintain, or "do" heteronormativity.

To summarize, I wish to convey that the stories in this section can be read in (at least) two ways. On the one hand, they express how colleagues can be welcoming and inclusive when a colleague comes out as gay. On the other hand, the stories express that there is something that made both Sandra and Sebastian hesitate before coming out, which made them lie and sneak around with their orientation. This "something" can be called heteronormativity and is articulated in the stories as "grabbighet/laddishness" and "the jargon…with fags and all that", and "gay jokes and that sort of thing". That these expressions of heteronormativity were viewed as unproblematic can be understood literally – they are, simply, unproblematic. But they can also be understood as an expression for a heteronormative culture that

Nina, Sebastian, and Sandra have gotten used to, a culture where membership means not viewing or treating this heteronormativity as a problem.

Conclusion

While the previous chapter focused on exclusion and its consequences, the emphasis in this chapter has been on the interplay between exclusion and inclusion. What all the stories in this chapter have in common is that inclusion and exclusion coexist, and that the processes that have been presented neither are about nor lead to *either* exclusion *or* inclusion, but rather that there is a "struggle" between inclusion and exclusion. In the context of this chapter, the struggle has been concretely expressed as a struggle between silencing and voice. Thus, the silencing of expressions of homosexuality is understood as an exclusionary force, while what I call the LGBTQ+ voice is an inclusionary force.

This view of the relationship between exclusion and inclusion as a struggle can be used to summarize a number of the findings from this chapter. First of all, I have already underlined that inclusion is a collective process. The meaning of this has been made more precise in this chapter by understanding the collective as an "audience" that is important for how the struggle between inclusion and exclusion unfolds. The audience observes what is happening and can react in different ways – from managers expressing that homophobic comments are not worth caring about, as in "Cancer", to fifty colleagues sending supportive messages in "The poster". One insight here is that silencing/exclusion is harder to maintain when the audience is broader, and particularly when the audience includes participants beyond the police organization. In both "Cancer" and "The poster", the media play an important role – in "Cancer" as a direct participant in the process and in "The Poster" as an indirect participant in the shape of a threat. The collective process – and thereby the struggle between inclusion and exclusion – is thus characterized by inclusionary and exclusionary forces from various different players (LGBTQ+ voice, chiefs, colleagues, the media) both within and outside the police organization.[21]

Second, we have seen how differently homophobic comments can be perceived, which emphasizes the point that inclusion can be seen as a struggle between silencing and voice. This was particularly expressed in the contrast between the boss's "nothing to worry about" attitude in "Cancer" and Henrik, Susanne, and Emma's ways of talking about homophobic elements of conversation, which rather were characterized by deep, negative emotions and a "very much to worry about" attitude. Given the difference in these views, it is not strange that there is a "struggle". This difference also relates to the democratically loaded question about whether police officers who try to silence the voice of a particular societal group (in this case, the LGBTQ+ voice) are appropriate representatives for a just state. Susanne in "Cancer" thought it was frightening that her colleague was still working at

reception and potentially receiving gay people who need help, and Emma in "The poster" said that her colleagues' behavior made her feel like an "idiot" when she gave lectures and was expected to say that gay people should not be scared of going to the police. One can say that Susanne and Emma see these homophobic elements as a democratic problem, but this is probably not true of those who think it is "nothing to worry about", not to mention those who portray homosexuality as an organizational problem, as in "The convertor".

Third, the emphasis on the struggle between silencing and voice implies that the final outcome is uncertain. A struggle can lead to different and unexpected results. Analyses that only focus on how marginalized voices are silenced risk missing how homophobic voices can also be silenced and made illegitimate. The "poster" experience shows how this can happen. Even if there was a systematic attempt at silencing the LGBTQ+ voice (through vandalizing and ridiculing the LGBTQ+ network's communication), these were condemned by the leadership, who called this behavior "completely unacceptable" and emphasized that those who vandalized the posters should recognize that they "are in the minority". "The poster" illustrated, in other words, how an attempt at silencing shifts from being aimed at LGBTQ+ expressions to *anti-LGBTQ+* expressions, and this process also changes what is represented as the core and as the periphery in the police organization. We are reminded of how historically there has been a struggle against homosexuality within the police, while today there is a struggle against homophobia. As noted, where this will lead is unknown. But as sociologist Georg Simmel points out in his analysis of the concept "struggle", a fight need not lead to division and polarization but can instead increase understanding between two parties.[22] I will return to this in Chapter 8.

Fourth, this chapter has provided insight into how the cultural context where exclusion and inclusion take place is characterized by heteronormativity. I have shown how heteronormativity can be reproduced – "done" – through heteronormative jargon that can both produce silence and a certain type of inclusion that is based on one getting used to heteronormativity. This insight emphasizes the variation in the LGB officers' roles in inclusion. Above all, the experiences in this chapter show how LGB officers are the initiative-taking actors when it comes to inclusion. They are the ones who "come out", protest, and, sometimes, get other participants to *react*. The result is that the heteronormative culture – which expresses that heterosexuality is privileged – is undone and space for inclusion is created. But there are also elements of LGB officers becoming part of heteronormativity by getting used to it and by being included on the condition that certain elements of homophobia are accepted or viewed as unproblematic.

This chapter has illustrated different types of exclusionary pressures in the shape of attempts at silencing and responses to this, as LGB police officers make their voices heard, get different types of support, and thereby create an inclusionary pressure. I have emphasized how this inclusion tends

to be a collective process. This collective aspect indicates that inclusion happens within a certain culture. This culture may be more or less encouraging of employees using their voices to express dissatisfaction. I have begun to touch on the topic of culture by introducing the concept of heteronormativity. In the next chapter, I will go more deeply into the description of this culture, in which silencing and voice struggle for influence. We will therefore leave behind our focus on individual stories and specific events and instead look at the culture in which these play out.

Notes

1. See Rennstam & Sullivan (2018), which this chapter to some extent builds on. Silencing also comes up in other studies of sexuality in organizations, such as Priola et al. (2014).
2. Albert Hirschman writes about this in his book *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty* (1970). Hirschman postulates that when members of an organization (or consumers of an organization's products) experience different types of organizational anomalies (or deficiencies in the quality of the consumer products) they have two alternatives: *exit*, which is when they leave the organization (or stop consuming its products), or *voice*, which is when they express their dissatisfaction with what is happening in the organization (or with its products) (p. 4). Hirschman defines *voice* as "any attempt at all to change, rather than to escape from, an objectionable state of affairs, whether through individual or collective petition to the management directly in charge, through appeal to a higher authority with the intention of forcing a change in management, or through various types of actions and protests, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinion" (p. 30).
3. Definitions of heteronormativity tend to be a little more complex, but this is the core of it. See Harris & White (2018, n.p.), who offer the similarly concise definition: "The assumption that heterosexuality is the default, preferred, 'normal' state for human beings […]". In terms of the aspect that says that heterosexuality is the *preferred* sexuality, also see Borgström (2011, p. 13), who describes heteronormativity as "a system that treats heterosexuals with affirmative action".
4. The argument that heteronormativity is "done" has been developed by, among others, the sociologists Kristen Schilt & Laurel Westbrook (2009), as a continuation of West & Zimmerman's (1987) earlier, analogous argument that gender is something that is done rather than something that is inherent. For definitions of heteronormativity based on this argument, see, for instance, Kitzinger (2005, p. 478): "Heteronormativity refers, in sum, to the myriad ways in which heterosexuality is produced as a natural, unproblematic, taken-for-granted, ordinary phenomenon." Also see Richardson & Monro (2012, p. 17), who write that heteronormativity "refers to the ways in which heterosexuality is both *naturalized* as universal and *privileged* as the 'norm', as a particular form of practices and identity, over other 'non-normative' sexualities". As these definitions suggest – with terms such as "produced" and "ways in which" – the focus is on heteronormativity as something that is produced and that becomes visible in actions, rather than as something inside people's heads. Besides heteronormativity expressing how heterosexuality is the norm and the preferred sexuality, the concept often also is thought to describe a number of assumptions around sex and gender, such as that there are only two sexes and that it is natural for these two to be attracted to one another (see Kitzinger 2005).

5. "Doing gender means creating differences between girls and boys and women and men, differences that are not natural, essential, or biological" (West & Zimmerman 1987, p. 137).
6. That exclusion and inclusion coexist, or can develop together, has also been noted by others. See, for instance, Doerfel & Gibbs (2020).
7. I have chosen to call this voice the "LGBTQ+ voice". As my interviewees identify as homosexual, lesbian, or bisexual, I could call it the "LGB voice" (after all, I use "LGB" when I am referring directly to my interviewees for this reason). But I have chosen "LGBTQ+ voice", in part because LGBTQ+ is a more established term than LGB, and in part because this is more generally about a voice for the inclusion of several sexualities and gender identities, even if in my case, it is empirically about the inclusion of homosexuality.
8. Insufficient protection, or "underpolicing", from the police is discussed in Chapter 1, such as in regard to Finstad (2016). Insufficient protection refers to the phenomenon that the police are not always considered to give the same protection to all societal groups, or to investigate crimes against members of these groups as carefully.
9. Ambjörnsson (2005, p. 188).
10. See, for instance, Holgersson (2014) and Wieslander (2016).
11. See the previous chapter, where I noted that my and others' studies indicate that people gossip about each other a lot within the police (for example, Forsberg et al. 2003, Wieslander 2016).
12. This idea has also been expressed by others, such as Vincent, a homosexual civilian employee: "In the middle of the '90s, there was 'the baseball team' that, as it was so nicely put, went out, 'fag beating' ("knacka bög" in Swedish) in town. […] A number have surely grown up, but others are commissioners and are in the highest positions." Vincent's point is that homophobic behavior is not a decisive obstacle for promotion. ("The baseball team" was the nickname of a group of police officers who worked on street violence in Stockholm in the 1980s. That they abused homosexuals has not been proven, as far as I know, but they were thought to use unusually brutal methods and were accused of excessive abuse. See the documentary on Swedish radio P3 for more: https://sverigesradio.se/sida/avsnitt/83899?programid=2519.)
13. See, for instance, Shore et al. (2011, p. 1271): "One of the distinguishing characteristics of our framework of inclusion is the notion that individuals want to feel a sense of belonging, as well as feeling valued, for their unique attributes."
14. Note that when I describe this story as being characterized by inclusion, I am referring to Nina's work life, which is what I am focusing on in this book. The part of the story that is about her private life is instead characterized by exclusion.
15. The Swedish word used is "grabbighet" and it has a negative implication. It refers to behavior and talk practiced among men when it is somewhat macho and tends to include a derogatory attitude toward women. In the UK, this could be described as "laddishness" or "blokiness". I [the author] chose "laddishness" as translation. Although it is a UK term, it is probably understood also by speakers of American English.
16. Priola et al. (2014, p. 489). In a similar way, Bell et al. claim (2011, p. 131) that "GLBT employees are often silenced by what is perceived as 'normal' in work organizations". The insight that normality is disciplining comes to a large extent from the French scholar Michel Foucault, who showed how dominance and discipline have historically been created through the construction of normal and deviant, including in regard to sexuality (see Foucault 1976).
17. Sandell (2014, p. 225).

18. Rumens & Broomfield (2014) appear to be somewhat skeptical about the concept of "gay-friendly" organizations, but they should be understood according to the following: "Significantly, gay-friendly workplaces are said, at least at the level of organizational rhetoric, not just to tolerate LGBT employees but 'accept and welcome them into the workplace'" (p. 368).
19. Rumens and Broomfield (2014, p. 378).
20. Williams et al. (2009). Williams et al. note that an alternative way of behaving in the "gay-friendly closet" is to live up to stereotypes about homosexuality (such as how a homosexual person is expected to be engaged in LGBTQ+ activism).
21. Others have made similar points. Ortlieb & Sieben (2019, p. 15) show, for instance, that norms around gender are not just created and broken down by institutional relationships (such as policy change) or on the initiative of bosses, but also by other members of the organization.
22. Simmel (1908/1970). Also see Asplund (1970) for a concise exploration of Simmel's "struggle".

5 The macho image and the inclusion of homosexuality

This chapter and the next one aim to contextualize the stories and events presented in Chapters 3 and 4. This chapter is about how the image of the police as "macho" is related to the inclusion of homosexuality, while the next chapter explores police work in relation to this. One could say that in these two chapters, I analyze the organizational context in which the individual experiences play out. Even the more inclusionary experiences in the previous chapter indicated that there is a "grabbig/laddish" attitude and that there are "some gay jokes" in the police, but that they are not seen as a problem. Here, I go into this in more depth to see what this means. What is this "laddish attitude"? How is it related to the police, inclusion, and sexual orientation?

The focus on the organizational context does not mean that I will discuss the police force's organization based on their formal documents. Nor will I touch upon *all* aspects of what is called police culture,[1] even if aspects of police culture will be discussed where relevant. Instead, I will continue to employ my LGB-respondents' accounts and descriptions to – from the inside-out – paint a picture of an organizational context where exclusion and inclusion take place.

The context I will present in this chapter and the next one is relatively diverse. Sometimes the police is depicted as masculine, macho, and homophobic. My study suggests that there are reasons to make this picture more nuanced, which I do, especially in the next chapter. At the same time, one should not underestimate the fact that the police force is by and large associated with masculinity. As I noted in Chapter 2, this has been found in many studies,[2] and it was also a key point in my interviews. I will therefore in this chapter delve into how this association with masculinity relates to the exclusion and inclusion of homosexuality.

Masculinity refers to culturally dependent properties, behaviors, and values, which are symbolically associated with men and men's actions. Organization and gender scholars Mats Alvesson and Yvonne Due Billing describe how masculinity is "the values, experiences, and meanings that are culturally interpreted as distinctly manly and that typically feel more 'natural' to and are more attributed to men than women in particular cultural contexts".[3] In other

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-5

words, *what* is associated more with men than with women, or vice versa, varies over time and depends on the context. It is also worth emphasizing that it is about *symbolic* associations. A man may very well exhibit femininity and be seen as more feminine than a woman and vice versa.

There are many different associations with men and their actions and therefore many masculinities. In gender research, where there is a power perspective, certain associations are considered to be culturally dominant and as something that both men and women need to relate to. This masculinity is often called *hegemonic* to indicate that it is about a range of associations and practices that make it possible for a certain sort of man and a certain type of manly practice to create and maintain a dominant position.[4] What is dominant and what comprises "hegemonic masculinity" is not stable but rather changes over time and place, but traditionally (historically) it is said that hegemonic masculinity in the West has been about demonstrating determination, aggression, competitiveness, autonomy, strength, rationality, the use of tools and technology, and the ability to disconnect from emotions.[5]

The role of homosexuality in the traditional hegemonic masculinity has been mainly as a counterpoint: "Gayness […] is the repository of whatever is symbolically expelled from hegemonic masculinity", writes the sociologist Raewyn Connell writes.[6]

The point of discussing hegemonic masculinity is not to claim that it is typical of most men or most police officers, but rather to show that it is a measuring stick, a historically constructed *norm* that many men are judged by or feel pressure to live up to.[7] And according to research, this is particularly true in police organizations.[8] This norm also features in my material, in the shape of a portrayal of the police as "macho". The macho norm – which can be described in approximately the same terms as traditional hegemonic masculinity, though I want to downplay the *assumption* that it is hegemonic – serves as a starting point, and a sort of sounding-board for the presentation of the organizational context.

Macho versus men

The interviews with the LGB police officers in this study always started with me asking the respondents to tell me what it has been like to become a police officer and to work as a police officer. This question often led to long answers, containing experiences and events similar to the ones I discussed in the previous chapters. But I also asked more specific questions. One of the questions was whether they thought there was a difference between being a man or a woman and gay. The answers were basically homogenous. Everyone thought there was a difference, and everyone but one person[9] said that it was "harder" or "tougher" for men.[10]

When I asked about the *reason* why they thought it was harder for men, their answers often went like this: first most of them said that they "didn't

know", then they said "but I *believe* it might be because of…". This belief in regard to the reason, just as the belief that it was tougher for male homosexuals, turned out to be pretty much the same for them all. It was because police work is seen as manly or "macho", and lesbians are viewed as "a little manly", and heterosexual men tend to see gay men's sexuality as provocative or even threatening.

Thus, the police force was often depicted by the subjects as macho, which is associated with difficulties in particular for gay men, whereas the stereotype of lesbian women is seen as more compatible with the macho norm. Many interviewees referred to this norm, often bringing it up in a slightly joking manner. My impression was that they find this a bit embarrassing and stereotypical, while at the same time thinking that such perceptions exist, both within the police and in society in general. Here is a selection of comments that indicate that the police are associated with a macho norm. Sebastian starts:

> *Jens: All this with men and women and homosexuality and the police. Do you feel that there's a difference, experiences in general, is there a difference between being a man or woman and homosexual within the police?*
>
> If I were to guess, I'd say that there are more prejudices against men. It's more acceptable for homosexual women. I think that's what the general idea is.
>
> *Jens: What do you mean?*
>
> Yeah, well, it's a more masculine job than a feminine one, if I could be a little stereotypical.
>
> *Jens: How so?*
>
> Well, a little. I think that there's still a macho label on it. It's disappearing more and more, but it's still a little there. And I can imagine that some people think: "Ah, but what the f… we can't have a ton of fags running around here, fooling around." I mean, I'm just assuming, I don't know for sure. While lesbian women are tougher, something like that [laughs].

Sebastian also imagines that gay men internalize this view and therefore become frightened of not being seen as a good police officer, but rather as a "Jonas Gardell type":[11]

> Yes. Why is it so [that there does not seem to be so many (openly) gay male police officers]? Well, it's fear, of course. Maybe you're scared of getting labeled as not being a real police officer. You are…you have your own prejudices about how people view gays. And it's Jonas Gardell types, and you don't want to be seen as one of those. And you don't want…to be treated differently in any way. Because it's a little, the stereotype is that gays are very soft and feminine, while lesbians are, yeah, more butch and manly and they get on with things.

Most of the interviewees speculated similarly:

> Being in the police is a man's job, if you put it like that. And so then maybe girls who don't follow the heterosexual norm, that is, lesbian girls, apply for that job. On the other hand, guys who don't follow the norm naturally maybe don't apply to the same extent.
>
> (Annette)

> The police, there's still, all this with the uniform, and so it can certainly be a macho culture in a way. It's uniforms and weapons and we can use violence and all that. And some men within the police *are* macho men. And I don't think that it's as simple as…I can understand that it would be harder to come out as a man. If you aren't *very* secure in yourself.
>
> (Erika)

> Of course it's harder to be an open man. And that's probably because it's a manly job and it's a lot about muscles and appearance.
>
> (Susanne)

> Policing is considered to be a very macho job. As a police officer, you have to have a lot of characteristics that stereotypically a gay man doesn't have. Gays are, you know, foppish and wimpy and prissy and hair stylists. […] If you describe a stereotypical dyke, then she's butch and tough and like that. That's what you need to be as a police officer, sometimes. According to the stereotype anyway. So it's not as strange to be a homosexual girl in the police as it is to be a homosexual man. […].
>
> (Emma)

The point here is that the idea that a "real police officer" does not correlate with the idea of a "gay man". Henrik develops this line of thinking further around the relationship between manliness, "fags", and lesbians in more explicit terms. The police is associated with manliness, and therefore it is important to want to be a man, and lesbians "try" to do that, while fags "don't even try" to be men, he suggests:

> Guys have a tendency to accept girls as lesbian officers. Because it is a man-dominated job, and these girls at least try to be men. Do you see? The thoughts within the police are very strange.
>
> *Jens: That they think like that?*
>
> Yeah, that they think like that. Fags, they don't even try to be [men], in other words…it's two steps. It's hard for me to explain this, but… it's harder to be accepted as a gay man by a heterosexual police officer who is in this macho culture. At least it was then. Today it's easier, but…but I still think that…younger guys who come out early, in their twenties, it's pretty hard for them, still, within the police.

The norm that Henrik is expressing is about how police officers ought to try to show macho-related behaviors, and that there is a belief that gays do not do this, which is reminiscent of Connell's argument cited above that "gay" is seen as a "repository" for what is *not* associated with (hegemonic) masculinity. Henrik bases this on his experience of becoming a police officer. He was not open when he started as a police officer, but instead came out later. During his time as a "hidden" homosexual, he showed his prowess as a police officer by exhibiting macho behaviors – such as by having "fought" alongside his colleagues – and then it was easier to come out later:

> I think I have a pretty good reputation within the police. I've been lucky, because I worked as a police officer for a long time and did a pretty good job and…liked being in the police, and was pretty well liked and all that. I was rather grounded…that is, had a foundation as officer, like, *before* people found out I was gay. […] It worked [to come out] because I *was* already a police officer. Most people I'd worked with had fought alongside me. They already knew what I was and wasn't. […] If I'd come out at the police academy, and come out [from the academy] *as* gay, then you have to prove yourself, the way girls have to, they always have to prove they're better. Gay men have to prove first that they're better than girls, and then they have to be better than guys, or at least the same. So we have two steps. Because gays are at the bottom of the food chain within the police. Girls are actually higher up.

The logic is pretty simple. The police force is generally associated with macho/manliness, "gay" is not associated with manliness, but lesbian/"dyke" is. So lesbians fit a little better.

Masculinity work

These statements show that the police officers who were interviewed have experience of the police force being associated with and dominated by a certain type of masculinity, which they often call "macho". One aspect of this is that to fit in, a police officer may need to exhibit behaviors and characteristics that fit this masculinity type. They might need to do what I have chosen to call "masculinity work"; that is, they might need to make an effort to engage in actions that show that they are masculine.

One can carry out masculinity work by doing things that in a particular cultural context are primarily associated with masculinity, or by distancing oneself from things that are associated with femininity. This is relevant for understanding the conditions for inclusion of male versus female homosexuality within the police. It appears to be easier to be a lesbian in the police because lesbianism, just as the police itself, is masculinely "coded" (that is, lesbianism is associated with masculinity). Male homosexuality is

femininely coded, which means that male homosexual police officers have to engage more in masculinity work to feel included.

This was expressed in my material. One example is Henrik's statement above: it was easier to come out as gay because he had already proved he was a good police officer by showing that he could fight: "It worked [to come out] because I *was* already a police officer. Most people I'd worked with had fought alongside me. They already knew what I was and wasn't." In Chapter 3 in "The Christmas party", Henrik expressed how he "went along with the talk they had" before he came out – the "talk" included degrading slang about homosexuals – which meant that he felt that he was part of the (hetero)gang. To put it another way, Henrik proved that he was good enough by exhibiting masculinely coded behavior ("taking part in the hetero-talk", "fighting together").

Johan too, who shared his experience in "The picture", expresses similar masculinity work. Johan, who is not open about his orientation, discusses a "macho culture" that to a great extent encourages people to show that they are traditional men, which he himself has demonstrated by going to the gym and showing how he can do "three figures" on the bench press and, when he worked on patrol duty, by showing that he did not have to call for reinforcements when things got hard. This does not necessarily have anything to do with Johan's orientation, but sometimes sexuality is brought to the fore in masculinity work, as when Johan pretended he did not know the gay clubs in Stockholm when he was assigned to investigate crimes against homosexuals who were connected to these clubs. "I almost had to be an actor," Johan says, "[my colleague] told me about this club. I knew very well what he was talking about. But, like, I couldn't say it." Johan says that this culture, in which he himself participated, which made him "no better than anyone else", meant that he could not come out. Being gay simply did not fit in the "frame", as he describes based on an example of the attitude toward training around sexual harassment:

> I remember that we had to take a course on sexual harassment, and our tough team, we never went there, none of that. And so suddenly we're sitting there, and it is both guys and girls on our team, but I wasn't better than anyone else, I was going on in the same way, so it wasn't that. But finally our boss came and said: "I'm going to come to you tomorrow, and we'll do this sexual harassment training." Then one of the girls in the group says: "Bring along a camp bed and I'll show you what sexual harassment is." That was the sort of tone there. And this tone makes it, you see, or see and see, but it means that this is not the time to start bending the frame.

"The frame" – or the norm – can, in other words, create expectations to exhibit behaviors similar to what the police officers call macho. In this way, a certain sort of masculinity that fits into the heteronorm is "done"[12]

(see Chapter 4 on heteronormativity). One way of a man "doing" masculinity is by behaving in ways that indicate that he is *not* gay. It is then more specifically heteromasculinity that is "done". The interviewees expressed this through the examples of how they have "fought", how they can do "three figures" on the bench press, how they pretend not to know about gay clubs, and how they have gone along with laughing at courses on sexual harassment.

"The frame" that Johan is referring to affects everyone, but the pressure is harder on those whose identity already has a built-in feminine symbolic association, such as women and gay men. "I almost had to be an actor," Johan pointed out. Heterosexual men, from this perspective, have an advantage. Those who do not have this advantage are, at least structurally, under greater pressure to do masculinity work in a macho-oriented culture.

Sexualization and sensitive male heterosexuality

In addition to the belief that there is an inverse relationship between male homosexuality and the macho image of the police, there is also a tendency to see *sexualization* – that is, the depiction of something with a focus on its sexual aspects – as an explanation for why it would be more difficult for male homosexual police officers than for female. In other words, when homosexuality in one way or another is expressed, it is portrayed with an (exaggerated) focus on its sexual aspects. This is combined with a perception that male heterosexuality is more sensitive to violations of the heteronorm than female heterosexuality. My point in focusing on this is to show that there is a connection between gay male officers' "difficulties" and cultural phenomena far beyond the police sphere, and how these phenomena find their way into, are expressed and are empowered in the police organization. I will return to this after a few representative selections from the interviews.

Emelie is a police officer in southern Sweden and believes it is easier to be a woman and homosexual in the police, and that this is because people tend to emphasize sex in homosexuality, and that men think it is "easier to see" female homosexuality than male.

> For some strange reason, it's more okay to be a girl and homosexual than to be a guy and homosexual. It's easier. And that's because… sometimes I think that it's this, how people focus so much on the *sexual*, like the sexual, then it's easier in some way for men to see two women than two men, and they maybe feel raped and offended as men. I don't know, that's my personal reflection [laughs]. I think there could be some…men find it easier to respect women, because, I think, they focus so much on the sexual, unfortunately.
>
> […]

Now I can't, I haven't confirmed this in any way, it's just a feeling I have, but I also think that when you hear the discussion around homosexuality, it's often when it's unpleasant and tasteless and all that, then it's always a discussion about two men. Seldom, I think I've never heard it, that it's tasteless with two women in some way [laughs].

Erika works in the Stockholm area and she also refers to sexualization and heterosexual men's ideas about male homosexuality being shaped by fear:

Jens: Mmm. When it's about…I'm asking now about your general perception, but is there any difference between being a man and being a woman and homosexual within the police?

Yeah, yeah. I really think so. In general, being homosexual is, for some men, a threat. And that's true within the police too. It's, like, just the way it is, that male sexuality is highest up. Female sexuality is a little below. So it's not a threat for a man [that someone is a lesbian]. I've never experienced it as a threat. More that it can trigger some… some think it's a little cool and, well…

Jens: Cool?

Yeah, like, it's more, more…more that they [men] are fascinated when it comes to women. […] But in any case, you can say that it's not a threat. I believe that men don't think it's threatening when women are with women. But men think it's threatening when men are with men.

Jens: Hmm. How are they thinking then, do you think, when they think it's threatening?

Well, they're surely thinking of anal sex and that sort of thing. I believe.

Jens: Yeah, yeah. And that's threatening?

Yeah, that is, men with men, I think that's threatening for men. Some men. Not all men.

Jens: No, no. Because…? I'm just wondering…

So, I think it's that…yeah, because, I don't know. I'm just thinking that there are some men who believe that two women, they can't satisfy each other completely. Like, you need a penis for that. So there's something that's above everything else in male sexuality. And those men who are the most scared of [gay men], I don't know what their problems are, in their sexuality, actually. But it must be something. Those who are relaxed and don't have any problems with these thoughts, a man with a man, maybe are secure in themselves as men. They're not provoked by it. I don't know why, there could be a number of psychological…eh [laughs].

Annika expresses the same thought:

Men find it easier to see girls than to see guys. And that could be also because of their thoughts, guy-guy, that's really difficult. A straight man

> and a gay girl. He might not mind making out with her, or what should we say, making a move on her or anything, *even* if he knows that she's gay. […] Ha, you know what I'm saying, but I can't explain it…better.

These statements are attempts to explain what is harder about being a man and gay in general, and thereby in the police. Two points are made in these attempts. First: sexualization is at the base of this; that is, a tendency for associations with sexual interactions to arise when homosexuality is spoken of or when gay people participate in social contexts. Second: the understanding of this sexualization is gendered. Emelie, Erika, and Annika express the idea that male heterosexuals find sex between men more problematic than sex between women, and also more problematic than female heterosexuals perceive sex between women, or men. In other words, there is a perception that it is mainly heterosexual men who are "sensitive" to violations of the heteronorm within the frame of their own sex.

These attempts at explanations are thus about how there is a societal view of the relationship between masculinity and sexuality – similar to the macho norm and its rejection of the idea of men having sex with men – that plays a role in creating difficulties for male homosexuals within the police. This belief does not just exist in the imaginations of the interviewees. First, there is a historical context for it. In Chapter 2, I described how the law prohibited homosexual activities between 1864 and 1944. Those who established the law were almost exclusively men, those who put the law into practice (the police officers) were exclusively men, and those who were affected by the law were also almost exclusively men (very few lesbians were prosecuted for breaking the law). Second, research shows that this tendency exists today too. Research indicates that generally, there is more "hostility" toward gay men than toward lesbian women[13] and that heterosexual men to a greater extent than heterosexual women tend to have negative attitudes toward homosexuals, particularly if the homosexuals are men.[14]

Sexualization and its depiction of male homosexuality as less desirable than female homosexuality is also expressed in the police organization. Ludvig demonstrates this when he compares his own sometimes problematic experiences with the high status of a lesbian colleague. When I ask Ludvig if he thinks there is a difference between being a woman and a man and gay within the police, he replied immediately:

> Yes. Hell of a difference. Partially because there are many more dykes, female police officers, who are open about it. One who you surely know, Sandra, she's openly homosexual. She has a certain authority in [the South], there's absolutely no problem. And I think a lot of guys get turned on by it being two girls, they fantasize: "Fuck, that's hot." While if it's a guy, I think…I mean, it has never happened because no one's come out, but the talk is: "Fuck, that's disgusting."

I interviewed Sandra, who was mentioned by Ludvig. She points out herself that she has never experienced any problems because of her sexual orientation (see Chapter 4, "No Problems"). But Sandra also says that she thinks it is harder for male homosexuals, and that there are sexual reasons. When I ask if she thinks there is a difference between being male and female and also homosexual within the police, she says that she thinks it is "tougher" for men:

> If I'd been a guy, I'd probably have kept a lower profile than I initially did, and I have total understanding for that. […] I think it's harder for a guy to tell. Absolutely, because it's a more macho world that we live in here in the police. Plus as I said, all this about wet dreams, which some guys maybe have about two girls, and ideally with themselves as the third in it. They probably don't have that about two guys and themselves as the third.

Sandra later elaborates on how this sexualization can be expressed in the police organization, when she describes in positive terms a male colleague's reaction to her being a lesbian:

> It's funny, like when a guy said to me once when we were driving together in a patrol car together: "Fuck, how cool. You and I can check out the chicks together." So it's very relaxed. I've never had anything negative. As I said, I've never had anything negative. I think it's such a funny comment from him: "Fuck, how cool. You and I can check out the chicks together."

This sexualized way of being one of the gang does not reasonably apply to male homosexuals (though they may be able to check out guys with female heterosexuals). The macho norm shapes inclusion here, creating different conditions for male and female homosexuals.

Expressions of the sexualization of homosexuality in the police organization have also been discussed in previous chapters. For example, there was "The hate meeting" with the SWAT police officer who wanted to try same-sex sexual interactions; "The picture" with the colleague who said "Ugh, fuck!" when he saw an erotic picture of two men; "The poster" with the advertisement for the "buttsaver" that referred to anal sex; and "The cruising terror", where the origin of the issue was a sexual come-on to the commander. All of these examples are of how (primarily male) homosexuality is depicted as a threat or a problem and almost exclusively with a focus on sex. All of these stories, except possibly "The poster", are also examples of how heteronormativity is "done" by (presumably heterosexual) men distancing themselves from male homosexuality. In "The hate meeting", it was the male boss who organized the meeting to identify and punish those who were having homosexual interactions; and in "The picture" it was the male colleague who said,

"Ugh, fuck! Fucking hell! We can't even stand here." when he saw the homoerotic picture at the crime scene; and in "The cruising terror" it was a male commander who ordered them to "terrorize the fags" in the park.

Other scholars have also noted this phenomenon of sexualization and that it tends to be aimed at male homosexuality. In Malin Wieslander's study, there is an example of diversity training within the police, where there was a PowerPoint picture of a male police officer putting his hand on the bottom of another male police officer, with the text, "Are we ready for LGBT colleagues?"[15] The sexualization of gay men is (overly) explicit here. To be "ready" for gay colleagues means being ready to be pawed at.[16]

The police officers' accounts – which have connections to general societal views – as well as organizational comments thus suggest 1) that sexualization plays a key role in explaining differences in the perception of and conditions for the inclusion of male and female homosexuals, 2) that there is a tendency to view male homosexuality as more "problematic", and 3) that this fits with how traditional masculinity tends to be strongly linked to non-homosexuality.

I want to emphasize that this is about traditional norms and tendencies; many heterosexual men do not view male homosexuality as problematic at all. What I want to point out is that societal norms around sexuality have an impact on understanding the inclusion and exclusion of homosexuality in organizations, such as the police. Societal images of the police and of homosexuality find their way into the police organization and affect how the police officers see themselves. This is not just something my subjects imagine but rather an established insight from social psychology: we see ourselves by imagining how others see us.[17] In other words, police officers' and aspiring police officers' images of themselves and of police work are affected by general views of the police, masculinity, and homosexuality.

This insight is largely neglected in traditional organization theory, however. Sexuality is assumed to have nothing to do with formal organizations. Bureaucracy has no space for sexuality, other than as something that should be kept away and left in the home and family. Organization scholar Gibson Burrell even writes that when bureaucracy began to take shape at the start of the 20th century – with its focus on rationality and rules and thereby with the elimination of emotionally based behaviors – the oppression of sexuality was seen as one of the main tasks of management.[18] But less traditional organization scholars, such as Burrell, would probably find my interviewees' speculations relevant because they underline that neither human emotions nor sexuality can be eliminated from organizations. Some scholars, such as Judith Pringle, even argue that sexuality permeates every organization:

> Far from being marginal to the workplace, sexuality is everywhere. It is alluded to in dress and self-presentation, in jokes and gossip, looks and flirtations, secret affairs and dalliances, in fantasy, and in the range of coercive behaviours that we now call sexual harassment.[19]

Whether sexuality is as central as Pringle claims can be discussed, but there is good reason to assume that it exists *in* humans as biological urges, and *between* people as cultural constructions of what sexuality means in certain contexts, and that formal organizations such as the police are no exceptions from this. My interviewees' accounts are indicative of this insight. But how can we understand this in terms of inclusion?

The heterosexual matrix

To understand the thinking around male and female homosexuality in the police, it is useful to employ the well-establish concept of *the heterosexual matrix* from the philosopher and gender scholar Judith Butler.[20] The matrix was touched upon in my historical overview in Chapter 2; an endnote there discusses how the meaning of being a man is strongly linked to the desire to have sex with women. The matrix expresses a heteronormativity where there are connections between sex (man/woman), gender (masculinity/femininity), and sexual desire. Being a man is expressed by showing masculine characteristics, and feeling desire for women is considered a fundamentally masculine characteristic.

Butler argues that these links are culturally shaped and so fundamental that it is hard for us to understand things that do not fit into the matrix. The matrix makes it possible to understand some identities as normal (those that fit in), while what does not fit in is either not understood at all (even today there is relatively little understanding for those who do not want to identify as either a man or a woman) or is understood as abnormal or deviant. The matrix is therefore a way of describing how it works when we construct the meanings of being a man/masculine and a woman/feminine. It illustrates how heterosexuality is "compulsory"[21] in our conceptions of what makes a man or a woman – one "must" be heterosexual to fit into the matrix. A man who is not attracted to women is considered, according to the matrix, less masculine and does not pass "as a man". A woman who is attracted to women seems masculine and also does not fit into the matrix "as a woman". On the other hand, she fits "as a police officer" in the police, because the police organization is viewed as masculine. In this way, the matrix is helpful for understanding differences when it comes to male and female gay police officers.

The ideas that my respondents call "speculations" and "beliefs" express, in other words, longstanding social norms that link gender to sexuality. The matrix helps us to understand the respondents' ideas about why it is more difficult to be a gay male police officer than a gay female police officer in light of a long history where masculine heterosexuality – which is part of what is referred to as "macho" – has dominated. The quotes and examples in this chapter – as in a number of previous studies[22] – show how the police is characterized by masculine heterosexuality, and the matrix emphasizes that to fit in as a police officer, it is important to express this sexuality, and

this is most clearly done by showing desire for women. Heterosexual men and lesbian women express this desire in various ways, but gay men do not. Respondent Henrik expresses this very clearly when he says that lesbian women "at least try to be men", while "fags, they don't even try to be [men]". This forms a hierarchy in the perceptions around sexuality and the police organization: heterosexual men are the most manly because they "are men", then there are lesbian women who are not men but try to be "like men", and finally there are "fags", who do not even show the good will to try to be "like men" but rather are "like women". This hierarchy is visible as a norm, a background that is taken for granted, in the police officers' accounts about why it might be harder to be a man and gay in the police organization.

In light of this discussion, it is not strange that Sandra fits in so well, and that she has experienced so few problems, "even though" she is a lesbian. She "does" masculinity and therefore can be said to "pass"[23] as a man in the police context. She can do things that heterosexual men do, including "checking out chicks".

To add some nuance to this, it is worth noting two things about the matrix. First of all, the matrix naturally provides only a one-sided version of masculinity. The point is not that there are no other ways of expressing masculinity than showing attraction to women or distancing oneself from an attraction to men; the point is that heterosexual masculinity is strong, even dominant, and something that men and women need to relate to and deal with. So Butler's matrix is a helpful tool as we try to understand why it can be harder to express homosexual masculinity in masculinely-coded cultures.

The second thing worth pointing out is that this is not saying that generally it is easier to be a lesbian. Rather, it is saying that it is easier to fit into a masculinely-coded culture if you do things associated with masculinity, such as "checking out chicks". Therefore, in the police, lesbian women and heterosexual men can have a certain common interest. But lesbians will reasonably want to fit in as lesbians and not "as men". Sexuality scholars have noted that lesbians who, in Henrik's terms, *do not* "try to be men" but rather show femininely-coded behaviors tend to have a harder time fitting in as lesbians.[24] This is demonstrated, among other ways, when lesbians who use feminine symbols – such as dressing in more typically female clothes, wearing jewelry, or using make-up – are not seen as lesbians, but rather are continued to be seen by men as sexual objects, even when they are open about their orientation.[25] In "The convertor" in the last chapter, there was an example of this, when the supervisor/convertor reportedly said to the trainee: "But you're so cute and feminine, so you can't be a dyke. But maybe I can help you to change that in various ways." This highlights that sexuality – regardless of orientation – is not just something we are, but something we do and that others do with us in social contexts. Even if someone is a lesbian and there is an association between lesbianism and masculinity, that is not enough to fit into a masculinely-coded culture. One must also do lesbianism

in the "right way", in this case by alluding to the masculinized characteristics. Sometimes, as in "The convertor", being seen as "cute" can be enough not to fit in.

Conclusion

The image of an occupation affects both those who are about to choose the occupation and those who work in it. In this chapter, I have presented how the police force is viewed as partially characterized by a particular masculinity norm, often referred to as "macho" by my respondents, and I have discussed how this is related to the inclusion of homosexuality. "Macho" prioritizes traditional masculinity and marginalizes things associated with femininity, which means that people who have identities or show behaviors associated with femininity might have to carry out "masculinity work" to fit into the macho norm. With the term "masculinity work", I want to emphasize that it is about *work*, an effort to fit in that those who belong to the norm do not have to make.

The macho norm contains a sexualized aspect in that there is a negative association between macho and male homosexuality. This association is not unique to the police organization – it affects society as a whole, which "the heterosexual matrix" illuminates – but it becomes particularly relevant in the policing context because there is an image of the police as macho. In the police's organizational context, to the extent that it is shaped by the macho norm, the inclusion of, in particular, male homosexuality is made more difficult by the norm. This is because of the aforementioned negative association between macho and male homosexuality. But the difficulty is reasonably reinforced by the police's history of excluding and combating primarily male homosexuality and by the fact that male heterosexuality in general tends to be more sensitive about male homosexuality than female heterosexuality is about female homosexuality.

Even if the macho norm is more prominent in the police force – and in other masculinely-coded jobs – than in many other jobs, the police should not be reduced to this norm. The next chapter continues the description of the organizational context in which inclusion and exclusion take place, but I will leave the image of the police and societal views of homosexuality and instead focus on the work of policing itself.

Notes

1. For a broader analysis of "police culture" in a Swedish context, see, for example, dissertations by Ekman (1999), Granér (2004), and Stenmark (2005), or later work by Granér (2016). For a non-Swedish context, see Loftus (2009, 2010) and Reiner (2010, particularly Chapter 4).
2. See, for example, Belkin & McNichol (2002), Bernstein & Swartwout (2012), Granér (2004), Lander (2008), Loftus (2008), Miller et al. (2003), Panter (2018), Prokos & Padavic (2002), and Wieslander (2014).

3. Alvesson & Due Billing (2011, p. 111).
4. Connell (1995, particularly pp. 100 fwd.).
5. Ely & Meyerson (2010, p. 5). For other descriptions of masculine and feminine associations, see Ahl (2006), Alvesson & Due Billing (2011, pp. 111–2), and Hines (1992).
6. Connell (1995, p. 102). Also see Ambjörnsson (2005, pp. 198 fwd.), which explores life at a Swedish high school. Ambjörnsson writes that male homosexuality is depicted as the thing that boys define themselves in opposition to.
7. Ely & Meyerson (2010), Schrock & Schwalbe (2009).
8. See Belkin & McNichol (2002), Bernstein & Swartwout (2012), Granér (2004), Lander (2008), Loftus (2008), Miller et al. (2003), Panter (2018), Prokos & Padavic (2002), Wieslander (2014).
9. The police officer who said that it was harder for women had Stockholm in the late 1980s in mind. At that time, there were few women working for the police and especially few lesbians. This officer pointed out that "they had no [female] friends" and particularly no lesbian friends, as opposed to the men in that context, who, according to the respondent had other homosexual men within the police force to talk to.
10. Finstad (2000/2013, p. 258) also found this in her study of Norwegian police officers: "The overall impression is clear […]. It is obviously easier for lesbian police officers than for gay police officers to be open about their life experience and to talk as naturally about their partners as heterosexual colleagues do during the lunch break or in the patrol car."
11. Jonas Gardell is a famous gay Swedish writer and celebrity, considered slightly "camp".
12. West & Zimmerman (1987).
13. Hammarstedt et al. (2015, p. 95). This statistical study is very general and is based on all Swedish occupations. It is likely that attitudes are different depending on, for example, occupation and workplace. Similar results have been shown in studies of police organizations in the USA (Bernstein & Kostelac 2002, Miller et al. 2003) and in England and Wales (Jones & Williams 2015).
14. Kite & Whitley (1996), LaMar & Kite (1998). It can be worth noting that naturally things vary from context to context about how male or female homosexuality is perceived and how non-heterosexuals experience their situation. Also, double minority status can lead to increased discrimination. For example, lesbian women can feel marginalized both as women and as non-heterosexuals (Couto 2018, Jones & Williams 2015).
15. Wieslander (2014, pp. 115, 122).
16. For a similar observation in an American context, see Panter (2018, p. 156), in which heterosexual male police officers referred to male homosexuality as "unacceptable" and "repulsive."
17. This insight is connected primarily to the philosopher and social psychologist George Herbert Mead (1934).
18. Burrell (1984).
19. Pringle (1990, p. 162). Also see Fleming (2007).
20. Butler (1990). Also see Bendl & Hofmann (2015), Bogren (2010), Rosenberg (2005a), and Tyler & Cohen (2008).
21. See Butler (1990, pp. 26, 42) for more on "compulsory heterosexual", a concept she has borrowed from Rich (1980).
22. For instance, Bildt (2004), Davies & Thomas (2003), Lander (2008, 2013), Loftus (2008, 2010), Miller et al. (2003), and Wieslander (2014). See the overview in Chapter 2.

23. See Endnote 19 in Chapter 3 about the term "passing" (Goffman 1963, pp. 42, 73 fwd.). To "pass as a man" means that a person who is not a man communicates information about themselves – using language and other symbolic actions, such as "checking out chicks" – in such a way so that they appear, pass, like a man. This is in line with West & Zimmerman's (1987) point, building on Goffman, that masculinity is something that is "done", and thereby it is possible to pass as a man, regardless of biological sex.
24. Bowring & Brewis (2009), Einarsdóttir et al. (2016).
25. Einarsdóttir et al. (2016, p. 499).

6 Policing and the inclusion of homosexuality

In the previous chapter, I explored how the "macho image" of the police and its relationship to sexuality might be a partial explanation for the relative absence of (openly) gay men in the police force. The explanation is somewhat general, and even if I referred to how sexualization can be expressed in the police, there is good reason to explore in more depth the relationship between the nature of policing and the inclusion of homosexuality.

In this chapter, I will continue the analysis of the context in which the individual experiences from Chapters 3 and 4 take place, but here I will focus on the work of policing itself. I will discuss dimensions of policing that my study found to be central and that are relevant to our understanding of the organizational context in which exclusion and inclusion take place. First, I will discuss how policing is corporeal and intimate, which accentuates sexuality. Then I will refer to the ways that police officers talk to one another, with a particular focus on jargon that can be described as "raw but cordial". Finally, I will present what I call de-heteromasculinization, which aims to add nuance to the image of policing as macho.

Since this chapter refers to policing in general, I will employ not just my interviews with LGB police officers but also my interviews with other police officers, whose sexual orientation I do not know, and my observations of police work (see the section on methodology in Chapter 1). I indicate which interviewees are known to be LGB police officers. Although I do not think this matters when interview statements are about police work in general, I still indicate this throughout for the sake of transparency. It can happen that the reader might see a relevance that I have not considered.

Corporeal and intimate – Policing as a catalyst for the relevance of sexuality

Sexuality is expressed more in policing than in most jobs. This means that there is good reason for claiming that while the previous chapter's reasoning around the heterosexual matrix is relevant for understanding the connection between sexuality and gender in general, it is *especially* relevant in regard to police work.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-6

This sexual dimension of policing is primarily expressed in its corporeal and intimate aspects. These aspects make sexuality more "present" in a different way than in most jobs, as expressed by Erika, a lesbian police officer, when we talk about the differences between being a man and a woman and gay within the police. She says that she has heard that men might wonder about more things such as "if that [gay] man will get an erection in the shower", but that there "aren't such things among women". I wondered if this is specific to the police, and Erika replied:

> Well, but you shower a lot in the police. You change together. You've very…you work close to each other. You touch each other and all that. A lot of self-defense exercises. So it's probably a more, what can I say, intimate job, between colleagues, maybe than other jobs.

Emma, who shared her story about "The poster" in Chapter 4, said something similar:

> In our job, we have a lot of group training, a lot of self-defense, a lot of exercise together. You shower together more than you maybe would in other jobs. Those are things that I think may prevent [a man from being openly gay]. I think that maybe they'd be scared that colleagues would say, "Fuck, don't touch me" and "What the fuck are you looking at in the shower?" Or when you're doing training in self-defense: "What the fuck, did he grab my ass or what did he do really?" When it was just a fucking typical exercise.

Susanne (an LGB police officer) also emphasizes the intimacy when she tells about how people realized that she was a lesbian:

> I was working in a smaller group then in [an area of the city]. And we had worked together for half a year. And when you work together in that way, ten people, or eight or whatever it was, you get very close. You're sitting in a patrol car close together for many hours a day, sometimes ten hours. It's like you can't avoid it, somehow.

The stories from the previous chapters also reference intimacy among colleagues. Sebastian, who in "Hype" in Chapter 4 talked about how it was to come out, highlighted the intimacy. He explained how the fact that people work in pairs and often sit together in a patrol car triggers "chat" about private affairs:

> It's clear that, two men in a police car, a night shift and not much is happening – you talk a lot. So there were a lot of questions. And I was then "single". Even though I wasn't. And there was a lot of talk. Sex talk. Well, yeah, you know, all that.

In particular Sebastian's final sentence – "Well, yeah, you know, all that." – illustrates how normalized personal conversation (including "sex talk") is within the police, at least after you have done a couple of night shifts together. It is as if Sebastian refrains from explaining any further because the topic is so well known that he instead can refer to it as general knowledge.

The police officers' description of work as corporeal and intimate concords with my observations of police work in Malmö. There was a lot of talk about sex. For example, in the lunch room, there were jokes about who got to have sex or not have sex "every night", and I observed a discussion about the phenomenon of "ex-fucking" (having sex with one's ex). And there were often jokey sexual allusions when there was room for it. For example, there was the following episode from my field notes, where a female police officer jokingly was sexualized when there was confusion during the briefing about who was going to travel with whom to their traffic enforcement work:

> Harald [the commander in charge of the briefing] says who is going in which car. "Rickard will take Jens and the laser," Harald says. "Who are they?" Maria asks. I say "I'm Jens". "Who is Larsson?" Maria says. "The *la-ser*," the others clarify, laughing. [The laser and Larsson sound similar, at least in southern Swedish dialect…] "Did you think there was something new and interesting?" Rickard jokes.

Maria's confusion about the laser and Larsson was, in other words, made into a joke based on the idea that Maria was interested in Larsson as a new, sexually "interesting" colleague. The following field observations show more examples of sexual allusions:

> [During a traffic control shift.] Amelie and Maria come over to me and Lars after Maria spoke to a woman who was speeding, who Lars apparently thought was cute. "Was she single?" Lars asks.
>
> "You know, I didn't ask because I'm not inclined that way," Maria replies.
>
> [After the traffic control, in the bus with Rickard, Karl, Amelie, and Maria.] We're done with the traffic control and are going to buy food on Östra Förstadsgatan [a street]. On the way there, a "masturbation case" comes up on the radio. A man is standing, masturbating, on Östra Farmvägen [a road]. They don't take it. "I thought you'd both say, 'Yeah! We're taking it'", Karl says, smiling. Amelie replies, hardly amused, "Why would we find it interesting to watch while he's standing there, jerking…?"

The corporeal and intimate aspects are thus not only expressed in formal situations – such as training, "self-defense", and arrests – but also in informal interactions. As in the following, yet another example from the police

station, when I was observing "my" police officers Magnus and Johannes as they sat there, writing reports. From my field notes:

> I go into the office and watch Magnus and Johannes sit there, writing reports. Magnus goes to the lunch room and comes back and says to me, "There's a fight in there, if you want something to write about." I hear shouts from the lunch room. "We're like a big family here," says a female police officer who is sitting and writing. Two police officers, a man in uniform and a woman in plain clothes, come running into the office. The man wrestles the woman down and puts her hands on her back as if he was going to put her in handcuffs. She laughs and screams a little, the way you'd imagine young people in love would do. "Ah, behave now," Magnus says, half-seriously.

The wrestling match (which was in fun) expresses how there is a strong corporeal dimension at work. The contrast becomes clear if I imagine myself wrestling down my female academic colleagues in fun, or they me. We do not do that. It is not the norm. Our work is much less corporeal.

Corporeality and intimacy and private and less work-related communication are prominent aspects of police work. People touch each other, they exercise and shower together, they wrestle for fun, and they talk a lot with and about each other, not seldom about sex. I am not pointing out the corporeality and intimacy in police work to judge it, but rather to argue that this aspect makes sexuality become present more easily and thereby more relevant to understanding policing than many other occupations. One could say that the intimate and corporeal policing practices function as a "catalyst" for societal discourse around sexuality. To the extent that the heterosexual matrix affects how we think, talk, and act, it is strengthened. Under such conditions, elements or revelations of non-heterosexuality arguably become more charged and potentially more problematic.

Raw but cordial

Another aspect of the nature of police work concerns their way of talking to one another. This has already been touched upon through references to "jargon". In "The support" in Chapter 4, Nina referred to "that jargon" and associated it with "gay jokes and that sort of thing", and in a similar way, Sandra in "No problems" said that "the jargon can be a little like that within the police, with fags and all that, but often it's more that they're joking: 'Thanks for having us over. My ass is a little sore.'" The police officers themselves, as well as previous police research,[1] call this jargon "raw but cordial", and it performs, I argue, at least two opposing functions that I will explore more in depth. On the one hand, it is a source of mental release and group belonging that is perceived as important in police work, while on the other hand, it contributes to a certain sort of superficiality and a silence that

discourages deeper reflection on aspects of police culture that can counteract inclusion.

High ceilings – Mental relief and inclusion in the group

"Raw but cordial" means that it is acceptable to joke about most things and that denigrating comments are normalized and should not be taken seriously as long as they are "just a joke". As I mentioned, this has come up previously by the references to "gay jokes". But it is not just about sexuality; rather, this is a general phenomenon within the police. The following description from Jörgen, a commander in Malmö, makes this clear. He offers examples of interactions where the literal sense is racist, while on a deeper level it is about, according to Jörgen, a sort of jokey jargon:

> We can discuss an example, like in my group, there are a lot of people with immigrant background. And they call themselves "blattar" and us "svenne"[2]. And they're the ones who started joking about it; it was probably the easiest thing to joke about to become part of the group and all that. And I think it's gone a little too far, and sometimes the jokes are too crude. And I've talked to some people and said you need to say if it's too much, so it isn't seen as racist, or someone gets upset. Then we had a party and there's this guy from Bosnia. When he comes there, he's sitting there with his gold chain and his tank top, saying, "Hey, what's up?" [with an accent]. And he is the one who's worst: "Oh, are you calling me a blatte, do I look like a blatte, huh, huh?" [with an accent]. Like that. But…if it had been recorded, people outside, people would have been surprised. It was like a colleague, we were sitting and eating, and someone came by and was going to sit down, and she says, not meaning anything bad, "Hey, excuse me, it's just us white people sitting here at this table." And he just was like: "Fucking svenne", and then leaves. Doesn't get upset at all. When I first heard that, it was: "What the fuck are you saying?" But then I understood that they just think it's funny. But then people were sitting at the next table who don't know us. And I'm thinking, if they'd heard that, there would be an outcry.
>
> *Jens: But they know each other?*
>
> Yeah, they know each other really well, so it's the jargon between them. They would never have said it to someone they didn't know or know about. But I can imagine that people from outside…it does sound really awful.

The phenomenon of the "raw but cordial" jargon is relatively well-known. Police scholar Rolf Granér writes in his study of police culture:

> …in the police car as well as in the staff room, the language could be coarse, with both sexist and racist implications. The jargon was usually described as "raw but cordial", with generous amounts of teasing and jokes.[3]

In a similar way, the sociologist Daniel Görtz notes that abundant joking characterizes police culture and that the police make jokes about one another, at the same time that "a coarse joke is almost always met with hearty laughter".[4] Police scholar Malin Wieslander also writes that police jargon is characterized by a raw but cordial atmosphere. Wieslander notes that "it is above all those who deviate from the norm who are the objects of jokes" and that "the demand to adapt language in the name of political correctness is contrasted with the need for humor and that jokes by their nature are not intended to discriminate".[5] Similar conclusions have been drawn by research in other countries. In her studies of British police officers, Bethan Loftus observed, just as Wieslander did, how police officers complained about the demands for "political correctness" when they were expected to adapt their language use in order to not marginalize minorities.[6] As I wrote in Chapter 3, Loftus suggests that the police create *white spaces* where they can employ language in relation to minorities and "deviants" in ways that are otherwise not accepted.[7]

Journalist reportage has also referred to this tendency to joke about those who deviate. Katia Wagner writes in her book *Pojkarna Och de Ensamma Poliserna* [The Boys and the Lonely Police Officers] about how police officers who tried to get to know and help unaccompanied immigrant boys jokingly were called "men with an abnormal interest in little boys" and in general were teased by certain colleagues for engaging in social work.[8] Also, in less investigative journalism, it has been said that the police, possibly in an attempt at joking, have used example names such as "Neger Niggersson"[9] in their internal training.[10] Even if the content varies, and even if it is sometimes rawer and sometimes more cordial, these examples can be viewed as an expression of the "raw but cordial" jargon.

This jargon does not characterize all contexts or all employees within the police. Both my studies and my references show that this sort of language is primarily an internal jargon that rarely comes up in direct contact with outsiders,[11] and that many police officers do not practice or have need of this jargon, and that teasing and jibes may well be mixed with praise. For instance, Wagner's book shows that while the police officers who engaged with the boys who arrived on their own to Sweden had to deal with teasing from certain colleagues, they also were praised by others. And in a similar way, Emma in "The poster" (Chapter 4) had to withstand harassment when the posters were torn down and mocked by some colleagues, while others supported her when she spoke up. Thus, jargon is situation-dependent, influenced by who is listening.[12] But both my and other studies indicate that "raw cordiality" is something that characterizes the police more than other organizations. Why is that the case?

The police officers themselves often say that the nature of the work is a reason why this sort of language is needed. They themselves face raw language

in their work and therefore develop their own joking rawness as a way of counteracting the difficult situations and tragic human circumstances that they deal with. It is a way to "vent", to get mental relief, the police officers say in my and others' studies.[13] Among the police I interviewed and rode along with in Malmö, this was expressed, such as by Jörgen and Peter, both commanders on patrol duty:

> We police officers are, you know, pretty raw. As we say, cordial but raw jargon. This has something to do with how we are exposed to things. One way of dealing with it is to joke. I've noticed that my language has become rougher.
>
> (Jörgen)

> You can't take on everything. Sometimes you have to vent too. […] We can't go here and…I have to be able to come into the lunch room and sit down and say, "Fuck, she was stupid, that one." As long as you've behaved properly out there, you have to be able to let off steam in here. That's what I mean. Among your colleagues. Then maybe it becomes a sort of, yeah, jargon and all that.
>
> (Peter)

Police officers experience really difficult things, and surely this "raw cordiality" fills, just as the police officers say, a venting function ("let off steam") that can create a more light-hearted version of the often heavy everyday police work.[14] Jargon can thus be an important way of handling the work, and when it is expressed between colleagues, it is probably most often as a joke. They say that they have "high ceilings", meant as a metaphor for freedom and open-mindedness:

> The ceilings are pretty high here, when we're alone. There's a lot of joking about everything and everyone. You have to give a lot and you have to take a lot. That's just how it is.
>
> (Niklas, a police officer in Malmö)

Another function – besides the mental release – can also be traced here, namely that the jargon indicates group belonging and therefore is a source of inclusion. Or, as the Norwegian police researcher Liv Finstad has put it: the ability to participate in jargon confirms that you are a good colleague.[15] This function is related to the general theoretical insight that the ability to speak a group's language, in the sense that you master the group's way of speaking to each other, is a way of showing that you are a legitimate member of the group.[16] This is true for different types of groups (not least for the police's formal counterpart: criminals), but we are talking about

occupational groups. Researchers, doctors, engineers, lawyers, teachers, police officers, and others have their own "jargons", and the mastery of these is one (among others) way of showing that you belong to the group and can participate in its work.

A closer reading of the previously given quotes indicates how jargon is associated with a "we" and an expectation about mutual raw cordiality that is particular to the police occupation: "we police officers are, you know, pretty raw", "we have to deal with things", the work means that they have to "let off steam", jargon can be used "among colleagues", you joke "to become part of the group", there are high ceilings (freedom, open-mindedness) "when we're alone", "you have to give a lot and you have to take a lot". In other words, this raw but cordial jargon along with "high ceilings" is something that the police officers have together and seldom share with others. Participating in the jargon is a way of joining the group, and it can contribute to creating solidarity and unity, which can be particularly important for police officers, who often come into conflict with other groups and need to feel collegial support.[17]

Close to the floor – Silencing of analysis and reflection

But the jargon can also – perhaps in opposition to what one might expect, given the metaphor of high ceilings – create a conformity that contributes to a sort of silence around sensitive topics.[18] Having jokes and teasing "about everything and everyone" implies a *certain type* of openness; it is a particular way of dealing with sensitive questions. As Sandra notes: "Sometimes I think it's about sensitive topics and that's why people think it's fun to joke about it." But joking also means not really taking things seriously and distancing oneself from deeper analysis and reflection around sensitive subjects. Sensitive and complex issues are dealt with in a quick and relatively superficial way.

One can say that "raw but cordial" is partially opposed to "critical and reflective" – in the sense of focusing on trying to understand how different groups experience the current way of interacting and who benefits from it – which is another "genre" for handling sensitive and problematic issues. Those who do not want to participate in the jargon or who wish to leave the level of joking for the benefit of deeper discussion risk being marginalized, even if that is not necessarily the intention. For example, it might not have been the intention to marginalize or stigmatize Johan in "The picture", when his colleague said, "Ugh, fuck! Fucking hell! We can't even stand here" at the sight of a homoerotic picture of a man. And maybe it wasn't the intention to do it either when a colleague informed Ludvig that gays "fuck monkeys". It might have been a joke, an expression of the "raw but cordial" jargon. But the effect, regardless of the intention, was marginalization and silencing. Neither Johan nor Ludvig felt that these situations were the right time for suggesting that they take the opportunity

to engage in some deeper reflection about how gay people are represented in everyday police work.

This form of distancing from a more reflective and analytical way of relating to issues of inclusion was also expressed by Nina. Nina said in Chapter 4 that she noticed a jargon with "gay jokes and that sort of thing". She continued:

> And then I sometimes could, when I heard it, share what I thought about that language. And then it's always some people who think that you're that feminist who has to…So I had that role a lot as that left-wing feminist who always wanted to discuss this and who always wanted to see problems.

Nina indicates that questioning the raw but cordial jargon is not very popular. If one is critical, then one becomes "that feminist […] who always wanted to see problems". Questioning it challenges the cohesive function of the jargon. Emelie, a lesbian police officer, noted something similar when she said that "it is hard to be the one who questions things a little, particularly when it's discussions about racism and homophobia". In other words, the raw but cordial jargon combines high ceilings with proximity to the floor. One can joke about most things without too much trouble, but it is not as easy to engage in deeper reflection around racism, sexism, or homophobia in the police.

The "high floor" is related to what researchers and journalists call the *culture of silence* in the police.[19] Scholar Malin Wieslander writes that the culture of silence is about how police employees "are socialized into keeping criticism and viewpoints to themselves", where colleagues are "sanctioned if they offer viewpoints, criticism, or questions about operations".[20] The culture of silence means, among other things, that police officers are afraid to criticize their organization due to the fear of punishment of various types (ostracism, not being promoted, etc.). Hence, there is the employment of metaphors such as "the freezer" and "the black list", partially to signify the perception that it is hard to be promoted if you have made things difficult for the management,[21] and partially as an internal, cynical criticism of the culture of silence.

But the explanation for silence and limited critical reflection should not be solely reduced to a fear of reprisals from management. The collegial dynamic can also have a silencing effect. Collegial solidarity – sometimes referred to as esprit de corps – is, as previously mentioned, well-documented within the police,[22] and deviating from the jargon becomes a way of deviating from the collective. Just as participation in the jargon can indicate that you are a good colleague, not doing so can indicate that you are not.

But here the concept of a culture of silence needs to be modified. The raw but cordial jargon is related to the culture of silence, but it is about a *certain*

type of silence that builds on the existence of a *certain type* of non-silence (voice). In other words, it is *not silent* between colleagues.

The potential problem in terms of collegial inclusion is therefore not that people do not talk, but rather that *the way* that they talk tends to make other ways of talking more difficult. The high ceiling allows a certain type of "voice" – the one that jokes about things and expresses raw but cordial jargon, according to the description above. But for the voice that wants to go more in-depth into problems – for example, the one that wants to try to understand why there are so few openly gay male police officers *despite* the "high ceiling", or the one that does not want to joke about but instead wants to discuss what is behind the incident with the "buttsaver" on the poster (Chapter 4), or the one that wants to explore how it can happen that the person who said that homosexuals are like a cancer on society can continue to work at the reception desk (Chapter 4), or the one who wants to discuss, in a more professional way, how the police can actually work on hate crimes (Chapter 7) – it appears that the ceiling is not as high. Perhaps here too the fear of reprisals from the management lies behind this, but it would be wrong to claim that there are no opportunities for "regular police officers" to bring up these subjects. For instance, both "The poster" and "The sauna" experiences indicate that some managers are willing to take problems with exclusionary talk and action seriously.

Organizations that develop cultures of silence tend to create a climate that makes the inclusion of minorities more difficult.[23] Limitations on what can seriously be talked about make it harder to "raise one's voice" to point out or complain about circumstances that are perceived as problematic, unjust, or counterproductive. This is sometimes referred to as the development of "spirals of silence", which means that the majority's views become dominant over time as individuals are more likely to express their views or to behave in a certain way if they believe they have support from others, and to keep quiet if they believe that they do not have support.[24] If employees avoid behaving in a way that deviates, existing norms become cemented. This can contribute to organizations not developing, both specifically in terms of developing new norms around what is *norm*al behavior, and more generally in regard to developing improved routines, working methods, and structures. But when employees feel that they have support from either colleagues or management, they are more likely to speak up or to change their behavior, and the "spiral" changes direction. Then one can describe it as a culture that encourages employees to speak up, where management and colleagues are willing to listen and support, and where protest is *not* associated with fear or negative consequences to any great extent.[25]

In sum, the raw but cordial language is arguably a double-edged sword that can contribute to both inclusion and exclusion. "Raw but cordial" offers community for individuals who can participate in the jargon, which is not to be undervalued in an organization such as the police.[26] There is a great need to feel collegial solidarity, to feel that colleagues are behind you, and

to know that you can "vent" your often mentally challenging experience, and can present them in a more easygoing manner. But at the same time that "raw but cordial" jargon enables talk about difficult things, the jargon can also build walls against inclusion by having a silencing effect on deeper discussions and problematizations of police practices. One should not be "critical for real" and should not break the acknowledgment of the jargon. There are high ceilings in the sense that people can refer to and joke about everything, but it is also close to the floor in the sense that people should not dig too deeply into what is actually going on and what implications it might have for who fits in, and for the organization as a whole. This phenomenon can exist both vertically (in relation to bosses and management) and horizontally (in relation to colleagues on the same hierarchical level). In terms of the vertical, this is about being silent to avoid reprisals from management and bosses. In terms of the horizontal, this is about how deeper reflections risk being silenced in favor of maintaining the raw but cordial community.

De-heteromasculinization

In Chapter 5, I discussed how the police are largely symbolized as masculine (with an emphasis on macho) and heterosexual – that is, as heteromasculine. But if you consider police work today, there are also indications that this association is changing. To put it another way, there are indications that the policing is being "de-heteromasculinized". I will discuss two expressions of this. The first is about an increasing presence and visibility of non-heterosexuals and non-heterosexuality, and the second is about elements of practices in the police organization that downplay masculinity and marginalize homophobia.

Non-heterosexual presence

One expression of de-heteromasculinization is the openly gay police officers themselves. The fact that most of my gay and bisexual respondents are open about their orientation means that non-heterosexuality is present in a different way than if they only existed hypothetically or as something that exists "somewhere else". This presence tends to tone down heterosexist language and behavior. Sebastian, who told the story about the "hype" in Chapter 4, exemplifies this:

> It requires, of course, something to happen that breaks the pattern, and that you get close, because it's easy to have preconceived ideas about things that are distant. But if it is someone you like, who you hang out with, and who says that they're gay, then you have reflect on your prejudices, and have a talk with yourself about how you want things to be. That's the most important thing we can do. Be open and talk about it is as if isn't a big deal, which it isn't.

This phenomenon is well-established in research and is often referred to as the *contact hypothesis* (also see Chapter 1). Simply put, it is about how positive contacts between groups reduce prejudices between these groups.[27] If the hypothesis is valid, then my respondents themselves, through their presence and openness, are creating to a certain extent the positive experiences they are having (see Chapter 4 for examples of "inclusionary pressures"). After all, a condition for contact is that representatives of the groups are present.

Other examples of non-heterosexual presence and visibility are the formation of the Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association)[28] and of the LGBTQ+ network that Emma described in "The poster" (Chapter 4). In both cases, there initially were attempts at silencing. Among other things, certain police officers sent letters to the editor of *Svensk Polis* (Swedish police) magazine, opposing the normalization of homosexuality by allowing the gay police officers who had formed the Gaypolisföreningen to feature in the magazine and then allowing them to wear their uniforms in the Pride parade.[29] Tomas, one of the LGB police officers I interviewed, describes how there was "such a *damned* hullabaloo, I can tell you, in our magazines, our union magazines and employee magazines. [There was] a colleague from Sörmland [Södermanland, a county on the east coast of Sweden, south of Stockholm], and the headline for their article was, 'You're normalizing sick behavior.'" But not everyone was negative. Just as in "The poster", there were both exclusionary and inclusionary pressures, which in the case of Gaypolisföreningen had a geographic dimension that was often mentioned in my interviews, namely a separation between the Norrmalm and Södermalm police departments in Stockholm.[30] Tomas recalled: "I can say that the colleagues who were working at the pride parade, some, those who worked in Söder, they turned and cheered, but the others didn't turn, that's how it was."

Both the example of the Gaypolisföreningen and the formation of Emma's LGBTQ+ network in "The poster" emphasize how non-heterosexuality has become present and visible. At the same time, the attempts at silencing remind us that "contact" is not always perceived as positive. According to the contact hypothesis, prejudice is not reduced in such cases.

But even if contact is not experienced as positive, the examples highlight a certain aspect of the contact hypothesis, namely that the presence of non-heterosexuality *exposes* and thereby creates the conditions for the questioning of heteronormativity.[31] Heterosexuality, like all categories, is relational, in the sense that heterosexuality cannot be understood if there is no non-heterosexuality. This is how all linguistic categories work. X must have Y to be meaningful.[32] "Woman", for instance, is only meaningful where there is something that is not "woman", and it is usually "man" that takes that role. In this way, the assumption that everyone is heterosexual is exposed by someone who is *not* that. In an organization where everyone is or is expected to be heterosexual, heterosexuality is not exposed; it is just

a silent agreement. In contrast, the heteronorm is exposed by the presence of (open) non-heterosexuals, as individuals or as a network, which raises consciousness about how people act and talk in regard to sexual orientation, which in turn makes it possible to question and change norms.

In other words, presence can counteract the spirals of silence that I described earlier. From this perspective, the LGBTQ+ network and other types of presence strengthen the ability to raise one's voice in regard to LGBTQ+ issues since the presence itself indicates that there are others who will agree.

In a general sense, this section is about how the presence of something that works against the norms exposes the norms, which creates the potential for the norms to be challenged and changed. We need to see and feel things to be able to ask questions about them. There is a link between women's and gays' presence in the police organization, and an analogy between them can be enlightening. I referred to women joining the police in Chapter 2. Until around the 1970s, it was taken more or less for granted that being a police officer was a job for men. That was the norm; it was viewed as *normal*. When some women joined the police, the norm was exposed. If there are women who are police officers, you cannot take it for granted as easily that it is a job for men, or that it is a masculine occupation. Police scholar Roddrick Colvin argues that women paved the way for changing what was seen as a "good police officer", which I referred to in Chapter 2.[33] Today, the norm has changed. It is more or less normalized that both men and women are police officers in Sweden (and elsewhere). But for the norm to change, it first needs to become visible, and women's presence contributed to this visibility. In the same way, openly non-heterosexual police officers contribute to making the heteronorm visible. And as long as there is a negative association between masculinity and male homosexuality, heteromasculinity will be exposed by the presence of gay men. It then becomes possible to see that masculinity need not be about attraction to women.

Policing practices that counteract the macho norm

Another expression of "de-heteromasculinization" is that the police engage in some activities that do not fit very well with the macho norm that was discussed in Chapter 5 and that is often said to characterize the police. We have already seen a number of elements of this in previous chapters: the support of Nina when she had personal problems due to her lesbian orientation, the distancing from the police officers who tore down the posters for the LGBTQ+ network, and the colleagues who viewed it as a positive thing when Sebastian and Sandra came out. Although Nina, Emma, Sebastian, and Sandra's "voices" were required for a dynamic to emerge that included other sexualities than hetero, the response to their voices was not particularly "macho".

Also, the "intimacy" that I discussed previously in this chapter deviates from the macho image. Police officers talk frequently about private things, and to some degree, they have started to talk about feelings and *validate* intimacy. When I rode with the Malmö police, they had just introduced "start and end conversations" as a way of dealing with the strong emotions associated with police work, which is a different method of dealing with them than the "raw but cordial" language. When I interviewed the then-police chief in Malmö, he mentioned how the "raw but cordial" attitude had gotten competition from what is called "debriefing". When he talked about how the police had developed, he discussed how the way of relating to difficult events at work had changed:

> Things get to you, and sometimes there are certain defense mechanisms that make you maybe distance yourself a little from the [difficult] event. And then people can think you have a pretty raw attitude, but it's more of a defense mechanism, because you can't take everything on of course. And at that time [the 1970s-1980s], there were no end conversations or debriefing; that word was not invented yet. It came up with the *Scandinavian Star*[34] accident. That was probably the first time that the Swedish police heard about debriefing. […] There was no form of unburdening oneself, so it was a pretty hard attitude.

More recently, the police chief argues, things have changed, and he refers to the "start and end conversations" as examples, and he explains how they are meant to work:

> The group manager is responsible for a shift, and should begin with a start conversation. So it's pretty regulated how it should be, where everyone gets to say how they feel, how they are feeling today. Because you might have fought with your neighbor or wife or children, or some municipal institution is annoyed with you. It could be anything, which could mean that you're not really fit for fight, to go out and work in a tough environment. […] Then, in principle, every shift should finish with an end conversation. The last half-hour you should…the group boss should gather all the staff and say: "How have you been today?" "How has it been?", in order to be able to have conversations, if there have been any incidents.

The start and end conversations have nothing explicitly to do with sexuality. But the practice itself, of institutionalizing conversations about work that invite people to have a deeper conversation about how they feel, is, first of all, not particularly "macho", and, second, is an alternative to the "raw but cordial" way of dealing with work, and, third, creates a potential organizational platform for issues of inclusion and exclusion (for example, feelings

regarding work, group dynamics, any problems with jargon, sexism, heterosexism, and so on, can be raised during these conversations).

Whether this works in reality is unclear. When I rode with the police in Malmö, there was quite a lot of talk about these start and end conversations. However, such conversations rarely took place in reality, because other things were prioritized. But the possibility was there, and sometimes the group manager checked how everyone was feeling before the shift.

Once there was a major debriefing after a difficult incident in which a man, right in the center of Malmö, suddenly grabbed a little boy who was walking with his parents. The man sat down against a wall in a doorway and held a knife against the boy's throat and screamed, "Now it's time for someone to listen to me…either the boy will die or I will die." It was a terrible situation that lasted for over two hours. The despairing, quietly crying mother stood in front of the boy and the man the entire time. The boy cried and screamed for his mother. He wanted her to change his diaper. At the same time, SWAT police gathered around a corner just a couple of meters (6–7 feet) from the man, and snipers climbed up onto a roof opposite him. Neither the SWAT police nor the snipers dared to do anything, since the man was holding the boy close to him, with the knife against his throat. After long negotiations with the man, the drama ended when the police set off a distraction grenade next to the man, who then lost his concentration. Then the SWAT police jumped on him, and the negotiator got the boy. It was a tough two hours for everyone involved. Particularly for the boy and his family, of course, but also for the police officers, and for me. Many of the people had children the same age as the boy.

After the event, everyone involved was called to a debriefing. Below is a shortened extract from my field notes:

> Thirty or so police officers come to the debriefing. A commander introduces himself and says they've experienced something awful and then explains that the aim of the debriefing is to "create a common picture" and for "everyone who was part of it to say how they experienced the event", and then adds that the goal is not to "sit in a circle".
>
> All the primary participants – patrol commander, on-duty commander, SWAT team commander, negotiators – give their version of events. It takes a while, perhaps thirty minutes. The discussion is characterized by the dynamic between how they could have chosen to shoot the man in the head and the fact that it ended well, with no one seriously physically injured. The latter is largely accredited to the skilled negotiator, who was talking to the man the whole time and finally managed to distract him. After this, the patrol commander thanks everyone for doing such a good job, and suggests that they talk to their group managers about the situation when they start work again tomorrow.
>
> An HR staff member speaks then and says that the patrol commander made him feel redundant because he could not have said it

> better himself, "all this about how you should talk to your managers and colleagues". "It's easy to focus on what you should have done," he says. "This is as good as it can get; I want you to take that thought with you." Then he says that "many of you are parents, and if becomes difficult for you, call. I'll have my phone on all night." He gives them his number and also a number for his colleague. "Or call someone else you trust." He continues, "Both [his colleague] and I work according to the principle that whatever issues your job causes, your job has to fix to whatever extent possible." The colleague adds that many reactions arise late, and that maybe you will not be able to sleep or eat.

My point in raising these elements of police work is not to evaluate how they work, but rather to show that communication between police officers is not only characterized by "raw but cordial" jargon. There are also other "jargons" that characterize the work. There was not much of the raw but cordial language at the debriefing. Instead, factual descriptions of the situation were mixed with affirmation of the fact that these sorts of experiences are emotionally difficult. Even if the factual elements took prominence – indicated, for instance, by the commander who found it necessary to underscore that the debriefing was not about "sitting in a circle" – it would be misleading to say that this situation was characterized by macho culture.

The affirmation of the need for dialogue and conversations about feelings and experiences can, in other words, be seen as an expression of a downplaying of the macho norm and heteromasculinity, and as a complement to the "raw but cordial" way to "vent". If this conversational climate is normalized, there will also be opportunities to discuss problems on a deeper level without needing to "blow the whistle" (as did Emma in "The poster", Susanne in "Cancer", and Henrik in "The sauna") or to appear as a killjoy (like Nina, who felt like "that feminist […] who always wanted to see problems"). Even if these practices can end up in the background – there is not always time for start and end conversations and debriefings like the one I described here are saved for particularly challenging situations – they nevertheless show that macho activities coexist with activities that are not particularly macho.

Conclusion

The previous chapter focused on how there is a perception of the police as "macho" and how this perception can be an obstacle to the inclusion of male homosexuality. This chapter has focused on different dimensions of police work and how they are related to the inclusion of homosexuality. These dimensions can be understood in relation to the "macho image" and can be used to deepen our understanding of it and to add nuance to it.

One dimension is about how police work is unusually corporeal and intimate. Police officers touch each other, work closely together, and talk a lot

about private things, such as sex. This means that police work can be viewed as a catalyst that reinforces the relevance of sexuality at work. If people never touch each other or talk intimately at work, then sexuality does not play as big a role. But people touch each other and talk intimately to varying degrees in most workplaces, and in the police, it happens to be to a high degree. Therefore, there is more at stake when expressing a sexuality that deviates from the norm. The clearer it is that the dominant sexuality is a masculine heterosexuality of the "macho type", the more charged, and probably more problematic, it is to be gay, especially gay and male. At the same time, "intimacy" is not what we associate with "macho", which means that the intimacy itself adds nuance to the image of the police as macho.

A second dimension of police work regards the way officers talk to each other. The conversational tone is described as "raw but cordial". This too both emphasizes and adds nuance to the macho image. On the one hand, "raw but cordial" jargon fits into the macho image in that practical jokes and somewhat derogatory jokes about everything and everyone can be a way of handling complicated emotions; a way that is associated with a traditional masculinity in which the ability to distance oneself from emotions is valued.[35] But the jargon also involves actually bringing this and that topic to the surface. It is, thus, not silent. On the other hand, a certain *way* of talking about sensitive things is privileged and the "raw but cordial" jargon can mean that discussions about sensitive and problematic subjects stay on the surface level.

Finally, there is an aspect of police work that is characterized by the downplaying of traditionally masculine elements. I have called this *de-heteromasculinization*. Here, the part of "macho" that discredits homosexuality and femininity is seen as problematic. De-heteromasculinization is expressed in part through the presence of people who do not fit into the macho norm, which exposes the heteromasculinity norm and increases the potential for other voices and for the questioning of norms, and in part through the police organization beginning to employ practices that make it possible to have a more dialogic and reflective relationship to police work.

These "images" of policing – the macho image from the previous chapter and the aspects of police work presented in this chapter – coexist and hopefully say something about the diversity of organizational contexts in which police officers operate. They create a relatively varying landscape for the inclusion of homosexuality and gay people. The macho norm, the sexualization, and the corporeal and intimate work plausibly make being gay more "charged" than at other workplaces. The "raw but cordial" conversational climate means that inclusion happens on the condition that you feel comfortable with that jargon. At the same time, there is also a more dialogic and reflective conversational climate, and "macho" is not the norm in every context. Together, Chapters 5 and 6 emphasize that if you want to understand the organizational context where the experiences from Chapters 3 and

4 take place, you need to have different "images" of the police in your head simultaneously.

The next chapter continues the description of the organizational context, but with a focus on the police management's work on inclusion and how this is viewed by the police officers.

Notes

1. For instance, Granér (2004), Wieslander (2016).
2. Note from the translator: "blatte" (plural "blattar") is a derogatory Swedish word for a foreigner/immigrant, usually one with dark hair and/or skin, although this word is now being reclaimed by people from that background. The counterpart term is "svenne" (plural "svennar"), which refers to an ethnic Swede; the word "svenne" plays on the common Swedish first name "Sven".
3. Granér (2004, p. 162).
4. Görtz (2015, p. 142).
5. Wieslander (2014, p. 26), Wieslander (2021). Also see Peterson & Uhnoo (2012), who noted that police officers from immigrant backgrounds are expected to accept jokes about immigrants. At the same time that the police with immigrant backgrounds felt that these jokes were tiresome, irritating, and unprofessional, they also defended the police's opportunity to have space for this type of derogatory language as long as it took place behind closed doors. Peterson & Uhnoo (2012, p. 366) argue that this defense is related to the loyalty toward colleagues that tends to be an unwritten rule in police organizations: "[I]t is not permissible to criticize other police officers, in particular if the criticism is aired to 'outsiders'."
6. Loftus (2008), and Chapter 2 in this book. Also see Uhnoo (2019), who describes how police officers joke about what they perceive as "political correctness", primarily as a way of opposing it.
7. Loftus (2008, p. 764) defines white spaces as "spaces where the white majority feel comfortable enough to resists and subvert aspects of the diversity agenda".
8. Wagner (2017, p. 14).
9. Note from the translator: "Neger Niggersson" is a play on common Swedish names such as Sven Svensson, and means "Negro Niggersson".
10. *Sydsvenskan* newspaper (2009b).
11. For instance, Görtz (2015, p. 141) writes, "The police officers' sense of tact includes not making coarser jokes to outsiders."
12. Wieslander (2021) notes that it is not just the general public that is kept away from jargon, but also potentially critical colleagues and superiors. She calls this "safe spaces", places out of sight and earshot of colleagues and superiors who might be critical to the jargon.
13. Granér (2004, 2014), Peterson & Uhnoo (2012), Wieslander (2014, 2016).
14. See Görtz (2015, p. 143), who says that joking can create "a social reality that runs parallel with all the shifting events that characterize the everyday police work". Also see Waddington (1999) for an argument for the importance of what he calls *canteen banter* to handle the work.
15. Finstad (2000/2013, p. 227). Also see Granér (2014), Görtz (2015), and Wieslander (2014, Chapter 13) for similar findings based on studies of the Swedish police, and Loftus (2009, Chapter 4) for the British police.
16. See Lave & Wenger (1991). They write about membership in communities – and particularly about *becoming* a member by going from an apprentice to a master/full member – and they argue that the foremost function of language

is not to transfer knowledge from master to apprentice, but rather to indicate who is a legitimate member: "Issues about language, like those about the role of masters, may well have more to do with legitimacy of participation and with access to peripherality than they do with knowledge transmission. Indeed […] learning to become a legitimate participant in a community involves learning how to talk (and be silent) in the manner of full participants" (p. 105). For examples of how language usage in occupational groups other than the police – technicians and engineers – can create both inner belonging and coordination, and a sort of barrier for those who do not know the language, see Orr (1996) or Rennstam (2007).

17. See Loftus (2009, particularly Chapter 4) or Van Maanen (2010) for a discussion about how important mutual trust and loyalty toward the group is for police officers. In the Swedish context, Ekman (1999), Granér (2004), and Peterson & Uhnoo (2012) have noted the same thing.
18. Collinson (1998) showed, in a study of factory workers, how language built on jokes and practical jokes created an expectation for people to participate in these jokes, and those who were not in on the jokes or did not appreciate the jokes were marginalized. The function of humor in work groups is diverse, however. Nick Butler (2015) argues that humor can fulfil at least three main functions: 1) opposition to authorities, 2) the creation of conformity/the maintenance of group norms, and 3) control of the group members' behavior. Add to this the venting function that I have described. These functions are not mutually exclusive. They can be present at the same time (Butler 2015), and the same joking that can be a source of mental relief and amusement for some can cause displeasure and discomfort in others (Bolton & Houlihan 2009).
19. For research that finds a culture of silence within the police, see Finstad (2016), Holgersson (2014, 2019), and Wieslander (2014, 2016). In Wieslander's case, interviews with police officers and observations of police work form the basis for the claim that there is a culture of silence. But another sign that a culture of silence is an issue within the Swedish police force is the fact that it was the police themselves who asked for Wieslander's study precisely because they suspected that a culture of silence existed. Wieslander (2016, p. 4) writes, "The evaluation is presented as part of employee-driven developmental work and as grounded in the fact that the management has received signals that employees are worried about expressing views, criticism, or dissatisfaction internally." For an investigative journalistic book about how whistle-blowers within the police have been silenced, based on the stories of nine whistle-blowers, see Kjöller (2016).
20. Wieslander (2016, pp. 5–6). Also see Morrison & Milliken (2000, p. 708), who state that a "climate of silence" signifies "widely shared perceptions among employees that speaking up about problems or issues is futile and/or dangerous".
21. Wieslander (2016, p. 32). I also noted these metaphors during my observations of the police force in Malmö.
22. See, among others, Ekman (1999) or Granér (2004). Granér (2004, p. 71) notes that there is a norm prescribing that police support each other and defend each other against external criticism. Ekman (1999, p. 170) writes about the importance of "affirming the police community" and "caring for of other police officers". Also see Peterson & Uhnoo (2012), and for international references, see Loftus (2009, pp. 117 fwd.) and Skolnick (2011, especially Chapter 3). A frequently referenced and highly plausible explanation for police officers' cohesion is that their work involves threats of violence, which emphasizes the need for trust in colleagues, and that their work, with its authority to carry out violence and deprive people of their freedom, to a certain extent isolates them from the rest of society (Loftus 2009, Skolnick 2011).

23. See Bowen & Blackmon (2003), Gonzalez (2010), and Wieslander (2014).
24. The concept of spirals of silence comes from Noelle-Neumann (1974) and has been used within organizational theory (such as Bowen & Blackmon 2003) to explain, for instance, why bisexual and homosexual employees hesitate about being open about their sexual orientation. The logic behind the spirals of silence is also the basis of building networks for minorities as a way of achieving change: LGBTQ+ networks and similar affect the will to raise one's voice regarding LGBTQ+ issues since the network shows that there are others who will agree.
25. See Milliken et al. (2003, p. 1455).
26. I argue that certain scholars underappreciate this, and view the jargon as some sort of objective proof that there are prejudices against and a derogatory view of women, gays, and foreigners (e.g. Westin & Nilsson 2009). Jargon *can* be an expression of this but does not necessarily have to be. What is said and how it is said has to be understood in a context, and the raw but cordial language use has multiple meanings, which I have tried to show here.
27. This hypothesis is usually said to originate with the psychologist Gordon W. Allport (1954/1979) and his book *The nature of prejudice*. In that book, he wrote, regarding contact between majority and minority groups: "Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals" (p. 281). Since paid work is a situation where humans come together "in the pursuit of common goals", it is also likely to be a situation with potential for reducing prejudice.
28. As I noted in Chapter 1, Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association) was founded in 2000 with the aim of counteracting homophobia in the police force. Gaypolisföreningen was a volunteer organization and independent of the police, although the police did allow some police officers to decrease their working time to contribute to the organization.
29. See *Svensk Polis* (Swedish Police) (2000a, 2000b). *Svensk Polis* is the Polismyndigheten's (Swedish police authority) magazine, which goes to all employees. Also see *Polistidningen* (The police magazine) (2007).
30. Norrmalm and Södermalm are two neighborhoods in Stockholm with distinct reputations and styles. Norrmalm is known to be more conservative and expensive, while Södermalm is a more liberal, youthful, and trendy area.
31. See Pringle (2008, p. 110) about how the presence of homosexuals exposes heterosexuality: "As the presence of women exposed the 'man' in man-agement, visible lesbian managers could potentially expose the heterosexuality within the organizational subtext." The phenomenon is not, of course, limited to sexual orientation but has also been noted in relation to gender and race, for example. In terms of race, the culture and race scholar Sara Ahmed (2012, p. 33) writes that "diversity can expose the whiteness of those who are already in place".
32. Ferdinand de Saussure (1915/1972) is a main reference in regard to the relational principle of language. Also see Svensson (2019, Chapter 2) for a concise explanation of de Saussure's ideas. Note that the relationships do not need to comprise opposites, but rather just something "other". The opposite of apple juice is not raspberry juice, but for apple juice to be understood, other types of juice are required. Otherwise it would be enough to call apple juice just juice, but then something that was not juice would be needed to understand juice, and so on.
33. Colvin (2012, especially Chapter 4).
34. The *Scandinavian Star* was a ferry that was set on fire in 1990 on Swedish water. A total of 159 people were killed.
35. See Collinson (1988).

7 Not real police work

On managerial work for inclusion

How does the police management work on organizational issues related to sexual orientation? And how is this work viewed by the police officers? In Chapters 5 and 6, I argued that the inclusion of homosexuality in the police was influenced by police work being imbued with the following four aspects:

1. A macho ideal that makes male homosexuality in particular deviant from the norm.
2. A corporeality and an intimacy, which raises the relevance of sexuality.
3. A "raw but cordial" conversational climate that allows conversation about various topics while it can also make deeper reflection more challenging.
4. A tendency toward "de-heteromasculinization", which coexists with but also is a counter image to the macho idea.

In light of these insights, this chapter focuses on the police management's formal work on issues of sexual orientation, and how this work is interpreted.

In Chapter 2, I claimed that the police formally work on diversity and inclusion according to both current laws and their own diversity and equality policies. I have also referred to the role of managers in Chapters 3 and 4 in relation to activities of a more unplanned character, such as in "The hate meeting", "The poster", and "The sauna". In this chapter, however, I will leave both the policy level and the unplanned level in order to present two formal management initiatives for inclusion: a diversity training initiative and the police's national work on their core values, based primarily on my own but also on other scholars' observations. The purpose of presenting these two initiatives is to offer insight into what the police management is doing and to create a basis for understanding the police officers' views of these initiatives, which are discussed later in this chapter. In terms of the police officers' perspectives, I again draw on my interviewees – this time both LGB police officers as well as officers whose sexual orientation I do not know – in order to describe common criticisms of this type of work and to analyze what it means for the police organization.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-7

My goal is to offer an image of the police organization's work on LGBTQ+ issues that goes beyond formal descriptions and claims *that* they have diversity plans and core values, in favor of descriptions of *how* they work on this and how it is perceived by those who the work is aimed at. My main argument in this chapter is that diversity-related issues tend to be handled in a way that "decouples" them from what is viewed within the police as "real police work". *Decoupling* is a concept taken from institutional theory that refers to the phenomenon that structures are separated, and particularly that formal arrangements are separated from what is done in practice.[1] The result of this decoupling is not a complete separation but rather a *loose coupling* – that is, there is a connection, but it is vague, weak, and indirect – between the police's formal work on diversity and its operative work.[2] The police officers' views of the management's work along with my own observations of diversity training support this insight. The police officers' views are also characterized by the belief that the management's work on inclusion is more about making a positive impression on external actors such as the government and the media – which I call *impression management* – than an ambition to integrate diversity issues into police work in the long term. At the end of this chapter, I reflect on the effects of decoupling and impression management. While decoupling and impression management tend to make things look better than they are, the management's initiatives can also positively contribute to internal work on inclusion by showing formal support, by generating fruitful discussions, and by indicating the direction for the long-term development of the occupational identity of policing.

This chapter is relatively long, but if you read it as an analysis of the management's work in three parts, it will hopefully be lucid. The first part shows examples of how the management works, the second part presents the police officers' views and criticisms of this work, and the third part contains my reflections in light of the first two parts.

Attempts at inclusion – What is the management doing?

In addition to formal policies, many organizations also work to train their staff in diversity-related issues. The police force is no exception. I have followed some of the police's work in this area and will present two examples: an initiative in Skåne (southern Sweden) to give the staff diversity training and the police's general work on "core values". The initiatives are not just focused on sexuality, but more on values in general and different minorities' roles and situations. However, LGBTQ+ issues are often raised as part of this.

Diversity training

The diversity training I studied was called "The role of the police in a multicultural society". The training took place primarily during 2010 and 2011,

with a final report on it given in 2012. The aim, in the police's own words, was to "give police employees increased knowledge around diversity, along with insights about how increased knowledge around these issues can lead to more criminals being brought to justice".[3]

The training was in part a way for the Skåne police to respond to the government's letter of instructions from 2006, which gave the then-current Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) instructions to "account for the number and proportion of employees who had received training on discrimination and diversity issues".[4] In Skåne, this was interpreted as a mandate to train the staff, and in order to do so, the educational unit in Skåne applied for and received funding from the Swedish ESF board.[5] Initially, they applied for money for a pilot study to investigate what type of training "is required for the police to contribute to increased understanding among the public and to fulfil their crime-fighting mission regarding honor-related crimes, domestic violence, and hate crime due to the victim's sexual orientation".[6] The funding – around 200,000 SEK, which primarily financed salaries – was used, among other things, to carry out a survey of police officers in Skåne, in which they were asked to assess their own knowledge. The study, in the police's own words, "showed a lack of knowledge among the police staff regarding LGBTQ+ issues, domestic violence, and honor-related crime".[7] For example, 60 percent of those who worked for the police felt that they had no or little knowledge of LGBTQ+ issues.

With the aim of rectifying this lack of knowledge, the police then applied for another sum of money from the ESF board to carry out a training program.[8] They were granted the money, this time around 1.7 million SEK, which primarily financed the salaries of trainers, project administration, and follow-up. A training session consisting of three parts was designed. The first part was about human rights, and it was put together in close consultation with Amnesty. The second part was devoted for discussion based on a set of materials put together by a project leader from within the police force, in dialogue with police employees, and with support from two dissertations about police work. The final part was a presentation from representatives of various diversity-related organizations in Skåne – such as Romska föreningen (The Romany Organization) and RFSL (The Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Rights) – who put their material together themselves.

The training took place as follows: first, Amnesty helped to train "mentors" – some of whom were police officers while others were civilian employees – and they in turn trained managers within the police. The mentors then trained indirect managers within the police (that is, managers of managers), who would in turn train their subordinates, with support from the mentors.[9]

The training sessions lasted a full day for the managers and three hours for their subordinates. The training broadly followed the following schedule, divided into three parts with breaks in between:[10]

Hour 1

- Presentation on the background to this training program.
- Focus on human rights and discrimination, particularly the rights of women, LGBTQ+ people, and disabled people. Slides, small groups, and discussions.

Hour 2

- Focus on norms and values – role play and brainstorming. For example, a discussion about whether LGBTQ+ people ought to have the right to 1) get married and 2) adopt children.
- Focus on power and "the democratic process". For example, 1) slides about how different social groups have different interests, about everyone having the same right to express their views, and all points of view being of equal value, 2) a presentation about how power may be exercised (domination tactics), and 3) a discussion about police officers' role in society and within the police authority.

Hour 3

- Visit from a representative of an organization, talking about their experiences such as Romska föreningen or RFSL.
- Final discussion, evaluation.

The intention was to train 2,436 people, but in the end, the total was just 1,382.[11] It was primarily non-executive police officers who did not receive the training, which according to the final report "could almost exclusively be explained by the fact that their managers had not scheduled the training sessions for them".[12] The final report points out a number of times that the managers' moderate interest in the training was a problem for the implementation of the program, with comments such as: "It has also been hard to correct problems that have arisen during the course of the project because of the reluctance of certain decision-makers to prioritize the training", and "The project has to a certain extent revealed difficulties in embedding the importance of diversity issues among key police chiefs in the county".[13]

There were also problems with the mentors. The idea was that the mentors should be police officers, but instead the civilian staff – the project leader for the training, a diversity coordinator, and another administrator – functioned as mentors for the majority of the trainings. Two police officers worked as mentors but one of them – a male police officer with a high level of legitimacy in the organization – did not have the time to run many sessions

before he was given other work tasks. The other police officer – a woman who was already known as a bit of an enthusiast for LGBTQ+ issues and as a whistle-blower in the organization – ran several trainings.

Even if quite a few trainings were held – after all, more than one thousand police officers took part – it didn't quite turn out as planned. Above all, the training was relatively loosely connected to the everyday work of the police officers, partly because the training was not really taken seriously by the management. As I noted previously, the final report refers to this, and it is also reflected in the following excerpt from a training session in one of Malmö's police stations, in which I participated as an observer:

> Maria, who will be giving the training session, picks me up where we'd decided to meet and we go to [the local police station] together. The local police chief is home with a sick child so the deputy local police chief – Henrik – is going to run the session, together with Maria. When we arrive at the police station's door, Maria calls Henrik. He replies but says he's ill and can't participate, but will call someone else who can let us in. Maria shakes her head a little but doesn't seem too upset. We speculate a little about whether he "got sick" because he thought it was difficult to run the session.
>
> Inside the station, we get coffee and sit down in the staff room. Maria goes to prepare and I stay and chat with the police officers. I talk to a guy who has just been rejected from becoming a SWAT officer. He asks me about the training, as he doesn't really know what it will be about. I say that I'm not the trainer but a researcher and I'm just going to observe. Another police officer says that "this type of training, if I'm going to be honest, doesn't affect me as a police officer." He says that he knows where he stands as a police officer and that values and such are given to us since childhood and can't be changed like this. They talk a little more about values, and then a third police officer says that all this "espirit de corps" that is talked about is totally wrong. "It doesn't exist at all," he claims. Then he talks about how it's a generational issue, and the one who wanted to be a SWAT officer says that nowadays lots of different types of people become police officers, and he adds that around the table there are engineers and economists and lawyers. He says that if someone doesn't behave, it's noticed.
>
> A group manager – Robert – comes into the staff room and says it's time. We go in and sit down in the meeting room. Everyone seems to be Swedish in the sense of having grown up in Sweden (I hear no accents) and also in terms of appearance they seem Nordic (rather light-skinned and no dark hair). One has a background from the Balkan region [I understand this from later during my observation]. There are five women and fifteen, sixteen men. They seem to be between twenty-five and forty years old.

> Robert starts, sitting down, and says that "we have an external trainer who is going to talk about diversity today". Maria smiles and says "external" and rolls her eyes a bit. She is, of course, also employed by the police. Robert corrects himself and laughs a little. Maria then takes over, lets me introduce myself in brief, and then says, "I get paid to provoke, so I hope you know where the floor is, as then you'll know how high the ceiling is too." Then she introduces the diversity project and its background.

I will pause my description here to add a comment. The excerpt illustrates how the way in which the training is handled by the police contributes to decoupling it, and thereby decoupling diversity issues, from the police's operational work. As viewed from the perspective of the police officers' everyday work, the training is placed on the periphery.

First of all, the need for education perceived by the educational unit in Skåne is treated like a side project and a one-off activity, rather than as part of the continuous training and dialogue between managers and staff. This is mainly indicated by the fact that the police do not use their own resources to finance the activity, but let administrators spend a lot of time and effort to get an EU actor (ESF board) to finance the whole thing. EU financing is not just a symbol that the project is "something other" than everyday operative quality management, but it also requires a significant investment in documentation (the first application was ten pages, the second sixteen, and the final report fourteen pages).

Second, the managers' interest in the training is lukewarm. This is mentioned in the final report and is illustrated in my observation above. One manager in the observation was home with an ill child, and the deputy manager only told Maria when she phoned him directly before the training that he was ill. The managers' absence might have been an unlucky coincidence in this specific case, but if it had been very important for the managers to run the training, or at least to participate in it, then the training could have been rescheduled. I also observed two other training sessions and the managers did not run them either, although they were present.

Third, the person who works professionally with issues of diversity – Maria, the police organization's diversity coordinator – was presented as an "external" trainer. Maria has worked for many years in the police, but is not a police officer. It is well documented that civilians have relatively low legitimacy among police officers,[14] and to call her "external" strengthens the impression that this is not part of the police officer's everyday work, but something else, with a relevance that is unclear.

The above-mentioned aspects relate to the general framing of the training. But it is not just this general management that contributes to the training being constructed as peripheral; rather, to a certain extent, so do the training's contents and the actions of the police officers during the training.

In terms of the content, it is primarily abstract – human rights, general societal norms, democracy (see the schedule given earlier) – and this is only loosely connected to the police officers' actual work. The police should of course respect human rights in their work, but the content of the training is relatively general and of an informational character, and hopefully, most police officers already know how a democracy works and that everyone has equal rights.

The police officers themselves also contribute to the loose connection to their work. My small talk with the officers in the staff room – and other observations and interviews – make it clear that some (not all) have a rather avoidant attitude and like to point out that this type of training does not have an impact, like the police officer who said, "this type of training, if I'm going to be honest, doesn't affect me as a police officer."

My next observation – from the same training session as above – shows this avoidant view. Drawing on communication scholar Stan Deetz, one can say that this is an example of *topical avoidance*; that is, avoiding discussions about certain subjects (or events or feelings) in order to keep politically charged issues off the agenda.[15] In this case, the "agenda" is everyday work. When the trainer, Maria, invites them to discuss connections to their work – such as how hate crime is dealt with – the police officers do not choose to specifically discuss how they can work on hate crime. Instead, attention is diverted away from the actual work on hate crime and from a factual and serious discussion around this relatively new and difficult subject. The following extract from my field notes illustrates this diversion from operative work. Maria brings up hate crime, something that all police officers need to know about partly due to the fact that the police reporting routine (RAR)[16] has a box that needs to be ticked if officers believe there is a reason to suspect hate crime:

> After having spoken about laws on discrimination, Maria changes the topic and says, "Hate crime: what is it?" "Someone has a motive to offend," a police officer replies. "Some hate crimes are against the police," another then says. Yet another describes a situation where a man who worked hard to become a firefighter was beaten for it, and says that this was also a hate crime. Maria points out that the motive is central. A police officer wonders to what extent he is the one who decides if it is a hate crime or not. He refers to "the eminent system" (RAR), which they fill in at the crime scene, and which has a box for hate crime. He wonders how important it is that they tick it. Another police officer says it can be a hate crime regardless of what they tick. One officer says that a colleague ticked the box and then he was told he had to explain why it was a hate crime, and he had to spend an hour on it. "That was the last time he ticked it," he says.
>
> Maria takes over and emphasizes the importance of asking open questions when arriving at a crime scene. For example, she says, you should ask if they believe they were victimized because they are gay.

> A police officer says it's hard to know if someone is gay. Another one returns the focus to occupational groups and wonders if an occupational group can be a basis for a hate crime, and they discuss whether an occupational group can be seen to be "other similar circumstance"; in other words, other than race, skin color, national or ethnic background, religious belief, or sexual orientation. The law, namely, makes it clear that a stronger punishment must be considered when the motive for the crime has been to abuse on the basis of these circumstances. Maria agrees that it's confusing, and soon the discussion changes topic.

It is obvious that the meaning of hate crime is unclear to the participants, and that they are uncertain about how to handle it. And yet the discussion is led down a side track that hardly helped them clarify things. They talk about how they themselves and firefighters are victims of hate crime. They talk about how identifying potential hate crime leads to them getting more work to do, thus associating diversity with more tasks and bureaucracy rather than crime-fighting and crime prevention. They talk about how "other circumstances" was an unclear category rather than discussing how to handle the circumstances that are clearly referred to in the law (race, skin color, national or ethnic background, religious belief, sexual orientation, gender identity, or expression). In other words, they choose not to really take hate crime seriously or to go into more depth. A little "raw but cordial", one could say – they talk about it in a similar way to how they talk in cars and staff rooms, in a superficial and slightly jokey manner. This avoidance had the consequence that there were no meaningful discussions about how hate crime can be handled in the police's everyday work.

Diversity training is decoupled from the police's operative work in a number of ways. I do not mean that it is only the police officers' avoidance that decouples it, but rather that this is about the whole way in which the training is carried out, which can be summarized as follows:

- External financing.
- Few police officers as mentors.
- One-off initiative.
- Management who do not want or cannot lead the training/discussions.
- The positioning of the diversity coordinator, a civilian police employee, as "external".
- A deviance from focusing on relevant issues when they have the chance.

The decoupling of the diversity initiative is not unique to the police,[17] but to put this decoupling in a police context, one can say that diversity issues are constructed as "not real police work". Both Swedish and international research shows that the police have a tendency to divide their work into "real" and "not real" police work.[18] "Real police work" often refers to things clearly linked to repressive crime fighting, Rolf Granér writes in his

dissertation about police work culture, adding that the clearest characteristic is that the work contains drama.[19] Those who make this division are often street officers, but in regard to diversity training, it is not just the participants who construct this division. Rather, as noted, it is the whole way in which the training is conducted. All the points contribute to the construction of the training as "not real police work" and thereby loosely connected to the police officer's everyday lives.

Diversity training should, as Polismyndigheten (The Police Authority) itself wrote, be understood as an attempt to influence police work for inclusion by increasing the officers' knowledge in such a way that crime-fighting and crime-prevention are improved with regard to honor-related crimes, domestic violence, and hate crimes motivated by the victim's sexual orientation.[20] These improvements will naturally be more difficult to achieve as a consequence of the decoupling of the training from "real police work". At the same time, I want to emphasize that this decoupling is not a total decoupling but rather that the coupling is "loose" and indirect. In other words, I do not mean that the training is completely meaningless and irrelevant due to the decoupling, but rather that the effect will not be as intended. I will return to this at the end of this chapter.

Work on values

The next example of planned management work connected to diversity is the police's national "värdegrundsarbete", or "core values work".[21] The tendencies I found in the diversity training also inform this more overarching, national initiative. I will therefore present the values work more briefly.

Values work is similar to the diversity training in many ways. It is planned and management-led, takes the shape of a program, and is about training. But there are some differences. While the diversity training was local and relatively limited as an initiative for the region of Skåne, values work was (and is) comprehensive, aimed at the entire police organization. Another difference is that the diversity training was based on the leadership in Skåne thinking that they had identified a clear problem (a lack of knowledge among the police in regard to LGBTQ+ issues, among other things), while problem formulation behind the values work was more vague. I could not find a formal description of a problem in the police's own publication *Så tog vi fram polisens värdegrund* (How we decided on the police's core values).[22] Informally, however, one can make the interpretation – based on media reactions and interviews with employees – that certain people were thought to have inappropriate values, which were expressed through inappropriate language and actions. This view can also be discerned through the fact that the police officers were asked to carry out various value-based exercises, such as the "computer exercise" and the "fill-in-the-blanks exercise", which I will describe below.

In *Så tog vi fram polisens värdegrund* (How we decided on the police's core values), the problem was, as I said, more unclearly formulated. But that said, and as the title promises, the publication does describe how the values were decided, and the process was broadly as follows.

The work on developing a set of shared values was initiated by the national police chief in 2007. A project group was set up – comprised of representatives for Rikspolisstyrelsen, the various authorities, and the employees' organizations – and fifty values coordinators were educated to train managers throughout the country. Then they had the managers lead conversations locally with the help of "dialogue maps". These contained ten tasks for the participants to carry out, which then became the "employee contribution" that would form the basis of the values that the national police chief was later to decide on. Here are some examples of the tasks that the police officers were asked to carry out:

- Discuss what core values are.
- Read IKEA's and the Metropolitan Police's core values, and write down what the police can learn from them.
- Read short comic strips illustrating some situations within the police and then write down which "views/opinions/attitudes" are expressed by them.
- Read some (primarily positive) "voices from the general public" about the police.
- Fill in a short survey, answering the question: "What use do you think common core values will have for the Police?" The police officers were asked to choose one of three pre-produced answers, but they could also fill in their own answers, and then pick the answer that they thought was the most important for the working group.
- Write down what they want the general public to say about the police, once the core values have become part of their everyday work.
- Make a contribution to the core values. They would consider what they think the values should contain and agree on three to five words within the perspectives "internal", "external", "operations", and "feeling", and comment on each of the words. As assistance, participants received a "vocabulary list" containing thirty-eight words with positive connotations, but they could also make their own suggestions. (As it happens, the words "committed", "effective", and "accessible" were on the list, and they were later chosen as the key words for the police.) This task also contained the following message: "Important! It is here and now that you are contributing to the Police's set of common, national values! The contributions will be gathered and collated and will form the basis of the formulation of our values."[23]

The aim of these conversations was thus to collect contributions from employees. A total of 20,000 employees made contributions. These contributions were

fed into a database and then processed by the working group and the values coordinators. The county police chiefs and the employees' organizations were also involved. They agreed on three keywords – committed, effective, accessible – which were "decided upon" by the national police chief.

In other words, the project to come up with values was more geographically comprehensive than the diversity training. Another difference was that it was not about knowledge development with respect to diversity specifically. The aim was, rather, according to the national police chief, to create a common basis that said "what we want to stand for", which "will make us better" and that could be used and employed in the everyday work.[24] But issues of diversity and discrimination became part of the values, which (in their formally formulated) entirety read as follows:

> The mission of the police is to increase security and reduce crime. We carry out our mission professionally and create trust by being:
>
> - **Committed** – with responsibility and respect. We take responsibility for our tasks and care about equality.
> - **Effective** – for results and development. We are focused on results, collaboration, and continuous development.
> - **Accessible** – to the general public and to each other. We are helpful, flexible, and supportive.[25]

Inclusion and non-discrimination thus make up a foundation of the core values, expressed in phrases such as "care about equality", "accessible to each other", and "helpful".

After deciding on the values, the emphasis on inclusion and non-discrimination was further emphasized. When the values were to be worked on in the police organization, training initiatives were taken that were similar to the diversity training in that they were attempts to develop knowledge. For example, what I here refer to as the *computer exercise* – a "web-based training in issues regarding hate crime, homosexuality and bisexuality, and the law on discrimination"[26] – was carried out, which focused particularly on values. The training was presented as a hate crime initiative,[27] and the aim was for all police employees, first in Stockholm and then in the rest of the country, to take the training.[28]

The training consisted of an exercise in which the police officers had to sit in front of a computer and answer, among other things, LGBT-related questions to which it was impossible to know the answer. For example, they were shown a picture of a man and asked to answer "yes" or "no" to the question, "Is this person heterosexual?" The answer "don't know" was not possible. If the answer was wrong, "no" in this case (which only the designer of the exercise could know), a signal was heard indicating that it was wrong, and a text appeared below the picture with the correct answer: "This person is heterosexual." [29] Of course, you can't tell sexual orientation from a picture, and presumably (I assume and so did those I interviewed) this was the intended educational point. Similarly, they were shown a picture of two

men and two children, then asked to decide if this was a family, and if they answered/guessed that it was not a family, they were given the answer, "This is a family." The point would reasonably be that families can look many different ways. The officers I interviewed stated that the computer exercise was done individually and without a discussion leader.

Another exercise was the *fill-in-the-blanks exercise*,[30] which was more directly linked to the development of the core values. The aim of this exercise, according to the document that the police officers received, was for the police officers to "reflect on their contributions to the core values work and thereby to tasks and mission". In groups of four to six, they were to "find things that they could improve together".[31] The officers received a short text with blanks in it, which means there were words and phrases left out. Then, "using core values as support", they were to reflect individually about how they in their group had worked to develop their operations. After this reflection, they were to individually fill in the blanks with "words/sentences that fit". When everyone was finished with their individual tasks, the officers were to read their narratives aloud to the others in their group, then reflect together about what had been written, and "draw conclusions about what could be the next step in the core values work".

The text was as follows:

> This year, as a working group, we have particularly focused on the value word/s _____ because it is/they are significant for _____ in our work. To translate the core value/s into action, we have _____. In concrete terms, we have done _____ and _____. I myself have especially thought about _____ and _____. When we have worked with the core values, we have realized the importance of _____. We are pleased with what we have achieved in our working group because it has contributed to _____. A highlight of the last year was when _____. In our core values work, I think we have done a good job with _____, but we perhaps need to put more energy into _____ in the future. We think our core values work has primarily been linked to the following organizational goal: _____. The next step for us as a group is to _____, and for me personally to _____. In the long term, I hope that _____.

These two exercises – the "computer exercise" and the "fill-in-the-blanks exercise" – are examples of how staff were trained in values. Both are similar to elements in the diversity training in that they comprise relatively abstract exercises with a weak connection to everyday policing. They also are characterized by a certain triviality, which one can imagine contributes to them being separated from "real police work". This becomes clear if one looks at what "real police work" means, according to Rolf Granér's studies. Granér notes that real police work, according to police officers, is characterized by

three criteria: there should be a clearly identifiable crime with an obvious boundary between what is right and wrong, the crime should have a high punitive value, and the police work should contain drama and be describable by use of a hunting metaphor: "it's about tracking down the prey, catching it, and bringing it home".[32]

Based on my analysis, then, neither diversity training nor core values work fit particularly well with "real police work". What does this mean for the police officers and for the police organization? To look at this in more depth, let's turn to how the police officers view this type of initiative.

Criticism – The police officers' understanding of the management initiatives

In what follows, I will analyze what consequences management initiatives – such as diversity training and core values work, and to a certain extent policy – can have in the police organization by presenting the police officers' views, often in the form of criticism, of *how* and *why* the management attempts to manage diversity. Formally, the intended consequence is probably that the police officers' values are adjusted in a desired way and that they will be better equipped to deal with diversity-related issues, both in their own organization and in relation to the general public. However, when studying the police officers' views – in this case, both LGB officers and other police officers – about the initiatives, other ways of understanding the initiatives become apparent.

In brief, the police officers' views can be summarized as follows: knowledge about diversity issues might be needed, but *the way* diversity is worked with is characterized by abstract one-off initiatives that tend to "patronize" the officers, and it is felt that *the reason* for addressing diversity issues is to satisfy external stakeholders rather than an ambition to integrate diversity issues into policing in the long term. We will start with the need for knowledge.

The need for knowledge

Many police officers felt that there was insufficient or lacking knowledge and competence around issues of diversity. They expressed this view in, among other places, the survey mentioned above that the police in Skåne carried out, in which 60 percent of the police officers said that they had no or little knowledge about LGBTQ+ issues.[33] Recognizing that knowledge is lacking is not the same as believing knowledge is needed. But in the interviews I carried out, police officers – sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly through their way of talking about diversity work – expressed that there was a need for improved knowledge of diversity issues.

Some expressed a generally approving view without really being able to articulate what the knowledge would be used for. For example, Jonas, a

police officer in Malmö, noted that "new knowledge is good knowledge, but I can't say anything concrete now". He is looking for slightly more "practical knowledge" that is easier to translate into concrete work. Others expressed a somewhat clearer view about how even things that do not look like "real police work" can be useful. Hilde, also a police officer in Malmö, said the following, when I asked her if she thought that the topics covered in the diversity training – what human rights are and how the police live up to them, what LGBTQ+ is, and what honor violence is – were useful to her work:

> Yes, I absolutely think so.
>
> *Jens: Why?*
>
> Because one day you'll meet someone who is gay or transsexual or… And then you have to have some understanding. […] Maybe you'll pick up some warning bells if you know what it's about. […] You can maybe always do something little if you notice there's something that's not right.

One could say that Hilde thinks that the knowledge from the training is needed in order to increase her *cultural sensitivity* – that is, the ability to understand situations based on different social groups' norms and values – which can be useful in complex situations where various, often particularly vulnerable, societal groups are involved.

It is not just police "on the streets" who are thought to be in need of increased knowledge. Managers are also, or perhaps especially, portrayed as in need. The police officers express that there is a certain degree of "lostness" among managers, in the sense of uncertainty around how to work with LGBTQ+-related issues, which was communicated when the police officers reflected on the way the police authority works with these issues. The officers are relatively critical of management's work, and the LGB police officers in particular also produce their own examples of what is wrong and what could be done differently. Nina, a lesbian police officer, expresses this by criticizing the diversity work she has experienced and making suggestions for how to improve it:

> *Jens: In terms of the board's work on these issues, around sexuality, how have you experienced that?*
>
> It's non-work. It's non-existent. It takes a long time to get it going. […] It's very wooden. Personally, I think that there ought to be much more of this at the police academy. It's like with gender, there's one lecture, and then that's enough of that. We work a lot with cases already. They could have a case where you go to a house where there's a domestic quarrel and it's two men. So bring it in naturally into teaching. But it's also about ensuring that diversity training isn't something that just happens once. You have to work with it all the time. Now they see it like "now we've done our duty".

Nina is looking for a connection to police work. She is asking for more work-related, more "natural", and more continuous work with diversity. That was true for Emma too, who, in "The poster" in Chapter 4, talked about how she wrote a letter to those who ripped down and ridiculed the posters for the LGBTQ+ network and said that the management supported her by clearly denouncing the homophobic actions. Here, she continues the story, where she, while saying it was good that the managers supported her, also expresses frustration about their lack of knowledge and ability to handle "soft issues". Emma describes what happened after she wrote her letter to everyone:

> The managers came and talked to me and asked, like: "How do you think we should tackle it?" I said: "*I* am not a manager on a strategic level. You can't ask *me* that. It can't be the first time you've handled incorrect behavior, where you maybe don't know who did it, but where you have to influence an existing culture."
>
> […]
>
> The thing is, we can talk about goals, we can talk about tactics, we can talk about driving police cars, and we can talk about now we have to do traffic stops, we can practice shooting, we can go down and wrestle in the gym. These are really important things. […] But when these things, these soft issues, when someone behaves improperly, even like here, sneakily improperly, so that people get hurt, then they don't know. […] But we must have the courage to talk about behavior. That is, to talk about feelings, opinions, what's okay and what's not okay. But there's no time spent on it. I've never been to a work meeting where we've sat and talked about soft issues. Rather, it's a lot of information. "So this is our operational plan for the next year", and "this is what we're expected to do at LKC",[34] we're expected to reply within a certain number of seconds because otherwise we'll get red numbers. Lots of stuff like that. We produce this and that many cases. It's just hardware. That's where I think the management is lacking.
>
> They [the management] reacted very strongly and, I think, honestly to my letter. But then they don't really know what to do about it. And then they come up with a simple solution: "We'll talk about core values for fifteen minutes." Yeah, what the hell can you talk about when thirty people are sitting in a training room and we're supposed to talk about core values for fifteen minutes? It's nothing. It's really nothing. There are people sitting there, going: "Oh, we're going to talk about those fucking core values again."

Both Emma and Nina's comments contain rather hard criticism of the management. When Emma exclaims, "*I* am not a boss on a strategic level. You can't ask *me* that", she expresses (the reasonable) point that managers ought

to be particularly competent when it comes to handling conflict among staff. The criticism is also indignant. Emma expresses almost rage about how the leadership does not know how to handle LGBTQ+-related problems, which she articulated clearly with her, "Yeah, what the hell" comment. Nina and Emma also express how the management oversimplifies these complex issues, such as by trying to solve them by having "one lecture, and then that's enough of that" or "talk about core values for fifteen minutes". In other words, an implicit argument in Emma and Nina's comments is that the management's skills and knowledge in dealing with LGBTQ+-related problems need to be improved.

Those who worked as trainers within the diversity training program also talked about a lack of knowledge among managers and a need to improve their knowledge. Some of the trainers felt the need was great and they described it colorfully, as in Susanne's description of her impression from a training she ran, with police managers in a medium-sized city in southern Sweden (Skåne):

> I should say that I'm pretty taken by how many prejudices there still are. We started by training bosses, and I thought, like, they'll be more sensible than the average person, and "I won't be met by so many prejudices here". But it's been totally unbelievable. There was almost *always* at least one manager, often two or three, in a group of twenty or fifteen, who sat with their arms crossed across their chest, saying, "marriage, it's for a man and a woman, and I'll never change my mind about that", for example. Or who *absolutely* was against same-sex couple's right to be adoptive parents. And then you have to have in mind that it's allowed by law. It *is* the case, the law says that [that same-sex couples have the right]. You don't have to like the law. But there's still so much acceptance of declaring your prejudice. I thought that was *very* scary. I was actually really shocked, I have to say.
>
> And still, most recently last week, I was in [a medium-sized city in southern Sweden], and we've had these "negro discussions", lots of times. There was one manager who said to another, in his group, during the training, "Yeah, if you, Anders, were going to come to me and say that you have diversity in your group, because you have a negro and a blatte[35] and a dyke, I wouldn't have thought that was a strange use of language." You have to, like, pinch yourself in the arm and think, "Is he joking or what?" And then you ask, "What were you thinking then?" "Yeah," he says, "I'm an old-timer and I, nah, I don't think there's anything strange about the word negro." Like that. And when the *boss* puts the level there, it's very hard to get the group to buy my thinking about diversity. And then I've been working on human rights for two hours, and then you get these crude statements. And then, yes, [laughs], yes, it's like…how long will it take to turn this ship around?

Susanne embodies the view that improved knowledge and skills are needed by giving insight into the parts of the police that have not been reached by the formal organization's attempts to work toward a greater sensitivity to diversity and inclusion – the parts that police researcher Bethan Loftus calls *white spaces*; that is, places where the majority can use a form of language in relation to minorities that is not formally accepted.[36]

Susanne's presentation thus emphasizes the need to develop competence by articulating the *contrasts* in the police organization. Her story expresses the feeling of opening a musty room that has not been aired for a long time. Despite her years of experience with the police, she had not expected this – "it's been totally unbelievable", "I was actually really shocked", and "still" – and she indignantly expresses how extreme it can be: it is "*very* scary", "when the *boss* puts the level there". A police officer meets another officer and does not believe it is true; she has to "pinch [her]self in the arm". When Susanne opens the door to this room, she becomes a stranger in her own organization. In the room she comes from – the room where diversity training was shaped, which represents the formal organization – what she observes is completely unthinkable. Hence the shock, and hence the exposure of the contrast.

One can imagine that the police manager who said that there was nothing strange about calling colleagues "negro", "blatte", and "dyke" does not think highly of knowledge about diversity. One can also imagine that he probably belongs to the category of people that many of my interviewees consider to be in need of knowledge and competence development. The need for knowledge and competence development can be larger in some than in others, but many (not all) of the police officers in my study thought it was reasonable to work in some way with diversity-related issues. So far, thus, the police's formal organization fits reasonably well with the views of many of my respondents. But there was often criticism of the *way* that the knowledge and competence development took place. This is what I will focus on below.

One-off initiatives

One view – also expressed by Nina above – is that diversity issues are handled through measures that are then quickly forgotten. Hilde, who went through the diversity training and was generally positive about the content, replies as follows when I ask her if the training was rewarding:

> Yes, I think so. But it gets very… "now we're going to have this training", and then you have it, and then you never have it again. It's very compact. It's something that should be part of things the whole time.

Other police officers had similar opinions, such as David in Malmö:

> *Jens: Why do they have such training, do you think, that they do it right now and like this?*

> […] Why now? Well, it's a shame to say that Polismyndigheten (The Police Authority) has, unfortunately … I'm missing the long-term perspective. If you had started a long, long time ago, you could work at a steady level. Now they've added in lots of things in a short period of time, because society, maybe led by mass media, has brought this to the fore and demanded it. And rightly so. But it's something that should have started a long time ago. It shouldn't come as an emergency measure in this way.

Another example is Susanne, the trainer from the diversity training, who does not know how people will proceed after the training. I talked to her about how a lot of people take the training, and then I asked about the plan for the time after the training, and Susanne replied:

> Yeah, I wonder that too. I actually wonder that too. No, I don't know. I'm a little scared that they'll think: "So, now we've done it. Now we're done." [Susanne rubs her hands together as you do when you've finished a task]

Even the training chief for Polismyndigheten in Skåne, who was responsible for the diversity training, is fully conscious of, and critical of, handling diversity issues through one-off measures. When I interviewed him to follow up on the diversity training, I asked: "Are there any plans to work more on this at all? These types of issues?" He replied:

> So, if we had an educational organization in the police that was capable of that, then I would have gladly seen us bake it into current trainings. But as it is now, we don't have an educational organization, but we have to patch and fix with the resources that we have. But I would have liked to see that all types of training bake these issues into them. But as an answer to your question: no, there isn't [a plan] right now. And that's how I started. Really it's just wasted money doing one-off measures like this.

This orientation toward one-off initiatives was expressed by the interviewees with terms such as "compact", "emergency measures", "campaigns", and "patch and fix". The logic of this orientation is to have a fairly intensive training focus on selected issues in the short term, but not to integrate them into the regular operations. This way of handling diversity is common, even though research shows that participants in the training do not usually recall the content for more than a couple of days.[37] The training chief seems to be aware of this, refers to a lack of resources that force them to "patch and fix", which in turn makes him come to the conclusion that it is "wasted money".

It is likely that this orientation toward one-off initiatives – through messages and ideas not being continually "baked into" everyday work – contributes to the decoupling between diversity work and "real police work".

Abstract and patronizing

Another view was that the content of the training was rather abstract, in the sense that its relevance to police work was unclear. This was expressed above by Nina, who was looking for more concrete connections to police work (such as regularly using "cases" where LGBTQ+-issues played a role), and by Jonas, who was positive about the pursuit of knowledge, but could not "say anything concrete" about how the knowledge would be used.

"The computer exercise" and "the fill-in-the-blanks exercise" (see the descriptions earlier in the chapter) play in a league of their own when it comes to abstraction. These exercises were felt to be trivial and therefore "silly", "patronizing", and "humiliating" to carry out. Even those police officers who were generally positive and curious about new knowledge seemed not to really understand what the point was, or they felt the point was overly obvious (that you cannot tell from a picture if someone is gay, for instance). One example is Stefan, a police officer in Malmö, who brought up the computer exercise when I interviewed him:

> I thought the training *itself* was not great. There was a picture of an Asian woman. "Is she Swedish" question mark. "Yes or no?" And everyone can figure out that, yeah, I can't know that. She could be really Swedish, or she might not be Swedish. And then there were more pictures, a black guy, I think it was: "Is he Swedish or not Swedish?" And you had to reply, and then they [the computer] said: "nah, he is Swedish" or "nah, he isn't Swedish" […]. I mean, I thought it was a little ridiculous.

Some other police officers were more unforgiving when it comes to the computer exercise. Paula, a police officer in Malmö, said that the diversity training was good, but when she talked about the computer exercise, she used the word "silly" several times and said it felt like it was "mockery of those who had to sit there and do it". Erika, a lesbian police officer, expressed it in a similar way, saying that because of the triviality of the computer exercise, it could seem "patronizing", which can be irritating:

> We had to do this interactive training. I remember, because I was on a call-out. And you had to answer things like this: "Is this a family, is this a family, is this a family?" And it was like two men, two women, a man and a woman… And several in my group were like: "What the fuck are these stupid questions?" [laughs] You can't, like, underestimate people. Because then they get irritated. They must know that we understand this! So. Then I don't know if anyone responded: "This is absolutely not a family…" But the risk is when you have training like this, then you patronize heterosexual people. And that's never good.

And Jon, a police officer in Malmö, described the training, both the fill-in-the-blanks exercise and the computer exercise, in a similar way. I asked him what role he thought the diversity training played in work, and he brings up the core values work and the fill-in-the-blanks exercise as examples. Jon struggles to find the relevance in the fill-in-the-blanks exercise: "I don't know what you get out of it, actually," he said. He also talks about how the police officers felt that the level was so low that they felt denigrated by doing the exercises:

> *Jens: Hmm. How did people react to this [doing the fill-in-the-blanks exercise]?*
> Well, we're laughing. A story like that is what you learn at the read-and-write stage, when you're five or six years old. "Now let's see, what can fit in here?" It might be: "He goes out with his…on a leash. 'Dog' maybe?" [sarcastically]. I mean, that level, like. It's, like … It's very humiliating, actually, as a police officer, to get a task like that. We're actually a little older than five or six and we have, hopefully, gotten a little further intellectually too. But it doesn't feel like they believe that. Not everyone is convinced about it so we have to be, like, tested. No, it's actually humiliating to get tasks like that, it is. But we've explained that. I think that they've understood.

Jon's description of the computer exercise follows the same pattern:

> And if it's a heterosexual or a homosexual person, it's also pretty hard to tell [laughs sarcastically]. I don't think anyone can, actually. If you don't have very specific attributes. No, I don't know, I mean…[sighs]. […] I guess it was a way of opening up the mind: "What you see is not always what you think." But…we ought to know that, as we meet so many people in our work in the police. You're always surprised by people. So you're always learning. You never know who's doing what or saying what. So it felt a little, again, it felt humiliating to have that sort of training.

The way the police officers talk about the training communicates that they feel underestimated, like children who are five or six years old, which is expressed with a certain amount of sarcasm – "We're actually a little older than five or six and we have, hopefully, gotten a little further intellectually too." They point out that those who designed the exercises seem to think that police officers are a bit stupid – "the risk is when you have training like this, then you patronize heterosexual people". Jon also points out that the "patronizing" tone is particularly evident when you think about the character of police work. The message that you cannot tell by looking at someone if they are gay or Swedish etc. seems absurd to him, as a police officer: "we ought to know that, as we meet so many people in our work in the police. You're always surprised by people. So you're always learning."

In a somewhat simplified way, one can say that the police officers think that diversity-related knowledge can be relevant to their work, but that the way in which this knowledge is worked with has a tendency to be rather abstract and trivial, in the sense that it is loosely connected to police work. The triviality also means that the initiative can be experienced as humiliating and patronizing. As Jon resignedly remarks at one point about the computer exercise, "They don't think very highly of us, those who made the training, you know." A little pointedly, one can say that the exercises seem designed for the "musty room" that Susanne gave us insight into, but police officers in all kinds of rooms have to do them.

Problem-oriented rather than resource-oriented

Another criticism about the way that diversity training takes place is about how LGBTQ+ police officers are sometimes depicted as a problem that has to be handled, rather than as a potential resource. This criticism was not particularly widespread but was mainly voiced by the only police officer in my study who works on diversity training, Susanne. I refer to Susanne's criticism because it emphasizes a phenomenon I noted in previous chapters, namely that homosexuality is depicted as an organizational problem, and this relates to a more general phenomenon it terms of the view of minorities. Before I connect this to previous chapters, I will let Susanne explain how she believes that the skills that may be associated with belonging to a minority are not being used:

> I mean that you can get a lot of benefit out of having someone like me or others that…it's the same with religions and whatever it may be. They haven't taken advantage of having Jews in the organization, Muslims, or whatever else. And in a way I can understand it, because we're all doing the same job and should be equal and all that. But I still think that there's a better way of using our competence than they do.

Susanne puts her finger on an "dilemma of equality" when it comes to competence that relates to a person's identity. On the one hand, identity can be a resource since the person in question can have relevant experience that can be useful in terms of dealing with people and criminal investigations. On the other hand, minorities risk being put in a box if they are expected to work on something just because of their identity, such as LGBTQ+ police officers being expected to work on hate crimes (which they may not want to, or may not know much about). Then they are not being treated the same as their colleagues in the majority.

This dilemma needs to be handled with sensitivity – some LGBTQ+ police officers want to exploit this potential resource and others do not – but Susanne said that from a historical perspective, this dilemma has been handled in a way that constructs minorities as an organizational problem.

> In 1958, they had the first women, and there was quite a hullabaloo over that, what should they do with them? Then there were homosexuals, and they didn't know what to do with them. "Are they just going to work on LGBT issues?" Then there were police with immigrant backgrounds, and the same thing again: "Are they just going to work on ethnicity issues?" […] Exact same questions, new people, and it's really frightening. They make it into a problem, instead of saying that they are a resource. Instead of saying: "Now we're getting *women*, now we're getting *immigrants*", it's "groan groan, do we have to build a prayer room, how's that going to work out?" Then it becomes a problem.

This phenomenon – the portrayal of homosexuals and homosexuality as a problem to be dealt with – was, as mentioned, noted in previous chapters. In "The Christmas party" in Chapter 3, Henrik's boss said he was the one who was going to have "take the shit" because Henrik came out. The same applies to "The spy", where Annika's senior manager had ordered a female colleague to find out if Annika was a lesbian, and "The interrogation", in which the supervisor questioned Susanne about her orientation and said she would "have a hellish time" in the organization if it turned out that she was a lesbian. Susanne was depicted as a problem both for herself and for the organization. In Chapter 4, this phenomenon came up again, in "The convertor", when the supervisor exclaimed "that can't be true" when he realized that he "had" two of Västra Götaland's four open homosexuals in his area, and offered to "help" his lesbian trainee to become hetero. I also referred to this phenomenon in Chapter 5 in reference to an observation by the organizational researcher Malin Wieslander, in regard to a diversity training session that used a PowerPoint picture of a male police officer putting his hand on the bottom of another male police officer, with the text, "Are we ready for LGBT colleagues?"[38]

In my material, this phenomenon came up most explicitly in an event recounted by two different interviewees. One of them was Vincent, a gay civilian employee, who told me this when we were talking about differences between various geographical regions when it came to views of homosexuality:

> When the union wanted to train staff in [X county] in LGBTQ issues, the county police chief said, "We don't have that problem here." Not the problem with homophobia but, "We don't have LGBTQ people." Then the colleague he was talking to laughed and said, "Well yes, you're going to, because I'm moving to [X county] in a couple of weeks", and she's a lesbian. "So you're going to have that problem and we're going to talk about it" [she said]. Is it [X county] or is it just this person who is the problem?

The country police chief in the story expressed indifference[39] and silencing that reminds of something said by the manager in "Cancer" (who asked

Susanne not to worry about it and to instead have a good vacation): the police chief was unwilling to talk about LGBTQ+-related issues in the organization, which made the colleague who *wanted* to talk about LGBTQ+ issues and heterosexism seem like the one causing the problem. The unwillingness to talk, of course, excludes the possibility of seeing LGBTQ+ people as potential resources; if you do not talk about LGBTQ+-related issues, you cannot identify problems and relevant resources for working on them. Here, we are reminded of an insight from Chapter 3 about how the silence of the collective (in "The hate meeting" and in "The cruising terror") enables exclusion. At the same time – and this reminds us of the key insight from Chapter 4 – the story from X county shows the struggle between exclusion and inclusion. "The LGBTQ+ voice" would not be silenced. The union representative in the story instead used her own sexual orientation in a rather quick-witted way to mock the county police chief. In other words, the definition of what constitutes a problem is open.

Together with the other examples above, the interaction with the county police chief exemplifies the reproduction of the historically embedded view that LGBTQ+ people are a problem. This phenomenon is neither unique to the police nor to homosexuality. On a more general level, for example, culture and ethnicity researcher Sara Ahmed makes the same observation regarding the willingness to talk about race and racism. She writes that "the experience of racism is the experience of being the problem", and that the discussion of discrimination tends to portray those who want to talk about discrimination rather than those who discriminate as the problem: "To talk about racism is thus to be heard as making rather than exposing the problem".[40] The depiction of homosexual people as a problem is therefore related to the more general phenomenon that *minorities* – especially minorities who want to talk about sexism, homophobia, racism, etc. – tend to be depicted as a problem. What is particular about homosexuality and the police is that there is a historical link. As I noted in Chapter 2, homosexuals were in Sweden considered a criminal group up until 1944, and for a long time therefore were often seen as disruptive, as a part of a group who did not belong to the "good and the respectable" general public in the police's eyes.

To summarize this part of the chapter so far, on how the police officers view management's work with diversity, one can say that the police officers' reflections support the idea that diversity work tends to be "decoupled" from the police's operative work. That the police work on diversity issues in some way is often seen as reasonable, but the *way* that they do it arouses criticism. The one-off measures taken, the high level of abstraction, the "patronizing" tone, and a tendency to construct homosexuality as a problem all contribute to this decoupling. It is also notable that the police officers call for an approach that is more integrated with their work and that has a more qualitative orientation. By qualitative orientation, I mean that they want to have a focus on *how* they work – how it is integrated into general training, how they can talk regularly about collegial treatment and behavior in a serious

way that is linked to real problems, and how they can use LGBTQ+ police officers as a resource (instead of seeing LGBTQ+ issues as a problem) – rather than *that* they work with it. A less loose coupling, one can say.

Impression management

Up until now, I focused on *how* management is dealing with diversity-related issues and how this is viewed by the police officers. When it comes to *why* management takes initiatives such as the ones I have presented, the police officers' views are characterized by the idea that management engages in "impression management". The term is not the police officers', but rather my way of collecting their comments under one conceptual heading.

Impression management comes from the sociologist Erving Goffman's conceptual framework. For Goffman, impression management is about how we as individuals try to control how we are perceived in different relationships and situations in an effort to be perceived in a way that is in our best interest.[41] Primarily, it is about making a positive impression on the actors who, along with oneself, are involved in a relationship. For example, in relation to their parents, children may do things that make them appear "good". Police leaders can do something similar. Goffman was primarily interested in individuals, but organizations can also be understood in this way. In this case, impression management is mainly about what the management of an organization does to control how the organization is perceived by different actors in its environment.[42]

Different variations on impression management were thus a theme that shaped the police officers' understanding of managerial initiatives such as the diversity training and the core values work. A prominent variation was the view that the training came about as a response to media scandals, typically because some police officer had done something wrong or inappropriate.

An example of this was Jon, whom I spoke to a few months after the diversity training had taken place. Jon argued that the police management started the training around values and diversity as a response to inappropriate utterances by individual police officers: "But of course it's a direct result of those comments and stuff, obviously. It is. It's the 'apejävel'[43] again."

Peter, too, who works as an on-duty commander, expressed something similar. He told me how the on-duty commanders had gotten their "core value documents", probably the fill-in-the-blanks exercise, and were to sit down and discuss it. He says several times that it was "low level". I then ask Peter how it is that management can come to the conclusion that officers need training at such a low level:

> Yes, that's a good question. It's a good question. I don't think they have the grounding in reality. And then that pressure […] that pressure from the media and the pressure from the general public after all this [the

> "apejävel" incident], it was enormous, as I said. "What are the police doing about this?" We have to do something, we have to do something" [he imagines management thinking], "and anything will be fine. As long as we are doing something so we can say we're doing something. At least we've done this." Then what the quality is and how it was done, that's completely irrelevant.
>
> And that's how it's talked about, when it comes to training. The police officers should be educated about this and this and this and this. But what form will the training take? Is it quality or is it quantity? And in this situation, with the values, I think it's become more quantity, and an emergency situation. Because now the county police chief and the national police chief can say to the media when they come: "We have done this", "We've implemented this." Then what quality it has had, or what role it has played…oh, I…[resignedly].

Jon and Peter express a view of the police leadership as being almost panicked and so, without thinking about quality – "We have to do something… anything will be fine" – they start these sorts of initiatives to show that something is being done as a reaction to individual accusations of racism, homophobia, and sexism within the force. Or as other police officers said: "because it looks good" (Stefan, a police officer in Malmö) or to "cover their backs" (Sandra). There is a similar view when it comes to policy. Oskar, a gay police officer, said that they do have policies, but when it comes to everyday work, management is "invisible". Or Svante, who said that "at a strategic level, they produce documents, and then not much more happens with them".

A related view is that these managerial initiatives are about "fashion". Showing that you are up to date is a way of controlling the impression of the organization, as Harald, a police officer in Malmö, notes, for example. I ask him why he thinks they have these LGBTQ+-related trainings:

> Because it's timely. Right now, it's like…right now it's very politically correct to have this focus.

Jon expressed this too:

> And it's of course good [with diversity training] but we don't get much training time, so maybe we feel that we've gotten quite a lot of training about this in the academy, and so it's coming now, because it's a bit of a fad.

Impression management is about how individuals and organizations try to give a certain impression that is in their interest. Having one-off initiatives in the wake of particular events – particularly media-covered "scandals" – and following fads are examples of impression management techniques. Police

officers thus convey an image of training as an expression of police management's interest in giving the impression that it is actively and effectively addressing diversity-related issues in the organization, rather than that there is any genuine, long-term ambition to work on diversity.

Reflection – Possible consequences of decoupling and impression management

In this part of the chapter, I will reflect on the possible consequences of management's formal work on diversity and LGBTQ+-related issues. I am doing this in light of what I have already presented in this book – especially the findings that the initiatives tend to be decoupled from police work and are viewed as impression management – and with help of insights from organizational theory.

The consequences of the decoupling and impression management are not unambiguous, and therefore this reflection takes place in two parts, one more skeptical and one more benevolent. The aim of this is not to give a comprehensive view of the consequences or to fully understand the management's work, but rather to use the two somewhat contrasting reflections to contribute important insights while also acknowledging the complexity that characterizes managerial work.

A skeptical analysis – Tick box behavior and the wrong audience at the theater

Impression management highlights a much-discussed phenomenon: that public organizations focus on what can be measured rather than what is good. Organizational researcher Irvine Lapsley describes this as *tick box mentality*,[44] which means focusing on showing *that* something is being done. People focus on things that are visible, that can be "ticked off", things that are easy to verify and to show to various stakeholders.

Erving Goffman, originator of the concept of impression management, uses a theatre metaphor to understand society. The metaphor is relevant for making sense of the "tick box phenomenon". In Goffman's conceptual world, there is a stage where an event is taking place, and there are various actors (in this case, the police management, the media, the police officers, and the government), and there is an audience. A consequence of the tick box mentality is that *it becomes unclear who the audience is*. Who are the initiatives aimed at, really? Formally, the audience is the police officers. They are the ones who are supposed to be guided by and learn from the training and the values work. But the way the initiatives are run, the police officers' views of the initiatives, and my own and others' research[45] suggest that external actors such as the government and the media make up a large part of the audience. They are the ones who draw the "boxes" that need to be "ticked". The stage on which the core values work and the diversity

training takes place thus includes not only the police organization but the whole of society.

This is where impression management and the idea of "decoupling" meet. According to institutional theory, where decoupling comes from, decoupling happens because organizations have to handle conflicting demands.[46] The formal is "decoupled" from the informal in order to satisfy the demands of the outside world, without actually changing much of the practical work. Decoupling can be said to set the stage for impression management – to give positive impressions, the practical work cannot be presented as it is, but rather some things are decoupled and chosen to be put on display.[47] In Goffman's terms, this is about differentiating between "front stage" and "back stage".[48] Initiatives such as diversity training and values work are presented as the front stage and tend to be defined as "the police force's diversity work". But I argue that the police's diversity work happens just as much back stage, that is, in the informal activity that I have provided insight into throughout this book.

Institutional theory emphasizes that decoupling is not necessarily bad. It can protect an organization from too much change and create a certain calm at work. Above all, decoupling can create social legitimacy, which is a central resource for organizations; it helps them to survive. This is perhaps particularly true for the police, which is both watched by and dependent on the world around it, in the sense that outside influences have a large impact on the police organization.[49] But this type of decoupling and impression management is not without problems either. What are the risks?

One risk of decoupling and impression management as a way of creating social legitimacy is that more effort is put into making oneself "auditable" than into actually working qualitatively on the problems and challenges one faces. The concept of "auditable" comes from the British researcher Michael Power, who argues that there are ever more demands on public organizations to account for their actions, and as a consequence organizations have to a larger extent focused on doing the things that can be accounted for in an audit.[50] There is a tendency for "initiatives" for handling sensitive problems to lead to positive media attention in the short term, but then they fall by the wayside.[51] Accounting often gives the impression that organizations do more than they actually do, and it rarely says much about the quality of what is done. For example, the management of an organization can "tick off" in the annual report *that* they had diversity training, *that* they worked on values, *that* they carried out web-based training (such as the "computer exercise"), and so on. It is a little harder to tick off and requires more effort to work on, the processes that several of the officers call for: explaining relevance, integrating LGBTQ+-related issues into work, working continuously, and explaining how LGBTQ+ police officers and LGBTQ+-related knowledge can be a resource for organizational learning. Such processes demand a higher level of general insight, more attention to questions of social interaction and behavior and their role at work, and an ability to pick up problems when they occur and to have relevant, continuous, and problem-related dialogues.

A second risk – from a societal perspective – with focusing on "ticking boxes" and making oneself auditable is that the positive effects of the initiatives are directed at the police management rather than the police officers. To put it another way: the result is that the symbolic capital[52] of the police managers rather than the human capital of the organization is increased, and relevant and probably needed learning is left out. To follow trends and show that you are the one who initiated a program and trainings gives the impression that you are forward-thinking and progressive, which can be a resource when you are trying to move forward in your career. But for the organization, initiatives with little or unclear "local relevance" – that is, specific relevance in a certain organization or for a certain kind of work – may reduce management's *internal* legitimacy.[53] This is something that to some extent characterizes the police officers' comments management initiatives in previous sections. It was particularly the computer exercise and the fill-in-the-blanks exercise that were called "silly", "patronizing", and "humiliating", which probably has not strengthened the leadership's internal legitimacy. The direct audience for the initiatives – the police officers – is disappointed, while the indirect audience – senior police management and the government – applauds.

A third, related risk is the development of cynicism among the staff. When the employees experience situations characterized by impression management, cynicism may arise; that is, they perceive that management's initiatives are not sincere but taken for self-interest.[54] In terms of diversity training in particular, the scholar Pushkala Prasad's studies of diversity work in the oil and insurance industries showed that the lack of local relevance in training gave the impression that the work was more about management showing that they were following trends than about genuine interest in diversity issues, which produced cynicism.[55] This also came up in my material, not least in the observation that diversity work is constructed as "not real police work". This is akin to a lack of local relevance, which means that the risk of cynicism increases. The cynicism is perhaps most evident in the police officers' depiction of management as a group of people who, in the wake of individual events that turn into scandals in the media, respond almost in a panic to external demands for action.

There is thus much to suggest that the management's diversity work is perceived as being characterized by a quest for external legitimacy rather than operational change, which risks reducing internal legitimacy. But does the work have no internal effects other than decreased internal legitimacy? Is it just about "impression management"?

A benevolent analysis – Formalized support and long-term identity work

It would be one-dimensional to claim that the only thing that happens when management starts initiatives for inclusion is that it makes them look good in the eyes of external audiences. Regardless of the intended audience,

initiatives such as diversity training and core values work, as well as written policies, indicate that management supports work against discrimination and exclusion.[56] Besides the initiatives discussed in this chapter, there are other examples. Stockholm's police leadership supported the formation of Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association) in 2000, such as by allowing certain police officers to work on the organization during working hours. Just as when it comes to the educational initiatives and policy production, the acceptance of Gaypolisföreningen could of course be understood as impression management, as a comfortable way for the leadership to make it look as though they were "pro-diversity". But it is not the only way these initiatives can be understood. I will briefly discuss below how these initiatives can be seen in part as formalized support and in part what I call long-term identity work.

In organizational theory, there are different ideas about the role of formal management initiatives. On the one hand, some argue that it is primarily about superficial impression management, without any effect worth mentioning on the internal organization. An example is the Swedish organization scholar Mats Alvesson, who writes about how it is relatively "empty" on the inside of organizations, while the managers paint beautiful façades. Alvesson calls this "the triumph of emptiness", when the leaders write down either obvious or meaningless things about their organization in various policy documents.[57] This can sometimes be the case and the police force's diversity work, as I have indicated, has elements of this.

But it does not have to be completely empty or meaningless. Another point of view is represented by the British organizational researcher Paul du Gay, who emphasizes that formalized work – such as in the shape of policies and regulations – is necessary in order to have a reasonably equitable organization. "[I]n government and business alike, bureaucracy has become a condition of freedom."[58] Sociologist and gender scholar Yvonne Due Billing has a similar view. In a text on gender and bureaucracy, she concludes that "bureaucratic interventions are necessary, if we wish to equalize unequal social relations" and says "[b]ureaucracy provides protective structures, against arbitrary decisions, patriarchal ideas, etc."[59]

Du Gay and Due Billing's theoretical perspectives have also been seen in empirical studies of homosexuality in organizations, which have shown that formal rules, initiatives, and policies tend to have a positive impact on gay people's working lives.[60] A British study of gay men shows that the men felt that formal initiatives and regulations provided an incentive for management to continue to develop "'gay friendly' policies and practices".[61] And a study of lesbian women's experiences suggests that "[e]quality policies and practices that included sexual orientation had empowered [lesbian] women to challenge inequalities".[62] Similarly, police scholar John Broomfield writes that "policies put at ease aspiring gay officers and helped to articulate that gay men are welcome and accepted".[63] These scholars, like du Gay and Due Billing, emphasize that rules and policies are hardly a guarantee for an inclusive workplace

or serve as a "vaccine" against homophobia. The point is rather that they tend to comprise formalized support and that formal arrangements can provide a platform for creating more justice and freedom.

Du Gay, Due Billing, and the studies mentioned above have a point. Even if policies and formal initiatives, such as values work and diversity training, can be impression management – as I showed above – that does not preclude more inclusive internal effects. There are indications of this in my material as well.

If we look back to previous chapters, there are elements of the formal support that these scholars note. Not least, these formal arrangements contribute to an environment where it is *legitimate to raise one's voice*. For example, one can ask how management and other employees would have reacted in "The poster", "Cancer", "The sauna," or "The convertor" if they had not known that they had support from the formal framework. In other words, an actor that was not mentioned in Chapter 4 but which can be assumed to be in the background, is the formal organization of diversity. This is typically expressed through the development of various formal documents (such as core values or diversity and equality plans) and related trainings and exercises (such as the diversity training, the fill-in-the-blanks exercise, and the computer exercise). Du Gay and the other scholars mentioned above remind us that these formal arrangements create a certain pressure on, or support for, managers and other employees who are unsure of how to act in situations where there are exclusionary pressures. It can be perceived as difficult to raise these issues. To call a meeting with a manager, as in "The sauna" (a high-up manager, no less), or to write a letter to all the employees, as in "The poster", demands determination and courage. This is when support from the formal organization can be helpful. It can empower employees and put pressure on managers to act.

Management initiatives can therefore be seen as formalized support that facilitates inclusion. But the formal organization is powerless if it is not combined with a qualitative dialogue around the problems that various participants experience. Mechanically referring to diversity plans is not likely to create inclusion.

Another benevolent way of understanding the leadership's initiatives opens up if we look at them as part of a *long-term identity work*, in the sense of work on what the police is as an occupation and what it stands for. A research area that aims to understand this is the literature on *branding*. Branding is about attempts to influence what something – a product, a place, or an occupational group – stands for – that is, its symbolic meaning,[64] and *occupational* branding is described as "strategic work on the identity of work" by communication scholar Karen Ashcraft and her colleagues.[65] In brief, branding of the police as an occupation is about strategic/long-term attempts to influence what the police as an occupation stands for and about attempts to influence answers to questions such as: what is a police officer, what is police work, which social identities (such as men, women, heterosexuals, homosexuals) are associated with the police occupation?

Branding is usually aimed outward to influence what the world outside thinks. In this way, it is a form of impression management and can be linked to the risks I referred to above. But research has also noted how branding has internal effects; branding, even if it is aimed at an external audience, also informs the organization's own members. These effects can be increased cynicism and decreased internal legitimacy (see above), but they can also be signals about what the police occupation ought to entail and stand for.[66]

It can therefore be said that one aspect of branding is that it can send messages about an "imagined future", both to the internal audience and the external one.[67] The concept of the imagined future is borrowed from the sociologist Jens Beckert, who argues that we tend to underestimate the power of thoughts about the future, and that these thoughts are important because they create expectations, which in turn generate activity in the present.[68] From this perspective, we can see managerial initiatives – the diversity and value trainings as well as policies and decisions about supporting the Gaypolisföreningen (The Gay Police Association) or joining pride parades – in a new way, namely as management's communication of images of what the police in the future might look like, which creates expectations, which in turn generates different types of activities and sensemaking today.[69]

Which activity and *which* sensemaking the thoughts and expectations generate cannot be known in advance. My point is not that the management initiatives would work out as management intended, such as that the information communicated by the trainings would have any direct or controllable impact on the norms, values, or self-images of the police officers. The effects of the initiatives are open, and indeed I have thus far shown that the initiatives tend to reproduce the meaning that diversity-related issues are "not real police work" and that they are seen as impression management aimed at an external audience rather than at the police employees. That was probably not the intention. In other words, those who believe that diversity training can lead inclusion/exclusion where they want it to go have, I argue, an overconfidence in the idea that norms and values (culture) can be controlled. But, and this is the point here, those who say that the initiatives have no internal effects at all have an "underconfidence" in the effects of the initiatives. It is not "empty" on the inside of the organization – rather, the initiatives show that the production of symbols is in full swing. It is just that the interpretations of the symbols (the initiatives and the subsequent activities) do not turn out as intended. Instead of seeing the initiatives as empty words, it is more reasonable to view them as embryos for future norms, values, identities, and behaviors within the police; as symbols open for interpretation, as expressions of *one* among many "imagined futures".

Do we then see any of the activity in the present that Beckert refers to? Is there anything in the internal police organization that can be interpreted as the result of diversity training or core values work, besides the result that people view initiatives as impression management and express reduced trust in the leadership?

As seen above, police officers found some parts of the training sessions rewarding; some felt that the knowledge was useful when dealing with LGBTQ+-related issues. Recall, for instance, Hilde who expressed the sense that the diversity training improved her cultural sensitivity. And the computer exercise, which in principle everyone criticized, was not described *solely* as "silly". Stefan said that despite everything, it led to "good discussions". Besides saying, as quoted earlier in this chapter, that it felt "a little ridiculous" to do the training, he also said as follows, when I asked him to described the computer exercise:

> Yes. The two-hour-long interactive LGBTQ+-training. You sat and clicked…We did it in a group. Interesting. It was fun, because it led to interesting discussions. They were very serious discussions. Actually, I think it's relevant that it was just guys. The girls were absent for some reason. But they were very good discussions.

Even though it felt a little ridiculous, Stefan also says that it led to good discussions, or even "really sensible and interesting reflections", as he put it on a later occasion. And it was also good discussions among the "guys", which Stefan describes as unexpected. In other words, the training did not just make police officers in general sit down and discuss LGBTQ+ issues in a serious way, but even those in particular who Stefan did not expect to do so had serious discussions about LGBTQ+ issues.

Angelika, a police chief, expressed something similar regarding the diversity training. On one hand, she thought the training was "imposed" by those above, but on the other hand:

> When we got to the training, it was a really good session with lots of good discussions, things you could take home with you, or here. So it was a really good training session.

I have shown how the training was viewed as "decoupled" from police work. The above indicates that there can also be a certain "recoupling"; that is, formal and informal practices that have been decoupled (and thereby gotten a loose connection) are then coupled together again.[70] Recoupling is an established but significantly less developed concept than decoupling and adds nuance to the latter. Having too tight a focus on how organizations decouple formal arrangements from the informal organization risks missing how the arrangements can almost do a U-turn and in various and unexpected ways make their way into the informal organization.

Recoupling therefore indicates that even if initiatives are viewed as impression management aimed at an external audience, and even if they are constructed as "not real police work", they can still have an effect on the police organization. The idea of recoupling has its equivalent in branding scholars' point about the relationship between external and internal

communication: "branding does not only inform external stakeholders [...] about the values of the organization; it also potentially instructs and directs organizational members".[71]

In this case, it is notable that it is not the management but rather the police officers themselves who are behind the recoupling. That the police officers were to sit and have "serious discussions" was not a part of the training session. But apparently, the training created certain expectations among the police, which in turn generated activity (the discussions). Again, this emphasizes how inclusion is a collective and interactive process. Management initiatives have no effect if they are not picked up by the police collective. And *how* they are picked up is key. If they are seen as a way for the leadership to "tick boxes" and to brag to the government and the media, it can counteract inclusion. If they are treated as a way of initiating reflections around norms, values, and behaviors, they can open things up for increased inclusion.

In sum, I want to show with this benevolent analysis that it would be limiting to view the leadership's initiatives around LGBTQ+-related issues only as pointless impression management. Management's formalized initiatives can function as support, and they can participate in the creation of ideas that the employees are expected to live up to. The initiatives *themselves* do not necessarily contribute to LGBTQ+-issues being integrated into police practice. Rather, they are decoupled from it, so recoupling through police officers who choose to bring these initiatives into their everyday work is needed in order for integration to happen.

Conclusion – To touch and avoid simultaneously

I have presented a number of key parts of the management's work on issues related to inclusion and sexual orientation. In earlier chapters, I discussed the management's role in everyday work and showed that individual managers can play both an exclusionary and an inclusionary role. In this chapter, the focus has been on formalized management, and so a third role has come up: management as a political actor engaged in "impression management", which tends to "decouple" diversity work from operative police practice, but also as an actor that can provide formal support and can produce ideas about the future police force.

I have also discussed a number of consequences of decoupling in the form of "risks" (the skeptical analysis). One risk is the development of cynicism among the staff when they view the initiatives as being initiated out of management's own self-interest rather than out of a genuine interest in diversity issues, which can then reduce trust in management. Another risk is that management spends time on things that can be accounted for in an audit for the government and media but that does not contribute to increased quality. A third, related risk is that the managers' symbolic capital tends to increase, but it is doubtful whether the organization's human capital does. In other words, it looks as though certain police chiefs and staff (HR staff, PR staff)

are doing something important, but the police officers in the organization are not learning much. Decoupling contributes to keeping management and staff busy with diversity work, but not the police officers, one can say.[72] And being "good with diversity" then mostly means having formal arrangements like policies and training in place.

As a contrast to these risks, I have also pointed out that the formal arrangements can, after all, function as a support for more work-related inclusionary activities, and that even if this can be experienced as impression management, it should not be ruled out that these impressions impact the organization through "recoupling" and can thereby contribute to the police's long-term identity work.

These points lead to the insight that management in this formalized inclusionary work touches on LGBTQ+-related issues while at the same time managing to avoid them. Avoidance happens through the issues being decoupled and kept at the periphery, outside of core operations, placed in one-off and more or less abstract training sessions and exercises. The managerial work should not be seen as irrelevant but rather as "non-translated". One can say that impression management takes precedence over the translation of the initiatives so that they qualify as "real police work".

Notes

1. See Eriksson-Zetterquist (2011, p. 69).
2. The concepts of decoupling and loose coupling are, as noted, connected to institutional theory (Meyer & Rowan 1977) and also with the work of the organizational sociologist Karl Weick. According to Weick (1976, p. 3), loosely coupled systems are "somewhat attached, but […] their attachment may be circumscribed, infrequent, weak in its mutual affects, unimportant, and/or slow to respond".
3. Polismyndigheten i Skåne (Skåne Police Authority) (2012, p. 3).
4. Justitiedepartementet (Justice Department) (2006, p. 5).
5. The ESF board is a governmental body that works for the Ministry of Employment and the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs. The bord manages and advertises EU funding and "follows up and evaluates the effects of the projects". (See http://www.esf.se/sv/Om-ESF-radet/Organisation.)
6. Europeiska socialfonden (European Social Fund) (2008, p. 2).
7. Polismyndigheten i Skåne (Skåne Police Authority) (2012, p. 3).
8. Europeiska socialfonden (European Social Fund) (2009).
9. In the area of Rosengård in the city of Malmö, where I shadowed the work, it was as follows: Around 50 police officers work in the area. Among them, there are 3–4 group chiefs, whose manager were the local police chief and the assistant local police chief. The local police chief and the assistant local police chief were trained at this stage, but not the group chiefs. The idea was that the group chiefs, together with other police officers in Rosengård, would be trained by their local police chief.
10. This schedule is based on the teachers' manual that I had access to, along with my observations of three training sessions.
11. Polismyndigheten i Skåne (Skåne Police Authority) (2012, p. 5).
12. Polismyndigheten i Skåne (Skåne Police Authority) (2012, p. 5).

13. Polismyndigheten i Skåne (Skåne Police Authority) (2012, p. 4).
14. See Stenmark (2005) and Westin & Nilsson (2009). I have also observed that there is a clear division between police officers and civilian employees, and that it is "real" police officers who have the most legitimacy. At the same time, I have also heard police officers praise civilian employees as internal investigators – "it is not seldom that they do a better job than police officers", a police officer said to me during a training session I led.
15. Deetz (1992, pp. 192 fwd.).
16. RAR stands for "rationell anmälningsrutin", which means "rational reporting routine", and is a system police use to report crimes and events.
17. Prasad et al. (2011) observed how diversity training in an oil and insurance company tended to take place on an abstract and superficial level and to avoid deeper exploration of more serious questions and problems.
18. See Davies & Thomas (2003), Granér (2004), Hartmann (2014), among others.
19. Granér (2004, p. 131). Also see Andersson (2003), who notes that driving a car is associated with real police work, and with manliness. One of Andersson's interviewees says about their time as a trainee: "[When] they said, 'you drive', when you were a trainee, initially, then you felt really manly." (p. 91)
20. Europeiska socialfonden (European Social Fund) (2008, p. 2).
21. The police's values work has been described and analyzed by others, such as Holgersson (2014), Sefton (2011), and Wieslander (2014). It is common that Swedish public organizations have a "värdegrund" (literally translated as "value ground", but best translated as core values) and that they engage in "värdegrundsarbete" (core values work).
22. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2009).
23. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2009, p. 43).
24. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2009, p. 2).
25. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2009, p. 4).
26. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2009, p. 30).
27. Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board) (2009, p. 30). Also see Holgersson (2014, Chapter 20) or Sveriges Radio (Swedish radio) (2009).
28. See the response from the justice minister at the time, Beatrice Ask, to a written question from the member of parliament Eva-Lena Jansson (from the Social Democrats) regarding the hate crime training in the police: "The aim is for all employees to eventually take this training" (Riksdagen (Parliament) 2008). The training was carried out in Stockholm in 2008, when 90% of the employees (around 5,000 people) took it (Stockholmspolisen (Stockholm police) 2008, p. 30). The police officers I interviewed in Malmö took the training during the autumn of 2010. Unfortunately, I have no figures for how many took the training in Malmö or Skåne generally.
29. See Holgersson (2014, p. 191). Also see Sveriges Radio (Swedish radio) (2009). Police officers I interviewed have also described the exercise more or less in the same way.
30. I have gotten this information about the fill-in-the-blanks exercise from interviews with police officers and through studying the training material that was employed, which was developed by Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board).
31. This quote is from the educational material employed by Rikspolisstyrelsen (The Swedish National Police Board). The material does not have a date on it, but it does have a title: "Polisens värdegrund – Luckberättelse" ("The police's core values – the fill-in-the-blanks narrative")
32. Granér (2004, p. 131).

33. Polismyndigheten (The Police Authority) in Skåne (2012, p. 3).
34. LKC stands for "länskommunikationscentralen", which means "the county communication central operator", which was the name for the police's regional communication centers up until 2015, when there was a reorganization.
35. Note from the translator: as mentioned above, "blatte" is a derogatory term for a person from an immigrant background in Sweden.
36. Loftus (2008. p. 764).
37. Dobbin & Kalev (2016).
38. Wieslander (2014, p. 115, 122). Also see Panter (2018) for the same phenomenon in an American context. When Panter, who is a lesbian, was to start in a new group, she found out that the police chief had in advance told everyone that their new colleague was a lesbian. When Panter confronted him about this, he said that it was to ensure that they were all comfortable working with her, because she was "very gay" (p. 105).
39. Indifference has been used as an explanation for various problems with exclusion. Probably the most extreme example was given by the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1989), who wrote about how the Third Reich was possible. He argued that not that many of those who saw themselves as "real" Germans thought about or asked questions about what was happening with the Jews. "The Jews were out of sight and out of mind for most…The road to Auschwitz was built by hate, but paved with indifference", Bauman wrote (1989, p. 125), with reference to historian Ian Kershaw. The point here is (naturally) not to put the police organization on a par with the Third Reich, but rather that indifference tends to make people and organizations blind to problems related to inclusion and exclusion, even when expressions of exclusion are extreme.
40. Ahmed (2012, p. 153). This is also related to the phenomenon of women who have been raped or who have experienced sexual violence then being expected to take on the shame for something that someone else carried out, and how they are depicted as a problem rather than a victim, such as because they dressed in a certain way, etc. (see, for example, Wennstam 2016).
41. Goffman (1959, p. 4): "When an individual appears in the presence of others, there will usually be some reason for him to mobilize his activity so that it will convey an impression to others which it is in his interests to convey."
42. See Ginzel et al. (2004).
43. As noted, the police called protestors in Rosengård in Malmö "apejävlar" [fucking apes] and "blattejävlar" [fucking foreigners], which led to much media attention. See *Sydsvenskan* (the South Swedish newspaper) (2009a) for news reports on the incident and Rennstam (2013) for an analysis of management's handling of the event.
44. See Lapsley (2008). Also see Almqvist and Wällstedt (2013). In terms of the Swedish police force specifically, see Holgersson (2014).
45. Police researcher Stefan Holgersson (2014) has written about how the police management paints what Holgersson calls "scenery" to avoid criticism and to communicate a positive image of their operations. I have also published an article that analyzes the management's handling of the "apejävel" incident, in which I noted that the police leadership based their handling of the situation more on what they thought looked good in the eyes of the public and the media rather than what they themselves thought was appropriate and reasonable (Rennstam 2013). Malin Wieslander's study (2014), which was based on observations and interviews at the police academy, showed in a similar way that many police officers thought that the values were a "superficial policy" (p. 259) that were poorly linked to work and that the management engaged in this work on values mainly because it looked good in the eyes of the public

and the media (also see Wieslander 2021). Malin Sefton's studies (2011), which were also from the police academy, show that police students thought the values were a superficial façade for the general public, based on "management culture" (p. 35) and that they thought that the values were based on common sense, but had not been implemented in operational work.

46. Eriksson-Zetterquist (2011, p. 70) and Meyer & Rowan (1977).
47. See Elsbach & Sutton (1992), who contend that "decoupling set[s] the stage for impression management" (p. 710).
48. Goffman (1959).
49. See Björk (2012) on how the police is constantly the object of reforms.
50. Power (1997).
51. Stefan Holgersson, who has worked a lot within the police as well as researched it, argues that quality suffers when the police carry out these types of one-off initiatives: "'Initiatives" in this type of sensitive and pressing area risk having great media impact, but little practical significance" (Holgersson 2014, p. 190). He also argues that the "computer exercise"/hate crime training is an example of this: "The police force's marketing of its work on hate crime is a clear example of how an urgent activity suffers because of the police's focus on building pretty scenery out of the work" (p. 189).
52. The term symbolic capital is most often related to the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1984), who defines it as "the accumulation […] of a reputation for competence and an image of respectability and honourability that are easily converted into political positions" (p. 291). Or, in brief: "the *recognition*, institutionalized or not, that [individuals/agents] receive from a group" (Bourdieu 1991, p. 72, italics original). It is thus about the capital – the resources – that arise when someone receives recognition in a certain network, such as a network of senior police chiefs or government officials, which can also give access to power and privileges.
53. Also see Prasad et al. (2011), who also studied diversity training and had a similar comment: "Somewhat paradoxically, therefore, while following management fashions does sometimes enhance an organization's legitimacy in the eyes of internal and external stakeholders, fashions' frequent lack of local relevance also implies that the organization's internal legitimacy may become relatively diminished over time" (p. 720).
54. Avery & McKay (2006) and Gonzalez (2010).
55. Prasad et al. (2011, p. 719): "instead of initiating change in the direction of sensitivity and accommodation they produced a high level of organizational cynicism with regard to both diversity and similar future initiatives".
56. For the sake of the historical perspective, it is worth pointing out that support for diversity and non-discrimination is relatively new. The interviewees who had been in the police for a while said that there was no support whatsoever for this type of issues in the 1990s. Or as Arvid, one of the older respondents, said, "No, no, no. Nothing. Hans Holmér would never say anything, so to speak." [Hans Holmér was chief of the Stockholm police in the 1980s.]
57. Alvesson (2013).
58. du Gay (2005, p. 6).
59. Due Billing (2005, pp. 276, 271).
60. See, for instance, Broomfield (2015), Colgan et al. (2008), and Rumens & Kerfoot (2009).
61. Rumens & Kerfoot (2009, p. 772).
62. Colgan et al. (2008, p. 41).
63. Broomfield (2015, p. 119).
64. See Kärreman & Rylander (2008), who write that the "management of meaning" is central to branding. Also see Kornberger (2010).

65. Ashcraft et al. (2012, p. 468). Also see McDonald & Kuhn (2016) for a study of how branding is related to inclusion and exclusion. In their case, this is about women in IT.
66. Brannan et al. (2015), Kärreman & Rylander (2008), and Rennstam (2013).
67. It is worth emphasizing that branding does not have to send a message about the future, but rather that this is *one* aspect of it. This future aspect of branding is often called "brand vision" by branding scholars and is about how, as branding scholar Mats Urde (2003, p. 1025) puts it, "a brand vision is a source of inspiration and challenge for the organization".
68. Beckert (2016).
69. This view is also in line with the argument that language is performative, which means that the way we talk about something affects how we perceive and understand it. Talking about something is a sort of action, a "speech act", a concept usually associated with the philosopher of language John Austin (1962). This insight is still employed in modern communication theory, which emphasizes that communication is not only about sending messages but also about constituting/creating the objects someone is talking about (see Christensen et al. 2013, Cooren et al. 2006). Cultural studies scholar Sara Ahmed (2012) also discusses Austin's speech acts and argues that they can be carried out not just by individuals but also by institutions, as institutional speech acts, which come about when individuals speak on behalf of institutions. Then institutions take part in the creation of the objects spoken about, such as diversity: "To speak the language of diversity is to participate in the creation of a world", Ahmed writes (2012, p. 81).
70. Hallett (2010, p. 53). Hallett describes recoupling as "processes through which institutional myths and organizational practices that where once loosely connected become tightly linked" (p. 53). The concept of "institutional myths" can seem confusing, but it refers to formal organizational structures. Institutional theory (Meyer & Rowan 1977) argues that the formal organization is decoupled from the informal, but that formal structures tend to be so institutionalized that they function as myths that organizations adjust to, without necessarily exploring in depth whether these formal structures are effective. Hallett's (2010) point is that the myths can be recoupled and can thereby get "flesh and blood" in organizations (his article is called "The myth incarnate").
71. Kärreman & Rylander (2008, p. 104).
72. See Zanoni & Janssens (2004) for a study of how diversity discourses tend to produce management practices.

8 Conclusion

In this final chapter, I present a number of key insights from this book and propose an overarching concept – peripheral inclusion – in an attempt to capture the core of these insights. Then I will broaden my perspective and explore how the insights relate to time and have implications for other occupations which, like police work, can be said to be "masculinized". I will also discuss findings from the book that I think will be useful for those working practically with inclusion within the police, and I will return to the issue of diversity and police work in a democracy.

Key insights

In what follows, I will summarize the key insights from this book in regard to how the exclusion and inclusion of homosexuality work. This also means clarifying both the obstacles to and the opportunities for inclusion. In the description below, I have italicized central concepts. Part of this book's contribution lies in proposing this range of concepts as a way of understanding exclusion and inclusion in the police. It has been my ambition to make these concepts come alive by grounding them in real experiences and activities. For example, the concepts *stigmatization* and *dirt* can be brought to life by reading "The hate meeting", "The cruising terror", "The picture", or "The Christmas party" in Chapter 3, and the fight between *silencing* and *voice* can be seen in "The poster", "The sauna", and "Cancer" in Chapter 4.

I will start with Chapter 3, which is about exclusion. *Stigmatization*, an activity based on a stigma as a resource for the exercise of power, contributes to the exclusion of homosexuality in the police. Stigmatization can be carried out by managers or colleagues. In both cases, it is about *discrediting* homosexuality and about homosexuals feeling *discreditable*. That chapter illustrated how homosexuality has been stigmatized by organizing and allowing meetings where colleagues are exposed because they are rumored to have had same-sex sexual relations, by spying on and interrogating colleagues to find out what their sexual orientation is, by ordering to "terrorize" gay people who meet in the park, by saying that you will have to "take the shit" when a colleague comes out, by saying that you never again shower

DOI: 10.4324/9781003242871-8

with a colleague who has come out as gay, or by expressing disgust about a representation of homosexuality (a picture) during an investigation. All these experiences have elements of stigmatization; that is, the construction of homosexuality as something that is discrediting in a police context.

Stigmatization contributes to gay police officers needing to hide information about themselves to avoid being discredited, and it contributes to depicting homosexuality as *dirt*, something that is seen as being "out of place" when expressed within the police. Homosexuality, rather than homophobia, is depicted as an organizational problem. Thus, different forms of stigmatizing behavior – or the allowance of stigmatizing behavior, which also characterized many of the experiences in Chapter 3 – are therefore an obstacle to inclusion. I also emphasized how stigmatization can have problematic consequences for both the individual and the organizational level: for example, it can make it harder for gay police officers to engage in discussions of their private lives (which are common within the police), and on an organizational level stigmatization can lead to both overpolicing (see "The cruising terror") and underpolicing (see "The picture") of gay people.

However, social processes are complex, and often the processes are not about either exclusion or inclusion, but rather the two co-exist. Chapter 4 focuses on this. In that chapter, I argue that the relationship between exclusion and inclusion can be understood as a *struggle* between *silencing* and *voice*. This highlights that inclusion is a *collective process*; that is, a process that involves several actors. Without support from other actors (such as managers, colleagues, external players such as the media) than the LGB officers themselves, it would be very hard to achieve inclusion. The chapter shows how attempts at exclusion are met with different types of inclusionary reactions. Attempts to silence the LGBTQ+ network are met by anger from a lesbian police officer and support from managers and colleagues ("The poster"); and stigmatization of a gay colleague is met by other colleagues informing the person affected and demands for apologies ("The sauna"), or by attention from the media ("Cancer"), or by pressure from an LGBTQ+ network in the police ("The convertor"). The chapter also shows how inclusionary pressures can dominate (in "The support", "The hype", and "No problems"), while inclusion takes place within the framework of *heteronormativity*, which gay police officers have to get used to. For example, even within the frame of inclusion, gay officers might need to get used to behaviors that they do not necessarily appreciate – "grabbighet/laddishness", "some gay jokes", "the jargon…with fags and all that" – while heterosexuals do not need to get used to an equivalent treatment of their sexuality.

Chapter 4 thus shows that different types of silencing attempts can be fought with voices raised for inclusion. It is in this dynamic, and in this struggle, between silencing and voice that the process of inclusion takes place. In other words, the conditions for inclusion are characterized by having to, as a gay person, raise one's voice against attempts at silencing and to some extent by having to get used to heteronormativity. A bit pointedly one

could say that heteronormativity allows the inclusion of homosexuality on the condition that one acts as if one were heterosexual. The conditions for inclusion are also characterized by being dependent on an "audience" that is supportive. When the audience – colleagues, managers, the media – notice and also raise their voices, inclusion becomes stronger. Again, inclusion is a collective process.

Chapter 5 goes deeper into the conditions for inclusion and looks at the role of *the image of the police*. There is an image of the police as *macho*, which contains a negative association with homosexuality and means that traditional *masculinity* is the yardstick to which everyone within the police has to relate. A consequence of this is that one might need to engage in *masculinity work* to fit in. An aspect of the traditional masculinity is that homosexuality tends to *be sexualized* – to be understood with an overemphasis on sex – and that heterosexual men tend to be more sensitive to male violations of the heteronorm (men having sex with men) than to female ones. This is a phenomenon at the societal level that infiltrates the police and is probably accentuated due to the police's macho image. The macho ideal allows female homosexuality to fit in more easily because it is associated with masculinity to a greater degree.

This was expressed, for example, in Sandra's explanation of how she fits in because she could "check out chicks" together with male colleagues. Her orientation included an aspect of masculinity that fit into the macho norm. In light of the *heterosexual matrix* – a model that shows how societal norms around gender and sexual desire are interrelated and that depicts attraction to women as a fundamentally masculine characteristic – Sandra *passes* "as a man" rather than as a woman or as a lesbian. In contrast, the macho norm makes the inclusion of male homosexuality harder, as it tends to be associated with femininity and therefore does not pass as "macho". According to this model, more masculinity work is required of gay men, and by others who are not associated with masculinity, not least women. This means that the image of the police can be seen as an obstacle for the inclusion of homosexuality, in the sense that one has to work harder to become "one of the gang" if one is systematically counteracted by the general image of the gang's identity.

Chapter 6 fulfills the same function as Chapter 5 – it sheds light on conditions for inclusion – but turns the gaze inwards, toward police work itself. I show how police work is *corporeal* and *intimate*, which increases the relevance of sexuality. In other words, if people touch each other, use their body as a tool, and talk to each other a lot, sexuality is more relevant than if people don't. I also argued that the ways in which police officers talk to each are characterized by, among other things, a *raw but cordial jargon*, which can be a double-edged sword with the potential for both inclusion and exclusion. The jargon can create collegial solidarity and make it possible to handle the difficult aspects of work, but it can also be an obstacle for inclusion for those who do not want to submit to the jargon. The easy-going format

with its emphasis on jokes can make it challenging to have serious discussions and distance participants from emotions, which is part of the macho norm. This can create silence around certain topics by making those who seriously want to question policing practices – for example, by talking seriously about heterosexism, sexism, or racism – seem like a nuisance. Deeper reflection thus risks being silenced in favor of maintaining the jargon. At the same time, in contrast, I also show in the chapter how police work can be said to be undergoing a *de-heteromasculinization*. In part, this happens because the presence of non-heterosexual police officers *exposes the heteronorm* and can counteract silence around LGBTQ+ issues, and this makes it harder to ignore social groups when representatives of those groups are part of everyday life. Also, police work has elements that do not fit into the macho category. Police officers can support non-heterosexual colleagues and the fact that their work is characterized by intimacy and emotional exposure can lead to conversations around emotions and experiences becoming part of police work.

Chapter 6 therefore underlines the multifaceted nature of police work, contrasts this to the image of the police as macho, and thereby depicts an enabling force within the police that makes it possible to include identities that do not fit the macho image, such as male homosexuality. The image of the police as macho is selectively constructed by focusing on certain aspects of the work: the risks, the proximity to violence, the thrill, the arrests, and the emphasis on physical size and strength. But the work is also characterized by intimacy, emotion, care, and understanding for different societal groups. These aspects do not fit into the macho ideal, but they do not get as much attention when the image of the police is created. The image of the police as macho can therefore be claimed to be rather loosely connected to police work itself. My point in showing that the image of the police as macho is selectively constructed is not to say that the image is "wrong" or unrealistic, but rather to show that the image could be understood in a different way, where the macho aspect is toned down somewhat to the benefit of other aspects.

Chapter 7 focuses on the police management's formal initiatives for diversity and the inclusion of minorities. I show how the formal management initiatives – particularly training initiatives and policy documents – have a tendency to *decouple* diversity issues and to portray them as "not real police work". The police officers' views of leadership initiatives are also discussed in this chapter, and I show that while police officers often agree with the idea that some form of improved knowledge and practice around diversity is needed, they are also critical of the ways in which diversity is worked with. Management initiatives are often viewed as *impression management*, which risks creating cynicism among the staff, leading to a focus on quantitative rather than qualitative goals, and contributing to the management being seen as "good at diversity" even though the staff's competence has not been affected much. At the same time, I argue that management's formal

initiatives should not be so swiftly dismissed as useless. Formalized initiatives can be a resource for those who want to act and want to make their voices heard when attempts are made to silence homosexuality. They can also initiate discussions that *recouple* to the operative work and contribute to creating activities that in the long-term influence the image of the police and police work. In theoretical terms, one can say that formalized initiatives, while they may be about impression management, can be the seeds to the police's *long-term identity work*.

The above key insights, as I said, provide a range of concepts – a terminology grounded in experiences and activities from the Swedish police – that can be used to understand the problem of inclusion and exclusion in policing. It is important to remember that this problem is not general but rather varies in time and place. Sometimes it is helpful to think in terms of stigma and dirt and the consequences of this, and sometimes it is better to understand situations in terms of the open "struggle" between silencing and voice. Similarly, one should not unambiguously view police culture as "macho", but one also needs to understand the aspects that do not sit easily with the concept of macho, which I call de-heteromasculinization.

Peripheral inclusion

While it is important to have a diversity of concepts, I also want to suggest a concept that captures the primary finding in this study, namely that inclusion and exclusion coexist, and that the processes that have been presented here neither are about nor lead to *either* exclusion *or* inclusion. This phenomenon, I suggest, can be understood by the term *peripheral inclusion*.[1] The inclusion of homosexuality and gay police officers can, in other words, be understood as peripheral inclusion.

Peripheral inclusion is a figure of thought that covers both a process – the struggle between exclusion and inclusion – and the result of that process – peripheral inclusion results in inclusion in the organization without full membership being achieved. The result is therefore neither full exclusion nor full inclusion, but always something in between. Who or what is included in an organization ends up in the periphery, in the space between the core and the outside. Placement in the periphery can be caused by formal arrangements – such as temporary employment contracts – but that is not the focus here. Instead, the focus is on how something (homosexuality in this case) is placed in the periphery through an informal process.

This process – the struggle between exclusion and inclusion – is concretely expressed as a struggle between silencing and voice, which I explored in particular in Chapter 4. Silencing of expressions of homosexuality is thus understood as an exclusionary force, while what I call the LGBTQ+ voice can be understood as an inclusionary force. As long as the inclusionary voice coexists with the exclusionary and silencing force – which can be expressed through the harassment of LGBTQ+ networks, indifferent

managers, "some gay jokes", heteronormativity, the presentation of homosexuality as an organizational problem, or the depiction of diversity issues as "not real police work" – it is relevant to talk about peripheral inclusion. Viewing inclusion in this way sheds light on how inclusion is a dynamic and relatively fragile collective process that is shaped by both inclusionary and exclusionary pressures from various directions. Many actors (LGB police officers, colleagues, managers, the media) and norms (such as macho, "raw but cordial", or de-heteromasculinization) participate in the process of including homosexuality peripherally.

The emphasis on "struggle" is important. One could characterize the peripheral inclusion process as a "dynamic", a movement, between silencing and voice. But "dynamic" is too neutral. Struggle is better. It emphasizes *both* that it is not about a harmonious and problem-free relationship *and* that the process does not have to result in a polarization but rather in a conflicted movement toward one another. Silencing does not lead to silence but to voice. As I noted in Chapter 4 in regard to the sociologist Simmel, struggle need not lead to division. Struggle implies contact, and even if the outcome is uncertain, a struggle – as opposed to distancing or indifference – can eventually contribute to increased understanding between two parties. In other words, "struggle" builds the potential for greater inclusion into the concept.

Peripheral inclusion, through its focus on process, thus embodies the insight made in several places in the book: that inclusion is a collective process. But with its simultaneous focus on the result of the process, peripheral inclusion also includes an understanding of inclusion as a *position* on a continuum between full exclusion and full inclusion, between the core and the outside. Although peripheral inclusion is not a quantitatively oriented concept – it does not show the exact degree to which someone or something is included – its focus on position encourages us to broadly analyze the question: "How much is the process characterized by inclusion or exclusion?" For instance, we can in broad terms claim that the examples in Chapter 3 are characterized more by exclusion than the stories in Chapter 4 and that the last three stories in Chapter 4 ("The support", "The hype", "No problems") are characterized more by inclusion than the first four ("Cancer", "The poster", "The sauna", "The convertor").

In other words, as a figure of thought, peripheral inclusion does not produce solutions or recipes, but rather encourages the analyst – the police officer, the HR worker, the researcher – to ask questions to which they may seek answers in each individual context. More specifically, the concept of peripheral inclusion encourages us to ask what the process/struggle between silencing and voice looks like, and to what extent the struggle is characterized by inclusion or exclusion. In the context of this book, the specific questions are about the inclusion of homosexuality and LGB police officers, but within the frame of peripheral inclusion, these categories could be swapped out for other relevant social groups that are a minority within the police, such as women or officers with an immigrant background.

Answers to the questions

It is my hope that this book as a whole offers answers to the questions I posed at the start, namely how and under which conditions the exclusion and inclusion of LGB officers and LGB sexuality take place in the Swedish police, how can it be that there are so few openly gay male police officers, and how obstacles for inclusion can be understood. Of course, I recommend reading the entire book to find answers to these questions but *in light of* the book as a whole and the key findings within it, the very short answer is as follows:

Inclusion and exclusion take place to a large extent in a struggle between silencing and voice. In this struggle, which is a collective process that can be understood in terms of peripheral inclusion, elements of stigmatization coexist with the voices of LGB police officers and their colleagues and managers in favor of inclusion. The conditions for exclusion and inclusion are characterized by heteronormativity dependence on supportive external actors such as colleagues, managers, and the media, by an image of the police as macho, by police work being corporeal and intimate, by a use of language that is raw but cordial, and by managerial work for inclusion that is not integrated into the everyday work of the police.

The answer to the question of why there are so few openly homosexual policemen thereby comes from this. I argue that it is because the police force has a history of fighting and excluding primarily male homosexuality; that stigmatization still exists; that there is an image of the police as macho, which gives the impression that homosexuality does not fit in; that the work is corporeal and intimate, which accentuates the problems related to the macho-image; that management's initiatives for inclusion do not have much of an impact on police work itself; and that both the management and colleagues can be sources of exclusion. At the same time, the inclusionary aspects that have been discussed in the book offer another possible answer to the question. One can imagine that there are so few openly gay policemen in part because the inclusionary aspects of police work are overshadowed by the image of the police as macho. Perhaps society, existing gay officers, and future recruits have excluded the "de-heteromasculinized" police?

So far, I have in principle summarized what I presented in more depth in Chapters 1–7 and added the concept of peripheral inclusion. In what remains of this conclusion, I will offer a broader discussion in light of the book's key insights.

Inclusion, time, and persistence

It is notable how long the informal processes that counteract inclusion can remain even after the formal organization has changed. Many of the experiences in this book sit uneasily with the formal inclusive attitude that the police have had since the start of the 2000s. "The cruising terror" is almost

an echo from the time when homosexuality was a criminal act (1864–1944) in Sweden and many of the other contemporary experiences ("Cancer", "The poster", "The sauna") express behaviors and language that would never be formally accepted.

At the same time, my material indicates that the most exclusionary experiences were more common in the 1980s and 1990s, a trend consistent with other studies of homosexuality in police organizations, which I outlined in Chapter 2. What is the value, in terms of our understanding, of the "old" versus the "new" stories today?

First of all, the old stories are useful as evidence for how it could be "in those days". We know quite a lot about how society was in general, but not so much about what it could be like to be a gay police officer in Sweden during the 1980s and 1990s.

Second, the older experiences also have an analytical value. Both the older and the newer experiences constitute concrete expressions that help us to understand some of the mechanisms of exclusion, regardless of the time period. They concretize how stigma, stigmatization, and dirt work, as I showed in Chapter 3. The connection between these mechanisms and certain social identities – such as sexual orientation, gender, ethnicity – changes over time. But the mechanisms as such are not time-bound. In particular, the dirt-defining behavior appears to endure. Dirt, as noted, describes something that is "out of place" and gives rise to a need to "clean". Chapter 3 shows how this can be expressed in everyday police work with regard to homosexuality. On a more general level, this has been seen before, as in the description in Chapter 2 of what it was like when the first women joined the police. They were depicted as being "out of place" and they were supposed to be removed from the police. The same thing happened when the police allowed gay police officers to appear in *Svensk Polis* (the Swedish police authority's magazine) and to participate in uniform in pride parades, as I described in Chapter 6. In Douglas' terms: being associated first with women and then with homosexuality was thought to make the police "dirty".

Third, the "old" experiences are valuable for understanding experiences today, a fact which is often pointed out in organizational studies that look at sexism, racism, discrimination, inclusion/exclusion, and marginalization.[2] History makes the exclusionary mechanisms *persistent*. Or, to use the words of LGB officer Johan from Chapter 2, history "casts shadows ahead". Historical knowledge helps us to contextualize and understand the difference in strength and meaning between different types of exclusionary attempts, such as the difference between saying that "that fucking police officer" versus "that fucking fag" should get out of the organization. The point here is that the resources available in processes of exclusion and inclusion are embedded in history. We have historical knowledge about how homosexuality has been and to a certain extent still is associated with stigma and outsidership, which makes it possible today to use it in a stigmatizing way that is different from heterosexuality. The relevance of history

for individuals of course varies, but it exists as a collective consciousness, as a part of our culture.[3] That is why there is a difference between "fucking fag/dyke" and "fucking hetero" (or between "fucking blatte"[4] and "fucking svenne", between "fucking Jew" and "fucking Swede"). Both speech acts naturally have marginalizing effects, but the historical context is radically different, which influences the impact. Open systematic discrimination and stigmatization of homosexuals is still within living memory and still happens in some contexts, while there is hardly any such memory for the open systematic discrimination and stigmatization of heterosexuals in Sweden.

As for the newer experiences, in turn, some of these indicate how the ways in which inclusion and exclusion take place have changed. To put it another way, what is possible has changed. "The hate meeting", which took place in the mid-1980s, would probably not be possible today. Maybe it could take place in some unusually secretive group (or on the internet), but it would probably get out and be a scandal and some form of measures would be taken against the chief. The way "The hate meeting" was described, the meeting seems to have taken place relatively openly, yet no one spoke up and no measures were taken. According to my interview subjects, the organizer of the meeting was later promoted to criminal inspector. In other words, it was possible to more or less openly organize a "hate meeting" against a gay colleague, to interrogate people about their sexuality (see "The interrogation"), or to call someone a "fucking fag" in the sauna, and *nonetheless comfortably retain* a respected position. Knowledge about how to handle such situations appears to have been lacking, and the stigma was so strong that a fear of touching appeared to rule – if you touched homosexuality in any way other than to distance yourself from it, you became "dirty".

Today, people don't remain quite as comfortably in those positions. Now, the dynamic would probably be more like it was in "The poster" or "The sauna". Someone would probably speak up. The culture in which exclusion and inclusion take place has been furnished with *new artifacts* – new policies and new laws, leadership initiatives for diversity and against discrimination, and societal changes and activities such as pride parades and #metoo – which are a resource, and which strengthen the voice for those who speak up. These resources make it more difficult to comfortably carry out activities that exclude homosexuality. It happens anyway, as this book has shown, but someone cannot count on comfortably retaining their position after calling a "hate meeting", calling someone a "fucking fag", or harassing an LGBTQ+ network, in the same way they could before these artifacts emerged. It is easier to speak up, and when someone speaks up, something happens, at least sometimes.

What happens when someone speaks up of course varies. In my study, there are examples of measures against attempts at exclusion and silencing. For example, in "The sauna" and "The poster", the police officers and the chief who expressed homophobia were challenged. But there are also indications that homophobic expressions – as in the time of "The hate meeting" – are not

a serious obstacle for promotion or a threat to someone's current position. The police chief in the sauna – who said that that "fucking fag" should get out of Stockholm – is, according to my respondent, a high-ranking police chief; as far as I know, nothing happened to the chief in "The cruising terror" who encouraged the police officers to "terrorize the fags"; and according to my interviewee, the police officer who called gays a "cancer" on society was allowed to remain at the reception desk. The Swedish police is a hierarchical organization where careers have traditionally been made through long and faithful service, and there is a tendency to avoid questioning superiors.[5] "The commanders set the norm", as Henrik ("The sauna") said during one of our conversations. When managers like those in "The sauna" and "The cruising terror" retain their position, this naturally contributes to the persistence of exclusion.

I have described some of the experiences as stories of inclusion. In particular, I am thinking of "The support", "The hype", and "No problems" in Chapter 4. They are "happy" stories with happy endings. In "The support", Nina got support from her colleagues when she was having a hard time after coming out. In "The hype", it turned out that Sebastian's expectations of his colleagues' prejudices were incorrect. And in "No problems", Sandra emphasized (as the title of her story suggests) that she feels it is unproblematic to be a lesbian today. Sebastian and Sandra particularly highlighted that they experience "no problems" today.

On an individual level, they *are* happy stories – Sandra and Sebastian talk about how they feel included. On a cultural level, there is, however, a reason to tread carefully around these happy stories. The stories do not mean that the struggle is over. As I wrote in Chapter 4, inclusion is conditioned by a heteronormative culture – to be included involves getting used to heteronormativity. There is also a risk that these happy stories become what the cultural studies scholar Sara Ahmed calls *happy talk*; that is, happy stories primarily used because they make the majority feel comfortable since they give the impression that the damage that has occurred has been repaired.[6] Ahmed writes that the moral in the depiction of these kinds of happy stories tends to be that individuals – in particular, those who have been excluded – ought to "let it go" and forget past exclusion, which will make the exclusion disappear: "The moral task is thus 'to get over it' as if when we are over it, it is gone."[7] Applying this to the current study, the risk with *happy talk* is that the problem of deficient inclusivity is constructed as a question about individuals' – especially gay individuals' – inability to let go of history ("get over it") and to recognize that everything is good now, rather than a question about a heterosexist system being the foundation for exclusion. A view like this smooths over the historical exclusion and neglects the fact that the "struggle" is ongoing, even if it looks different than it did in the 1980s. In other words, while the happy contemporary stories should be seen as a sign that it can be unproblematic to be gay within the police, they should not be used to silence either that it has been or that it can be problematic.

After these warnings about "not counting our chickens" and pointing out that exclusion is persistent, I want to end this section on time on a positive note. In particular, I want to focus on the *collective process* that I have mentioned several times. This book contains a number of examples of how colleagues and managers have functioned as a resource for inclusion. These are key. Individual voices screaming without being heard, or without finding out that they have been heard, do not make much of a difference. It is also notable how these "individual voices" do not need to belong to gay people or to other minorities. Participating in a collective process for inclusion is not just about standing up when you are asked or called upon (as in "The poster"), but also about having the courage to take the initiative and to speak up (as in "The sauna", where colleagues took the initiative to inform Henrik and promised they would testify for him). I will return to this in the section below on "Ideas for practitioners".

"Narrow" masculinity in masculinized occupations

A theme of this book has been masculinity. Since this concept has a bearing on other occupations than just policing and plays a key role in a more general social problem – that masculinity tends to be "narrow" in masculinized environments – I will expand the discussion somewhat here and place the insights from my study in a broader social context.

In Chapter 5, I argued that an aspect of the police as an occupation is that it is characterized by a macho ideal that police officers are expected to live up to. One way of showing that you live up to this ideal is by behaving in ways that indicate that you are *not* gay. I also showed in Chapter 6 that police work is corporeal and intimate, which increases the relevance of sexuality at work.

This places police work in a category that can be called *masculinized* occupations. Gender studies scholar Joshua Collins describes these jobs as ones that typically employ men who embody "heterosexual work styles" and as jobs that have "a common history requiring for employment – explicitly or implicitly – a willingness to do physical labor or face job hazards".[8] Collins' point is that these occupations – such as police work, military work, construction work, work in the oil industry, and sports – have a tendency to reward men, but not all men; rather, it is specific men, men who are seen as traditionally masculine.[9] In other words, it is the physically demanding work – which is related to the corporeal dimension I discussed in Chapter 6 – and the element of risk that differentiate them from "regular" male-dominated occupations, such as IT, finance, or mathematics.[10]

A well-known problem in terms of inclusion is that masculinized occupations tend to privilege men while making it more challenging for women to participate. But my study emphasizes Collins' point that it is only about *certain* men. To put it another way, it is primarily a *certain* type of masculinity that is privileged, and that which is associated with femininity is

devalued. As I showed in Chapter 5, male homosexuality is often associated with femininity, which means that in this context, male privilege does not apply to gay men. As a result, in a masculinized occupation, gay men and women start by heading uphill, so to speak. They need to engage more in masculinity work to fit in, as discussed in Chapter 5.

It is therefore reasonable to claim that the macho image of the police privileges heterosexual men. This said, it is also worth noting that masculinity in masculinized occupations appears to be relatively "narrow" – in the sense that there is friction if someone behaves in a way that is associated with femininity – which limits freedom, including for heterosexual men.

It is problematic that masculinity is so narrow in masculinized, corporeal environments. Not because everything associated with "macho" and traditional masculinity is problematic in and of itself (of course), such as being attracted to women, liking to work out and get strong, being a little authoritarian, "raw but cordial", and similar. This is particularly the case in police work, which *is* physical sometimes and where it can be necessary to be decisive and authoritative, which can be seen as part of the macho norm. Problems arise if the macho norm creates expectations that steer men toward behaviors that are limiting for themselves as well as for others, such as if the macho norm makes gay men (or anyone who does not feel comfortable with the norm) feel that they do not fit into the police.

I have shown how the macho image of the police can create constraints, above all for the inclusion of male homosexuality. But it is not just in the police that male homosexuality tends to be seen as more problematic than female. As I mentioned in Chapter 5, this tendency is seen throughout Swedish work life.[11] It also generally seems that the movement from masculinity toward femininity with which male homosexuality is associated is viewed as more problematic and "stranger" than the reverse.[12] There are historic reasons behind this. Men who have done things that are associated with womanliness have been seen as strange or threatening. In Chapter 2, there was historical background explaining this: in the 13th century, it was believed that receiving sex from another man was to take the woman's role and it was significantly more problematic than to be the active (male) partner in same-sex sexual interactions, and to accuse someone of having been on the receiving end of sex with another man was defamatory and illegal, according to the county laws; in the 19th century, both male and female homosexuality was forbidden, but the law was applied almost only to men. This tendency to devalue the feminine remains. Women wearing "men's clothes" (such as trousers or suits) has been normalized and can even be seen as a sign of equality, while men wearing women's clothes (such as a skirt or blouse) is primarily associated with "drag" and is seen as belonging in show business rather than in workplaces. It is even more obvious in terms of children. A "tomboy" [in Swedish "pojkflicka", literally boygirl] tends to trump a "sissy boy" [Swedish "flickpojke", literally girlboy], and a "daddy's girl" tends to be a decisive, strong girl, while a "mama's boy" makes

you think of a weak type.[13] Little girls in light blue cargo trousers do not arouse as much attention as little boys in pink skirts or with bows in their hair. In other words, males who cross gender boundaries are thought to be "stranger" and possibly more threatening than females who do so, which is part of the explanation for why male homosexuality is thought to be more problematic than female homosexuality in the police.

Another aspect of this narrow masculinity is that it could be said that there is more space for different ways of being a woman than being a man, in the sense that women today have more access to traditionally male territory than the reverse. Women who have entered male territory have, of course, met with problems, not least women in Sweden who wanted to become police officers in the 1950s (as discussed in Chapter 2), but in recent times, women who have carried out traditionally masculinized activities have received increased legitimacy. This is shown by the aforementioned tendency for lesbianism to be viewed as more legitimate than male homosexuality, and it is also shown in the Swedish job market, where women to a large extent have begun to join what was previously viewed as male territory (such as police officers, doctors, lawyers), while men still keep to traditionally male occupations.[14] This creates a bias in the heterosexual matrix. Heteronormativity exists, but it is more legitimate if women want to be a little "manly" and are attracted to and fall in love with women. Simultaneously, since masculinity is ascribed higher status, this means that lesbian as well as heterosexual women need to live up to the masculine ideal. In other words, to the extent that masculinity has a higher status – which it does in masculinized occupations – heterosexual men are symbolically privileged, while masculinity is available to women more than femininity is available to men.

Thus, the narrowness of masculinity is potentially problematic not just for women and gay men in masculinized occupations but also on a more general societal level. Looking briefly beyond the police, there are many arguments that strong expectations to live up to traditional gender ideals cause problems. This includes everything from men avoiding applying for certain jobs (such as a preschool teacher) to societies with stereotypical gender expectations tending to be more violent.[15] It is doubtful whether these expectations – a sort of gender prison linked to sexual orientation, as we saw in the heterosexual matrix – are good for anyone. Perhaps in the short term they are good for certain men who receive privileges – in the form of "obvious" roles as authorities in certain contexts – because of their gender. But on a societal level, the division into traditional expectations of masculinity and femininity is limiting for everyone since, regardless of people's gender, these expectations create unnecessary obstacles for movement beyond stereotypes.

Practical food for thought

How should a practitioner – such as a police chief, a police officer, or an HR member of staff – use the content in this book? The task of research is not to

decide what practitioners should do. Most often, practitioners – in this case, those employed by the police – have the best knowledge about what works in their own organization. There is much talk today about evidence-based practice, not least within the police.[16] This can be interpreted in different ways. A usual way seems to be to imagine that research offers proof and guarantees, in the sense of: "If we do X, then Y will happen." This is possible with, say, medicine. It is reasonable to think that when we give medicine X to patients, then we (almost) surely know that Y will happen. For example, paracetamol/acetaminophen relieves pain in most people. Most people who have worked in organizations know that it does not work quite like paracetamol. You rarely know that Y will happen because you do X. It rarely turns out the way you thought it would. It is more complicated than that.

Therefore, it is not practical to view evidence in this way in social sciences, or more specifically when you are thinking of organizations. It is more useful to think of research as a form of support when thinking, as food for thought, as one source among many for reflection and general insights around the field you work in. Based on my study, I want to reiterate a number of findings I made in the book, which can function as bases for reflections when you, as a manager or employee, want to try to understand your workplace.

Acknowledge the problems with formalization

Chapter 7 suggests that formalized training initiatives for inclusion are linked to problems. I wrote that they are seen as impression management by the police officers, as attempts to make a good impression on external stakeholders. I am not the first to note that diversity training sessions are problematic. Sociologists Frank Dobbin and Alexander Kalev, for instance, note that diversity training often does not increase diversity and, particularly if the training is perceived as forced, can at worst activate rather than decrease prejudice.[17] Cultural studies scholar Sara Ahmed writes in a similar way that formal diversity management – especially policy production – can hide injustices in organizations because they can make it look like there are no problems.[18] Ahmed argues that being good at diversity can become being good at policy. And as I noted in Chapter 7, Pushkala Prasad and her colleagues' study of diversity training showed that real problems were glossed over in favor of general topics and that the local relevance of the training was lost.[19] There are more examples of this tendency.[20]

Formal arrangements, such as training and the production of documents, should therefore be understood as precarious methods for achieving the inclusion of minorities. Chapter 7 shows how diversity work tends to become one-off initiatives. They are good for showing that you are doing something, and of course they are rarely completely meaningless. People will always learn something. But it is unclear what they learn. The police officers might learn the difference between a transvestite and a transsexual

and can get a little insight into minority cultures, and so on. But if they feel that the training comes from above as a requirement, that it is based on the assumption that the police officers have the "wrong" values, that it is organized as one-off initiatives rather than being integrated into everyday work, and that it is an expression of the management's work to avoid criticism and to present a positive image of the organization rather than their genuine interest in diversity-related problems within the police, then the police officers will also learn not to take it seriously and not to have confidence in the management. In other words, diversity work that takes place through single initiatives now and then is ambiguous in meaning, and *how* these initiatives are carried out and how the aim is communicated is central to the meaning they will have in the organization.

One should also remember that training programs around diversity and core values are attempts at changing a culture. But there is little evidence that a culture can be changed through single initiatives here and there.[21] Culture exists in the meanings we ascribe to objects (guns, grades, posters for LGBTQ+ networks, government directives, posters with core values), actions (having diversity training, joking about gay people, tearing down posters for LGBTQ+ networks, demanding an apology when a colleague or manager has said something derogatory), and language ("cancer", "that fucking fag should leave Stockholm", "diversity", "crook"). These meanings will probably not be changed significantly in a two-hour training session. More long-term and overarching processes are needed.

Don't do too much

The criticism above against relying on formal arrangements suggests that perhaps management should not try to do too much. This is a view from diversity scholars such as Sara Ahmed and Elaine Swan.[22] In particular, they argue that there are problems when majority groups (often, here, heterosexual, Swedish-born managers), together with management consultants, try to arrange things so minorities can be included. This may communicate that these groups would understand the problems around the inclusion of minorities better than the minorities themselves, and as if these groups – who are not infrequently the basis for minority exclusion – have a "solution". Along similar lines, Laurence Romani and her colleagues, in a study of HR managers, noted a phenomenon that they call *benevolent discrimination*, which is about minorities being depicted as subordinate and in need of help from those who are already included.[23] Minorities can thus unintentionally be subjugated when majority members, with benevolent intentions, try to be good at diversity.

This makes it sound as though police chiefs, who usually belong to majority groups, should do nothing at all when it comes to diversity issues. But that is not the point. Rather, the point is that if you want to participate in creating an inclusive police organization, it is not enough to have formal

arrangements. It might even be the case that these formal arrangements counteract the aim by making it *look like* you are "good at diversity", and can thereby pat yourself on the back, while the formalized and the quantifiable draws attention away from the informal aspects of exclusion and inclusion.

Before formalized initiatives are taken, it is therefore a good idea to listen, both to the organization's culture, because inclusionary work takes place *in* a culture and needs to be adapted to it, and to minorities, because it is their experiences that ought to be the basis for what needs to be done.[24] This does not preclude having training and policies. But – thinking about the criticism that was presented in Chapter 7 – what a listening, more reflective approach can contribute is counteracting diversity work being decoupled from "real police work", by to a larger extent trying to increase the general insightfulness and sensitivity in regard to diversity. Then the risk of being "good at diversity" becoming reduced to being good at formalities will be decreased, and the training sessions run can be more relevant to operations than the examples we saw in Chapter 7. Hopefully, this book can be of some help in this reflective work – particularly when it comes to paying attention to organizational culture and LGB police officers' experiences – but it cannot replace police employees' own efforts to reflect and listen.

An important challenge, therefore, should be to avoid diversity becoming "not real police work". In November 2019, I spoke with an employee at the police's central HR department in Stockholm. She said that they are trying to work on integrating diversity-related issues into their everyday work, such as by cooperating with the officers working with hate crime. Given the insights from Chapter 7, this sounds wise, at least as a general idea. Hate crime groups work on issues related to the norms and values that exclude and include people because of their group membership. The knowledge they have about both police work and the dynamics of exclusion/inclusion in society ought to be translatable to the internal organization.

View training and policies as potential rather than finished processes

In contrast to this pessimistic view, it is also important to remember that formalized inclusion initiatives – even if they are seen as impression management – are not the same as nothing happening on the informal inside of the organization. Something happens; it is just that it is not quite as one had imagined. This "something" can, as noted, turn into the development of cynicism among the staff, which will decrease trust in the management. But initiatives can also lead to discussions within the organization, discussions that can play a role in the process of change. In other words, there is potential for change even in impression management. I touched on this at the end of Chapter 7, where I wrote that the formal side can be a source of support and input into the organization's long-term identity work, the process through which the meaning of police work and being a police officer is developed.

If the training sessions lead to "discussions" (as the police officers say they can do), and if these discussions get integrated into work and picked up by police officers with cultural sensitivity, then they can, in the long run, change the culture. Then the general cultural sensitivity of police officers', which Hilde talked about in Chapter 7, can be improved. In this way, there is a potential to the trainings. To return to Sara Ahmed, who like me is not exclusively critical of formalized diversity work, the trainings can *direct attention, give the institution a direction,* and *involve as well as become resources*.[25] But for this to happen, for this potential to be realized, the formal aspects need to be seen as part of an ongoing process rather than as completed projects that can be "ticked off".

Acknowledge the collective aspect but take responsibility

Looking back at the book as a whole, however, it is not within the formal arrangements that the main potential for minority inclusion is found. I have continually emphasized that inclusion is a collective process, a process that involves and is dependent on the actions of several different actors. It is a good idea to acknowledge this collective aspect in order to stimulate inclusion. In order to give the concept of the collective process a little flesh and bones and to show, in light of my study, which actions tend to stimulate inclusion, I will refer back to the experiences in the book. "The poster" will play the main role, in part to give a clear example, and in part because of how rich in details and complexity Emma's story is. In the story, the stimulation of inclusion is expressed, but so is the complexity of managerial action for inclusion.

In "The poster", we saw how, after Emma spoke up through her letter, the management reacted quickly and strongly. First, this shows that the management was an actor in the collective that contributed to inclusion in a particular work situation, by distancing themselves from the harassment of the LGBTQ+ network. Thus, clear and forceful managerial action when something happens can stimulate inclusion. This can be contrasted with "Cancer", where management appeared as a passive observer.

Secondly, "The poster" shows how a larger collective took part in the inclusion process. It was not just about one employee being harassed and one or two managers reacting. Emma sent the letter to many colleagues, which probably made it hard for the management to be passive and indifferent. Similar dynamics emerged in "Cancer", but there the larger collective was the media, and management also did not react significantly until the media had become involved. This shows the complexity of the inclusionary process. While the media can be a resource for inclusion, media attention can also turn into a "trial by media" that is lacking in nuance and local understanding for the situation that has arisen. There can be a lot of pressure to satisfy the media. Sometimes the pressure is justified, sometimes

not. The media can be an effective way of getting something to happen, but collegial support is more important for bringing the process of inclusion closer to police work itself. This collegial support was shown not just in "The poster" but in nearly all the stories from Chapter 4 (except "Cancer"). If collegial support for inclusion works, there is usually no need to involve the media – in "The poster", Emma threatened to get the media involved, but when she received collegial support, she did not carry out the threat. So being open and involving a larger collective can therefore stimulate inclusion, but the further the collective is from the actual situation, the larger the risk of decoupling it from operative police work.

A third, and related, point is that involving the larger collective in "The poster" highlights that inclusion is not primarily a management issue but a collective responsibility. This is key: a single LGB police officer – or someone else who feels excluded or discriminated against – who raises their voice but gets no response cannot create inclusion. But it is important not to use the idea of "everyone's responsibility" as an argument for management to do nothing. It is reasonable to attribute *more* responsibility to managers. Being a manager comes with responsibility. And if you just say that "everyone has a responsibility" without attributing some with *particular* responsibility, there is a risk that no one will do anything.[26] Emma in "The poster" puts her finger on this when, after being asked by her managers what she thinks they should do, she exclaims: "*I* am not a manager on a strategic level. You can't ask *me* that."

Emma undeniably has a point. It is reasonable to view the ability to handle issues of exclusion as part of a manager's competence. In Chapter 7, I showed that there is quite strong criticism of the lack of diversity-related knowledge of some managers. At the same time, one could view the police chief's question to Emma as a sign of humility. In this case, he was unsure of his task. That is not good. But it is better to admit your lack of knowledge than to be quiet and to pretend that you know what you are doing, or to remain indifferent (as in "Cancer", or, for that matter, "The hate meeting", where none of the many managers at the station had the courage to intervene). One could imagine that the police chief felt he could learn something from Emma. And if we take the criticism of the diversity training seriously, then it is likely that he could learn more from her than he could from, for example, the "computer exercise" or the "fill-in-the-blanks exercise". Maybe Emma did not want to jump in to train the management, but that is another issue. She probably has relevant knowledge and experience. In dialogue with Emma and after learning from "The poster" situation, maybe Emma's managers could act more independently and insightfully next time. The same could be said for the manager in "The sauna" who called the meeting on Henrik's, not her own, initiative. In other words, inclusion is a collective responsibility, but managers have a particular responsibility, and it is a good idea for managers to listen to minorities to better understand what exclusion and inclusion are about.

To conclude and to summarize this section on thoughts for practitioners: my study shows that inclusion is a collective and rather fragile process that is dependent on initiatives from LGB police officers as well as formal and (especially) informal support from other participants, particularly colleagues and managers. The practical consequence of this is that formal arrangements do play a role, but they are not enough to create inclusion. Nor can one expect LGB police officers to raise their voices alone. That would be to place too large of a burden on their shoulders, and the understanding that inclusion is a collective process makes that sort of allocation of responsibility ineffective. To only react when encouraged by LGB police officers – or by government directives or the media – reproduces a culture where peripheral rather than full inclusion of homosexuality is the norm.

Inclusion, democracy, and the view of police work

I will conclude by returning to the opening chapter, where I argued that the relevance of understanding the inclusion and exclusion of particular social groups rests on democratic grounds. An inclusive police force promotes the democratic idea that people should have equal access to the police, as employees, potential employees, and citizens. I also wrote that inclusion is not just about mechanically increasing the number of representatives for minority groups in the police. It is about building an inclusionary culture that ensures that potential and established police officers do not feel that they are out of place because of their social identity, such as their sexual orientation, gender, or ethnicity. It is about understanding police officers' relationship to both the law-abiding and the non-law-abiding public – and how the composition of the police workforce affects this relationship – and thoughtfully managing this. For example, as I discussed in Chapter 7, gay police officers can be a resource when it comes to understanding and investigating crimes that involve gay people. The same is true for other minority groups – women are needed to understand domestic violence, police from immigrant backgrounds are needed to understand crimes involving immigrants, and LGBTQ+ people are needed to understand crimes that have to do with LGBTQ+ people.[27] But one cannot expect that these police officers want to specialize in these issues just because they belong to the respective groups. From a democratic perspective, inclusion should be based on freedom, and not on the condition that the included person's social identity should be "put to work" to create value for the organization.[28] Inclusion work is complex. Therefore, general insightfulness and sensitivity are needed.

Because of this complexity, there is a close relationship between how the police relate to diversity and inclusion and how people look at police work itself. One can see police work as centered around the practical and, in terms of knowledge, simple bits. Sometimes police work can be simple and not demand more knowledge than the ability to drive a car quickly but safely,

to have a normal conversation, and to write down what has happened. But often it is more complicated, and there are grounds for viewing police work as knowledge-intensive. In situations where police intervention is required as well as in more strategic work with crime prevention, recruitment and training, and organizational culture, the understanding of different social groups and their situations and activities in society are relevant. The police know this. When I interviewed a senior police chief he explained the importance of understanding the complexity of diversity issues. He emphasized that diversity issues are important, among other reasons, because the police should protect marginalized groups and organizations in society and need to understand the problems connected to them:

> Take LGBTQ+ issues. Today there are completely different demands on society, and thereby different demands on the police, and so we have to demand different things of ourselves, participating on another level, collaborating, to understand the problems, to bring the problems to the surface.

I agree with the police chief in regard to this, and it is my hope that this book can be a source of support for understanding the problems, particularly when it comes to the internal aspects of the police organization.

Notes

1. The concept of peripheral inclusion has been explored in Rennstam & Sullivan (2018).
2. See, for example, Nkomo (1992), Pringle et al. (2006), and Zanoni et al. (2010).
3. Cultural studies scholars Billy Ehn & Oskar Löfgren (1982) define culture in terms of collective consciousness.
4. As noted before, "blatte" is a derogatory term for a Swede from an immigrant background. "Svenne" is the equivalent term for a Swede from a Swedish background.
5. Holgersson (2014), Wieslander (2016).
6. Ahmed (2012, pp. 165 fwd.)
7. Ahmed (2012, p. 167).
8. Collins (2015, p. 416). Also see Collins & Callahan (2012). For examples from other masculinized jobs, see Persson (2012) and Sundevall (2014) for studies of masculinity in the armed forces, and Hargreaves & Anderson (2014) for an overview of the connection between sport, gender, and sexuality.
9. Collins (2013, 2015).
10. Collins (2015).
11. Hammarstedt et al. (2015).
12. There are studies of opinions that show this. For example, Sirin et al. (2004, p. 120) notes that, "although both males and females are likely to be evaluated less positively when they do not conform to gender role stereotypes, males tend to be viewed more negatively than females when they transgress gender roles".
13. These examples are from Gillberg (2018).
14. Leijnse (2017).

15. See Leijnse (2017, especially Chapter 4).
16. See Punch (2015) for a discussion on evidence-based policing. Punch argues that evidence-based practice tends to focus on what works at the expense of what matters. See Bornemark (2018) for a more general discussion and criticism of using evidence as a basis in the public sector.
17. Dobbin & Kalev (2016).
18. Ahmed (2012).
19. Prasad et al. (2011).
20. Such as Dennissen et al. (2018) and Nkomo & Hoobler (2014).
21. Alvesson & Sveningsson (2015).
22. Ahmed (2012), Swan (2017).
23. See Romani et al. (2018).
24. Also see Swan (2017) and Tracy et al. (2020), who emphasize the role of listening when it comes to the majority's approach to diversity.
25. Ahmed (2012, p. 111).
26. This is also one of Ahmed's (2012) points (see p. 136 in particular). Also see Kalev et al. (2006), who in a large study of different types of diversity initiatives argue that the allocation of responsibility for inclusion is key to achieving change.
27. The American police scholar and law professor David Sklansky (2005, pp. 1825–26) writes that women joining the world's police forces has contributed to domestic violence getting more attention and being handled more effectively and that homosexual police officers' presence can be said to have contributed to the police improving their stance in regard to LGBTQ+-related violence.
28. See Burchiellaro (2020) for more on how inclusion can become a form a control that works through expecting social identities such as gender and sexuality to be "put to work" to produce value for the organization.

Afterword

In qualitative research, there is a tradition of emphasizing the importance of being reflexive, of considering one's role as a researcher. This can be expressed in different ways. It may involve generally reflecting on one's analysis to avoid taking things for granted, but also more specifically reflecting more explicitly on one's own identity as a researcher. The issue of the researcher's identity is often formulated in terms of the value and consequences of being an insider or an outsider in the contexts one is studying.[1] I am a man, which makes me an insider to the extent that I am writing about men and masculinity. But I am neither a police officer nor gay, and as these two categories are the primary ones in this book, I ought to be considered primarily an outsider.

The advantage of being an insider is that you have more lived experience of what you are studying. For example, Heather Panter, a police scholar and the author of the book *Transgender cops*, writes, "[D]ue to my 'butch' identity, I am familiar with being a victim of gender policing, as well as having personal experience of being a gay cop and being socially stigmatized".[2] In other words, Panter actively uses her insidership and her personal experiences as empirical material and claims to some extent to have a deeper understanding of her research area because of her identity as a lesbian police officer.[3] There is much to this. At the same time, there are also potential disadvantages to being an insider. In methodological research, there is discussion about the pros and cons of "going native", in the sense of becoming part of the culture one is studying. Being part of the culture can, as noted, increase one's understanding for it, but it can also increase the risk of the researcher being limited by the insider perspective and overlooking things that insiders take for granted but that for outsiders might be a source of increased understanding.[4] There are thus both advantages and disadvantages to being an insider.

I do not share Panter's insider-based advantages. I cannot claim to know what it feels like to be either a police officer or gay, and I cannot rely on these identities as a source for creating depth in my analysis. There are certainly aspects that Panter or others might have noticed but that I did not. Instead, I have to rely on any benefits that come from being an outside observer, such

as that I could find some things interesting that police officers thought were normal and of limited interest. For example, when I was observing police work, I found it interesting how openly the police officers talked and joked about sex and how their jargon could seem rather "raw" (see Chapter 6). Maybe a police officer would not think so.

In terms of my identity as heterosexual, this was rarely made explicit during the interviews. However, with hindsight it is possible to reflect on how my outsider position might have played a role. Among other things, some of what the police officers described as normal was notable to me. In particular, this happened when some of them said that they had not experienced any problems, while they also said that there were "some gay jokes and that sort of thing" (see Chapter 4, "No Problems"). As a heterosexual person, I have never experienced my sexual orientation being the subject of jokes. I have never needed to normalize "some hetero jokes". One could possibly say that my heterosexuality provided a certain analytical advantage here in that by reflecting on my own sexuality's role, I saw something remarkable and unfair in a situation that the gay police officers portrayed as normal. At the same time, of course, a non-heterosexual scholar could also be able to see that.

Another situation where my orientation may have played a role is personal and concerns how I was affected by the experiences people told me about. Several of the stories are very tragic and upsetting. Or at least I felt they were. On the one hand, you might imagine that gay interviewers would experience them as *even more* tragic since they would directly relate to them. But on the other hand, you can imagine that perhaps they would not be as affected since they probably have lived with similar experiences and have become accustomed to them. I do not know which it is. But I do know that I have no experience of my sexual orientation being grounds for exclusion, ridicule, stigmatization, and the like. Even if I naturally was aware that there could be a lot of stigma around homosexuality, especially in the 1980s, it had not affected me in the way it did through the conversations with the police officers and my work on the interview material. It was a learning process for me.

I noticed the impact of being moved like this in my work as a teacher. At the risk of making it sound like I am saying "poor me" – that is not my intention – I remember how during one lecture, I referred to examples from my interviews and I almost could not recount them. In a course on Human Resource Management, I was going to refer to the example of "The interrogation" – the supervisor who told Susanne that if it were true she was a lesbian, she would "have a hellish time" in the police organization – and I felt how the words got stuck in my throat and I got tears in my eyes. I thought that this wasn't working, for me to tell this story. The next year, I chose not to include these examples, because I was worried that the students would think I was strange or overly sensitive.

What does all this mean? I think that it means that the problems that some of my interviewees have had to deal with affect us all. It is of course most problematic for those who are directly affected, but my strong reaction, "despite" being heterosexual, is a sign that there is a general interpersonal unfairness built into many of the experiences that were told to me. Maybe my outsidership played a role in underscoring this.

I believe that we need studies from both insiders and outsiders, both those by people like Panter and those by people like me. Insiders alone risk creating an undynamic conversation where everyone talks about themselves, and outsiders alone risk objectifying, exoticizing, and stereotyping the insiders. I hope that I have avoided the latter as much as possible.

Notes

1. See, for instance, McDonald (2013) for an account of this debate. There are those who think one ought to "match" identities so that, for instance, feminist research should be written by women (such as Smith 1974). Others question this and note that humans carry many different identities and it is impossible to match all identities, and also that the matching idea is founded on the problematic assumption that people who share identities comprise a homogenous group (McDonald 2013). For an example of a discussion of the insider/outsider issue in another context – a non-computer game-playing researcher who studies game developers – see Styhre (2020, Chapter 1).
2. Panter (2018, p. 116). Also see Einarsdóttir et al. (2016).
3. Outsidership can also be used analytically. That is what Attila Bruni (2006) and Jamie McDonald (2013) did; they both researched what they call "homonormative" contexts (where homosexuality is the norm, such the editorial office of a newspaper aimed at homosexuals). They actively used the fact that they both identify as heterosexual but were assumed to be gay as analytical tools – for example, Bruni was asked, "Do you have a boyfriend or are you single?" when he carried out observations. A finding from their reflections is that a man who is interested in male homosexuality is assumed to be gay. This need not be the case, Bruni's and McDonald's example shows.
4. See, for example, Orr (1996, p. 7).

Bibliography

Ahl, H. (2006), Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *30*(5), pp. 595–621.

Ahmed, S. (2012), *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. London: Duke University Press.

Aldrich, R. (2007), *Gay: En världshistoria [Gay: A world history]*. Transl. E. André. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur.

_____. (2010), *Gay life and culture: A world history*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Almqvist, R. & Wällstedt, N. (2013), Managing public sector organizations: Strategic choices within changing paradigms. In L. Strannegård & A. Styhre (eds.), *Management: An advanced introduction*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.

Allport, G.W. (1954/1979), *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Perseus Books.

Alvesson, M. (2002). *Understanding organizational culture*. London: Sage.

Alvesson, M. (2013). *The triumph of emptiness: Consumption, higher education, and work organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alvesson, M. & Due Billing, Y.D. (2011), *Kön och organisation [Gender and organization]*. Transl. S.-E. Torhell. (2nd ed.) Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur. [Available in English as: "Understanding gender and organization"]

Alvesson, M. & Sveningsson, S. (2015), *Changing organizational culture: Cultural change work in progress*. London: Routledge.

Ambjörnsson, F. (2005), Johannas förändring [Johanna's change]. In D. Kulick (ed.), *Queersverige [Queer Sweden]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur, pp. 181–206.

Andersson, S. (2003), *Ordnande praktiker: En studie av status, homosocialitet och maskuliniteter utifrån två närpolisorganisationer [Organizing practices: A study of status, homosociality, and masculinity based on two local police forces]*. PhD dissertation. Stockholm University: Pedagogiska institutionen [Insitute of Pedagogy].

Ashcraft, K.L., Muhr, S.L., Rennstam, J. & Sullivan, K. (2012), Professionalization as a branding activity: Occupational identity and the dialectic of inclusivity-exclusivity. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *19*(5), pp. 467–88.

Ashforth, B.E. & Mael, F. (1989), Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*(1), pp. 20–39.

Asplund, J. (1970), *Om undran inför samhället [Wondering about society]*. Uppsala, Sweden: Argos.

Austin, J. (1962), *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Avery, D.R. & McKay, P.F. (2006), Target practice: An organizational impression management approach to attracting minority and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, *59*(1), pp. 157–87.

Bauman, Z. (1989), *Modernity and the holocaust*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Beckert, J. (2016), *Imagined futures: Fictional expectations and capitalist dynamics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Belkin, A. & McNichol, J. (2002), Pink and blue: Outcomes associated with the integration of open gay and lesbian personnel in the San Diego police department. *Police Quarterly*, *5*(1), pp. 63–95.

Bell, M.P., Özbilgin, M.F., Beauregard, T.A. & Sürgevil, O. (2011), Voice, silence, and diversity in 21st century organizations: Strategies for inclusion of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender employees. *Human Resource Management*, *50*(1), pp. 131–46.

Bendl, R. & Hofmann, R. (2015), Queer perspectives fueling diversity management discourse: Theoretical and empirical-based reflections. In R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Henttonen & A.J. Mills (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of diversity in organizations*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 62–82.

Bernstein, M. & Kostelac, C. (2002), Lavender and blue attitudes about homosexuality and behavior toward lesbians and gay men among police officers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *18*(3), pp. 302–28.

Bernstein, M. & Swartwout, P. (2012), Gay officers in their midst: Heterosexual police employees' anticipation of the consequences for coworkers who come out. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *59*, pp. 1145–66.

Bildt, C. (2004), *Redovisning av regeringsuppdraget att beforska homo- och bisexuellas arbetsvillkor [Review of the governmental task to study the working conditions of homosexuals and bisexuals]*. Arbetslivsrapport 2004:16. Stockholm, Sweden: Arbetslivsinstitutet [National Institute for Working Life].

Björk, M. (2012). *Den stora polisreformen: Fem arbetspapper [The great police reform: Five working papers*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Bogren, A. (2010), Sexualitet [Sexuality]. In C. Edling & F. Liljefors (eds.), *Ett delat samhälle: Makt, intersektionalitet och social skiktning [A divided society: Power, intersectionality, and social layering]*. Malmö, Sweden: Liber.

Bolton, S.C. & Houlihan, M. (2009), Are we having fun yet? A consideration of workplace fun and engagement. *Employee Relations*, *31*(6), pp. 556–68.

Boogaard, B. & Roggeband, C. (2010), Paradoxes of intersectionality: Theorizing inequality in the Dutch police force through structure and agency. *Organization*, *17*(1), pp. 53–75.

Borgström, E. (2011), Förord: Den *moderna* homofobin [Foreword: Modern homophobia]. In E. Borgström (ed.), *Den moderna homofobin* [Modern homophobia]. Älvsjö, Sweden: Charlie by Kabusa, pp. 10–23.

Bornemark, J. (2018), *Det omätbaras renässans: En uppgörelse med pedanternas världsherravälde [The renaissance of the unmeasurable: An agreement with the pedants' world domination]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Volante.

Bourdieu, P. (1984), *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (1991), *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Bowen, F. & Blackmon, K. (2003), Spirals of silence: The dynamic effects of diversity on organizational voice. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(6), pp. 1393–1417.

Bowring, M.A. & Brewis, J. (2009), Truth and consequences: Managing lesbian and gay identity in the Canadian workplace. *Equal Opportunities International*, *28*(5), pp. 361–377.

Brå (Brottsförebyggande rådet [Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention]) (2015), Djärv, C., Westerberg, S. & Frenzel, A. *Hatbrott 2014: Statistik över polisanmälningar med identifierade hatbrottsmotiv och självrapporterad utsatthet för hatbrott [Hate crime 2014: Statistics of police reports with identified hate crime motives and self-reported vulnerability for hate crimes]*. Authors: Report 2015:13. Stockholm, Sweden.

Brannan, M.J., Parsons, E. & Priola, V. (2015), Brands at work: The search for meaning in mundane work. *Organization Studies*, *36*(1), pp. 29–53.

Broomfield, J. (2015), Gay men in the UK police services. In F. Colgan & N. Rumens (eds.), *Sexual orientation at work: Contemporary issues and perspectives*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 111–33.

Bruni, A. (2006), "Have you got a boyfriend or are you single?" On the importance of being "straight" in organizational research. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *13*(3), pp. 299–316.

Brunsson, N. (1993), Ideas and actions: Hypocrisy as alternatives to control. *Accounting, Organizations & Society*, *18*(6), pp. 489–506.

Bullough, V.L. (1979/2019), *Homosexuality: A history (from ancient Greece to gay liberation)*. London: Routledge.

Burchiellaro, O. (2020), Queering control and inclusion in the contemporary organization: On "LGBT-Friendly control" and the reproduction of (queer) value. *Organization Studies*, *42*(5), pp. 761–785.

Burke, M. (1994), Homosexuality as deviance: The case of the gay police officer. *British Journal of Criminology*, *34*(2), pp. 192–203.

Burrell, G. (1984), Sex and organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, *5*(2), pp. 97–118.

Butler, J. (1990), *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.

Butler, N. (2015), Joking aside: Theorizing laughter in organizations. *Culture and Organization*, *21*(1), pp. 42–58.

Christensen, L.T., Morsing, M. & Thyssen, O. (2013), CSR as aspirational talk. *Organization*, *20*(3), pp. 372–93.

Colgan, F., Creegan, C., McKearney, A. & Wright, T. (2008), Lesbian workers: Personal strategies amid changing organisational responses to "sexual minorities" in UK workplaces. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, *12*(1), pp. 31–45.

Collins, J.C. (2013), Stress and safety for gay men at work within masculinized industries. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *25*(3), pp. 245–68.

_____. (2015), Characteristics of "masculinized" industries: Gay men as a provocative exception to male privilege and gendered rules. *Human Resource Development Review*, *14*(4), pp. 415–41.

Collins, J.C. & Callahan, J.L. (2012), Risky business: Gay identity disclosure in a masculinized industry. *Human Resource Development International*, *15*(4), pp. 455–70.

Collinson, D.L. (1988), "Engineering humour": Masculinity, joking and conflict in shop-floor relations. *Organization Studies*, *9*(2), pp. 181–199.

Colvin, R.A. (2012), *Gay and lesbian cops: Diversity and effective policing*. Boulder/London: Lynne Rienner.

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

Cooren, J.R., Taylor, J. & Van Every, E.J. (2006), *Communication as organizing: Empirical and theoretical approaches into the dynamic of text and conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Couto, J.L. (2018), Hearing their voices and counting them in: The place of Canadian LGBTQ police officers in police culture. *Journal of Community Safety and Well-Being*, *3*(3), pp. 84–7.

Czarniawska, B. (1998), *A narrative approach to organization studies*. London: Sage.

Dahlgren, J. (2007), *Kvinnor i polistjänst: Föreningen kamraterna, Svenska polisförbundet och kvinnors inträde i polisyrket 1957–1971 [Women in the police force: The connection between comrades, Svenska polisförbundet [Swedish police union], and women joining the police force 1957–1971]*. PhD dissertation. Umeå, Sweden: Institutionen för Historiska Studier [History Institution], Umeå University.

Davies, A. & Thomas, R. (2003), Talking cop: Discourses of change and policing identities. *Public Administration*, *8*(4), pp. 681–99.

Deetz, S.A. (1992), *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Dennissen, M., Benschop, Y. & van den Brink, M. (2018), Rethinking diversity management: An intersectional analysis of diversity networks. *Organization Studies*, *41*(2), pp. 219–40.

Dingwall, R. (1997), Accounts, interviews and observations. In G. Miller & R. Dingwall (eds.), *Context and method in qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Diskrimineringsombudsmannen [Equality Ombudsman] (2018). http://www.do.se/om-diskriminering/skyddade-diskrimineringsgrunder/sexuell-laggning-som-diskrimineringsgrund.

Dobbin, F. & Kalev, A. (2016), Why diversity programs fail and what works better. *Harvard Business Review*, *94*(7–8), pp. 52–60.

Doerfel, M.L. & Gibbs, J.L. (2020), Organizing inclusion: Top-down and bottom-up approaches. In M.L. Doerfel & J.L. Gibbs (eds.), *Organizing inclusion: Moving diversity from demographics to communication processes*. London: Routledge, pp. 24–45.

Doerfel, M.L., Gibbs, J.L. & Parker, P. (2020), Preface. In M.L. Doerfel & J.L. Gibbs (eds.), *Organizing inclusion: Moving diversity from demographics to communication processes*. London: Routledge, pp. 13–22.

Douglas, M. (1966), *Purity and danger*. New York: Routledge.

Due Billing, Y. (2005), Gender equity – A bureaucratic Enterprise? In P. du Gay (ed.), *The values of bureaucracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 257–79.

Ehn, B. & Löfgren, O. (1982), *Kulturanalys [Cultural analysis]*. Malmö, Sweden: Gleerups.

Einarsdóttir, A., Hoel, H. & Lewis, D. (2016), Fitting the bill? (Dis)embodied disclosure of sexual identities in the workplace. *Work, Employment and Society*, *30*(3), pp. 489–505.

Ekman, G. (1999), *Från text till batong: Om poliser, busar och svennar [From text to baton: About the police, mischief-makers, and Swedes.]* PhD dissertation. Stockholm, Sweden: EFI.

Elsbach, K.D. & Sutton, R.I. (1992), Acquiring organizational legitimacy through illegitimate actions: A marriage of institutional and impression management theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, *35*(4), pp. 699–738.

Ely, R.J. & Meyerson, D.E. (2010), An organizational approach to undoing gender: The unlikely case of offshore oil platforms. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *30*, pp. 3–34.

Eriksson-Zetterquist, U. (2011), *Institutionell teori: Idéer, moden, förändring [Institutional theory: Ideas, fashions, change]*. Malmö, Sweden: Liber.

Eterno, J.A., Barrow, C.S. & Silverman, E.B. (2017), Forcible stops: Police and citizens speak out. *Public Administration Review*, *77*(2), pp. 181–92.

Europeiska socialfonden [European social fund] (2008), *Ansökan [om medel för förprojektering]* [Application (for funds for a pre-project)]. Dnr: 2008-3040254.

_____. (2009), *Ansökan [om medel för genomförande av utbildning]* [Application (for funds for training)]. Dnr: 2009-3040077.

Finstad, L. (2000/2013), *Politiblikket [The police gaze]*. Oslo, Norway: Pax forlag.

_____. (2016), Det konfliktfyllda polisarbetet [Conflict-filled police work]. In P. Larsson, R. Granér & H.O.I. Gundhus (eds.), *Polisvetenskap: En introduktion [Police science: An introduction]*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur, pp. 251–79.

Fleming, P. (2007), Sexuality, power and resistance in the workplace. *Organization Studies*, *28*(2), pp. 239–56.

Forsberg, G., Jakobsen, L. & Smirthwaite, G. (2003), *Homosexuellas villkor i arbetslivet* [Homosexuals' conditions in the workplace]. Arbetsrapport [Working report]. Karlstad, Sweden: Karlstad university.

Foster, J., Newburn, T. & Souhami, A. (2005), *Assessing the impact of the Stephen Lawrence inquiry* (No. 294). London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

Foucault, M. (1976), *The history of sexuality: Volume 1, The will to knowledge*. London: Penguin.

Fretz, B.R. (1975), Assessing attitudes towards sexual behaviors. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *5*(1), pp. 100–6.

Gabriel, Y. (1998), The use of stories. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (eds.), *Qualitative methods and analysis in organizational research: A practical guide*. London: Sage, pp. 135–60.

du Gay, P. (2005), *The values of bureaucracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gillberg, N. (2018), *Jag har aldrig märkt att kön har haft någon betydelse* [I have never noticed that gender has made a difference]. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.

Ginzel, L.E., Kramer, R.M. & Sutton, R.I. (2004), Organizational impression management as a reciprocal influence process: The neglected role of the organizational audience. In M. Hatch & M. Schulz (eds.), *Organizational identity: A reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 223–61.

Goffman, E. (1959), *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin Books.

_____. (1963), *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Goldsmith, A. (2005), Police reform and the problem of trust. *Theoretical Criminology*, *9*(4), pp. 443–70.

Gonzalez, J.A. (2010), Diversity change in organizations: A systemic, multilevel, and nonlinear process. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *46*(2), pp. 197–219.

Görtz, D. (2015), *Etnifierade polispraktiker: Hur etnicitet görs i polisers vardag [Ethnicized police practice: How ethnicity is done in the police's everyday lives.]* PhD dissertation. Lund, Sweden: Institute of sociology, Lund university.

Granér, R. (2004), *Patrullerande polisers yrkeskultur* [The work culture of patrolling police officers.] PhD dissertation. Lund, Sweden: Lund university.

_____. (2014), Humorns funktion i polisarbetet [Humor's role in police work]. *Nordisk Politiforskning [Nordic Police Research]*, 1(01), pp. 9–23.

_____. (2016), Självständiga sheriffer eller lojala byråkrater – Om patrullerande polisers yrkeskultur [Independent sheriffs or loyal bureaucrats – About the work culture of patrolling police officers]. In P. Larsson, R. Granér & H.O.I. Gundhus (eds.), *Polisvetenskap: En introduktion [Police science: An introduction]*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur, pp. 141–59.

Granér, R. & Kronkvist, O. (2016), Kontroll av och i polisorganisationen [Control of and within the police organization]. In P. Larsson, R. Granér & H.O.I. Gundhus (eds.), *Polisvetenskap: En introduktion [Police science: An introduction]*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur, pp. 53–80.

Haake, U. (2018), Conditions for gender equality in police leadership: Making way for senior police women. *Police Practice and Research*, *19*(3), pp. 241–52.

Hallett, T. (2010), The myth incarnate. *American Sociological Review*, *75*(1), pp. 52–74.

Hammarstedt, M., Ahmed, A.M. & Andersson, L. (2015), Sexual prejudice and labor market outcomes for gays and lesbians: Evidence from Sweden. *Feminist Economics*, *21*(1), pp. 90–109.

Hargreaves, J. & Anderson, E. (2014), Sport, gender and sexuality: Surveying the field. In J. Hargreaves & E. Anderson (eds.), *Routledge handbook of sport, gender and sexuality*. London: Routledge, pp. 25–42.

Harris, J. & White, V. (2018), Heteronormativity. In J. Harris & V. White, *A dictionary of social work and social care*. (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hartmann, M.R.K. (2014), *In the gray zone: With police in making space for creativity*. Frederiksberg: Copenhagen Business School.

Hilton, J. (2005), *No tears for queers: Ett reportage om män, bögar och hatbrott [No tears for queers: A report on men, fags, and hate crime]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Atlas.

Hines, R.D. (1992), Accounting: Filling the negative space. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *17*(3–4), pp. 313–41.

Hirschman, A.O. (1970), *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations and states*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hjorth, A. (2007), Från syster till kollega [From sister to colleague]. *Polistidningen [The Police Newspaper]*. http://polistidningen.se/2007/10/fran-syster-till-kollega.

Höglund, L. & Schwan, M. (2005), *Homosexuella polismäns upplevelse av diskriminering på arbetsplatsen: Intervjuer med fem homosexuella poliser i Stockholm [Homosexual police officers' experience of discrimination at work: Interviews with five homosexual police officers in Stockholm]*. BA thesis. Stockholm, Sweden: Institution for social work, Stockholm university.

Holgersson, S. (2014), *Polisen bakom kulisserna [The police force behind the scenery]*. Huddinge, Sweden: Stefan Holgersson.

_____. (2018), *Polisens utredningsverksamhet: En studie av polisens arbete med demokrati- och hatbrott på nätet [How the police investigate: A study of the police's work with democracy and hate crime on the internet]*. Center for Advanced Studies in Emergency Response. Rapport nr. 24. Linköping University Electronic Press.

_____. (2019), Whistleblowing within the Swedish police. *Nordisk Politiforskning [Nordic Police Research]*, *6*(01), pp. 24–45.

Johnston, L. (1988), Controlling police work: Problems of organisational reform in large public bureaucracies. *Work, Employment and Society*, *2*(1), pp. 51–70.

Jones, M. & Williams, M.L. (2015), Twenty years on: Lesbian, gay and bisexual police officers' experiences of workplace discrimination in England and Wales. *Policing and Society*, *25*(2), pp. 188–211.

Justitiedepartementet [Justice Department] (2006), *Regleringsbrev för budgetåret 2007 avseende Rikspolisstyrelsen och övriga myndigheter inom polisorganisationen [Letter of approval for the financial year 2007 regarding the Swedish national police board and other authorities within the police organization]*. Dnr: Ju2006/10117/PO.

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F. & Kelly, E. (2006), Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action and diversity policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(4), pp. 589–617.

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

Kärreman, D. & Rylander, A. (2008), Managing meaning through branding: The case of a consulting firm. *Organization Studies*, *29*(1), pp. 103–25.

Kite, M.E. & Whitley Jr, B.E. (1996), Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *22*(4), pp. 336–53.

Kitzinger, C. (2005), Heteronormativity in action: Reproducing the heterosexual nuclear family in after-hours medical calls. *Social Problems*, *52*(4), pp. 477–98.

Kjöller, H. (2016), *En svensk tiger: Vittnesmål från poliser som vågat ryta ifrån [A Swedish tiger/a Swede stays quiet: Statements from police officers who had the courage to shout]*. Lidingö, Sweden: Fri Tanke.

Kornberger, M. (2010), *Brand society: How brands transform management and lifestyle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kunda, G. (1992), *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

LaMar, L. & Kite, M. (1998), Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *Journal of Sex Research*, *35*(2), pp. 189–96.

Lander, I. (2008), Varför finns det inga fjollor på polisutbildningen? Mångfaldssträvanden inom svensk poliskår – Kvalitet eller kvantitet? [Why are there no effeminate men in the police academy? The aim to have diversity within the police force – Quality or quantity?] In R. Granér & P. Larsson (eds.), *Policing in Scandinavia: Proceedings from the conference on police research in Växjö,* August 2007. Växjö, Sweden: Polisutbildningen [Police academy], Växjö university.

_____. (2013), Obstacles for changes within the (Swedish) police force: Professional motivations, homosociality, and ordering practices. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention*, *14*(1), pp. 43–61.

Lapsley, I. (2008), The NPM agenda: Back to the future. *Financial Accountability and Management*, *24*(1), pp. 77–96.

Lave, J.E. & Wenger, E. (1991), *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leijnse, E. (2017), *Fördel kvinna: Den tysta utbildningsrevolutionen [Advantage women: The silent revolution in education]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur.

Leinen, pp. (1993), *Gay cops*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Lindholm, M. & Nilsson, A. (2005), Rum, liv, identitet: Kvinnligt och manligt homoliv. *[Space, life, identity: Female and male homosexual lives]* In D. Kulick (ed.), *Queersverige [Queer Sweden]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur, pp. 289–306.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1976), Toward a homosocial theory of sex roles: An explanation of the sex segregation of social institutions. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *1*(3), pp. 15–31.

Lipsky, M. (1980), *Street level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in the public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Ljunggren, G., Fredriksson, K., Greijer, Å. & Jädert Rafstedt, M.L. (2003), *Arbetsvillkor och utsatthet: En studie genomförd som ett led i arbetet att motverka diskriminering eller kränkande särbehandling beroende på sexuell läggning [Working conditions and vulnerability: A study as part of the task of counteracting discrimination or wrongful treatment due to sexual orientation]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Statistiska centralbyrån [Statistics Sweden].

Loader, I. & Walker, N. (2007), *Civilizing security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Loftus, B. (2008), Dominant culture interrupted recognition, resentment and the politics of change in an English police force. *British Journal of Criminology*, *48*(6), pp. 756–77.

_____. (2009), *Police culture in a changing world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

_____. (2010), Police occupational culture: Classic themes, altered times. *Policing & Society*, *20*(1), pp. 1–20.

Malinowski, B. (1922), *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*. London: Routledge.

Manning, P.K. (2010), *Democratic policing in a changing world*. London: Routledge.

McDonald, J. (2013), Coming out in the field: A queer reflexive account of shifting researcher identity. *Management Learning*, *44*(2), pp. 127–43.

McDonald, J. & Kuhn, T.R. (2016), Occupational branding for diversity: Managing discursive contradictions. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *44*(2), pp. 101–17.

Mead, G.H. (1934), *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Meisenbach, R.J. & Hutchins, D. (2020), Stigma, communication and power. In M.L. Doerfel & J.L. Gibbs (eds.), *Organizing inclusion: Moving diversity from demographics to communication processes*. London: Routledge, pp. 46–63.

Mendos, L.R. (2019), *State-sponsored homophobia*. Geneva: ILGA World.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1977), Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*, pp. 340–63.

Miller, S.L., Forest, K.B. & Jurik, N.C. (2003), Diversity in blue: Lesbian and gay police officers in a masculine occupation. *Men and Masculinities*, *5*(4), pp. 355–85.

Milliken, F.J., Morrison, E.W. & Hewlin, P.F. (2003), An exploratory study of employee silence: Issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(6), pp. 1453–76.

Morrison, E.W. & Milliken, F.J. (2000), Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(4), pp. 706–25.

Mosher, W.D., Chandra, A. & Jones, J. (2005), Sexual behavior and selected health measures: Men and women 15–44 years of age. *Advance Data from Vital and Health Statistics, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services*. Number 362.

New Oxford American Dictionary (n.d.), Homophobia. https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195392883.001.0001/m_en_us1255551?rskey=OCEqQP&result=39561.

Nkomo, S.M. (1992), The emperor has no clothes: Rewriting "race in organizations". *Academy of Management Review*, *17*(3), pp. 487–513.

Nkomo, S.M. & Hoobler, J.M. (2014), A historical perspective on diversity ideologies in the United States: Reflections on human resource management research and practice. *Human Resource Management Review*, *24*(3), pp. 245–57.

Noelle-Neumann, E. (1974), The spiral of silence: A theory of public opinion. *Journal of Communication*, *24*, pp. 43–51.

Norrhem, S., Rydström, J. & Markusson Winkvist, H. (2015), *Undantagsmänniskor: En svensk HBTQ-historia med utblickar i världen [Exceptional people: A Swedish LGBTQ+ history, with comparisons to the wider world]*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.

Nyzell, S. & Larsson, P. (2016), Skandinavisk polishistoria [Scandinavian police history]. In P. Larsson, R. Granér & H.O.I. Gundhus (eds.), *Polisvetenskap: En introduktion [Police science: An introduction]*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur, pp. 31–51.

Orr, J. (1996), *Talking about machines: An ethnography of a modern job*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ortlieb, R. & Sieben, B. (2019), Balls, barbecues and boxing: Contesting gender regimes at organizational social events. *Organization Studies*, *40*(1), 115–34.

Panter, H. (2018), *Transgender cops: The intersection of gender and sexuality expectations in police cultures*. London: Routledge.

Paoline, E.A. III (2003), Taking stock: Toward a richer understanding of police culture. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*(3), pp. 199–214.

Paoline, E.A. III, Myers, S.M. & Worden, R.E. (2000), Police culture, individualism, and community policing: Evidence from two police departments. *Justice Quarterly*, *17*(3), pp. 575–605.

Persson, A. (2012), An unintended side effect of pepper spray: Gender trouble and "repair work" in an armed forces unit. *Men and Masculinities*, *15*(2), pp. 132–51.

Peterson, A. & Uhnoo, pp. (2012), Trials of loyalty: Ethnic minority police officers as "outsiders" within a greedy institution. *European Journal of Criminology*, *9*(4), pp. 354–69.

Peterson, A. & Åkerström, M. (2013), *Den sorterande ordningsmakten: Studier av etnicitet och polisiär kontroll [The sorting law enforcement: Studies of ethnicity and police control]*. Malmö, Sweden: Bokbox förlag.

Petersson, O. (2016), Vem är polisen? [Who is the police?] In P. Larsson, R. Granér & H.O.I. Gundhus (eds.), *Polisvetenskap: En introduktion [Police science: An introduction]*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur, pp. 115–39.

Polisen [The police] (2014), *Årsredovisning [Annual report]*. Dnr: A001.274/2014, Saknr: 902.

_____. (2017a), *Polismyndighetens strategi för likabehandling 2017–2021 [The police authority's strategy for equal treatment 2017-2021]*. PM 2017: 33. https://polisen.se/siteassets/dokument/om-polisen/polismyndighetens-strategi-for-likabehandling-2017—2021.pdf.

_____. (2017b), *Årsredovisning [Annual report]*. Dnr: A868.568/2016.

Polisförbundet [Police union] (2020), *Det här är vi [This is us]*. https://www.polisforbundet.se/om-oss/verksamheten (accessed 18 September 2020).

Polismyndigheten i Skåne [The Police Authority in Skåne] (2012), *Slutrapport: Polisrollen i det mångkulturella samhället [Final report: The police's role in a multicultural society]*. Dnr: 2009-3040077.

Polistidningen [The police newspaper] (2007), Kampen mot fördomarna [Fighting against prejudice]. http://polistidningen.se/2007/03/kampen-mot-fordomarna/ (accessed 10 October 2020).

Polistidningen [The police newspaper] (2016), Ideell kraft sjunger på sista versen [Voluntary organization plays its last tune]. https://polistidningen.se/2016/09/ideell-kraft-sjunger-pa-sista-versen/ (accessed 15 December 2020).

Power, M. (1997), *The audit society: Rituals of verification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prasad, P. (2018), *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.

Prasad, P., D'Abate, C. & Prasad, A. (2007), Organizational challenges at the periphery: Career issues for the socially marginalized. In G. Gunz & M. Peiperl (eds.), *Handbook of career studies*. London: Sage, pp. 168–87.

Prasad, A., Prasad, P. & Mir, R. (2011), One mirror in another: Managing diversity and the discourse of fashion. *Human Relations*, *64*(5), pp. 703–24.

Pringle, J.K. (2008), Gender in management: Theorizing gender as heterogender. *British Journal of Management*, *19*, pp. 110–19.

Pringle, J.K., Konrad, A.M. & Prasad, P. (2006), Conclusion: Reflection and future direction. In A.M. Konrad, J.K. Pringle & P. Prasad (eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity*. London: Sage. pp. 531–40.

Pringle, R. (1990), Bureaucracy, rationality and sexuality: The case of secretaries. In J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff & G. Burrell (eds.), *The sexuality of organization*. London: Sage, pp. 158–77.

Priola, V., Lasio, D., De Simone, S. & Serri, F. (2014), The sound of silence: Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender discrimination in "inclusive organizations". *British Journal of Management*, *25*(3), pp. 488–502.

Prokos, A. & Padavic, I. (2002), "There oughtta be a law against bitches": Masculinity lessons in police academy training. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *9*(4), pp. 439–59.

Punch, M. (2015), What really matters in policing. *European Police Science & Research Bulletin*, *13*, pp. 9–18.

Reiner, R. (2010), *The politics of the police*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rennstam, J. (2007), *Engineering work: On peer-reviewing as a method of organizational control*. Lund, Sweden: Lund Business Press.

_____. (2013), The sacrificial mode of branding: A study of the consumptive side of brand value production. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *29*, pp. 123–34.

_____. (2021). *Mellan bögskämt och prideparader: Excludering och inkludering av homosexualitet i svensk polis*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Rennstam, J. & Sullivan, K. (2016), The limits of inclusion – Stories from the margins of the Swedish police. In T. Köllen (ed.), *Sexual orientation and transgender issues in organizations: Global perspectives on LGBT workforce diversity*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, pp. 339–52.

_____. (2018), Peripheral inclusion through informal silencing and voice: A study of LGB-officers in the Swedish police. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *25*(2), pp. 177–94.

Rennstam, J. & Wästerfors, D. (2018), *Analyze!: Crafting your data in qualitative research*. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.

RFSL [Riksförbundet för homosexuellas, bisexuellas, transpersoners, queeras och intersexpersoners rättigheter (The Swedish federation for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex rights)] (2013), *Misstro: Om HBTQ-personers tilltro till olika samhällsinstanser och vad som behöver förändras [Distrust: About LGBTQ+ people's trust in different societal organizations and what needs to change]*. Stockholm.

Rich, A. (1980), Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *5*(4), pp. 631–60.

Richardson, D. & Monro, pp. (2012), *Sexuality, equality and diversity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riksdagen [Parliament] (1973), *Lagutskottets betänkande i anledning av Kungl. Maj:ts proposition 1973:32 med förslag till lag om ändring i giftermålsbalken m.m., jämte motioner [The law committee's report on the occasion of His Highness's proposition 1973: 32 with a proposal for a law amending the marriage code, etc., together with motions]*. LU 1973:20.

_____. (2008), *Hatbrottsutbildning: Svar på skriftlig fråga 2007/08:1516 besvarad av Justitieminister Beatrice Ask [Hate crime training: Responses to a written question 2007/08:1516 responded to by Minister of Justice Beatrice Ask]*. https://www.riksdagen.se/sv/dokument-lagar/dokument/svar-pa-skriftlig-fraga/hatbrottsutbildning_GV121516.

Rikspolisstyrelsen [The Swedish National Police Board] (2009), *Så tog vi fram Polisens värdegrund [How we worked out the police's values]*. Dnr: HR-161-6300/06.

_____. (2010), *Mångfald: Polisens nationella policy och plan för mångfald och likabehandling 2010–2012 [Diversity: The police's national policy and plans for diversity and equal treatment 2010-2012]*. Dnr: HR-7491663-09.

Rizzo, D. (2010), Public spheres and gay politics since the second world war. In R. Aldrich (ed.), *Gay life and culture: A world history*. London: Thames & Hudson, pp. 197–221.

Romani, L., Holck, L. & Risberg, A. (2018), Benevolent discrimination: Explaining how human resources professionals can be blind to the harm of diversity initiatives. *Organization*, *26*(3), pp. 371–90.

Rosenberg, T. (2005a), *Könet brinner! Judith Butler: Texter i urval av Tiina Rosenberg [Gender is burning! Judith Butler: Texts chosen by Tiina Rosenberg]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur.

_____. (2005b), Schlager, känslor och svensk homokultur [Pop music, feelings, and Swedish gay culture]. In D. Kulick (ed.), *Queersverige [Queer Sweden]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur, pp. 336–62.

Rumens, N. & Broomfield, J. (2012), Gay men in the police: Identity disclosure and management issues. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *22*(3), pp. 283–98.

_____. (2014), Gay men in the performing arts: Performing sexualities within "gay-friendly" work contexts. *Organization*, *21*(3), pp. 365–82.

Rumens, N. & Kerfoot, D. (2009), Gay men at work: (Re)constructing the self as professional. *Human Relations*, *62*(5), pp. 763–86.

Sandell, K. (2014), Minoritiserade grupper mellan policy och villkorad närvaro [Minoritized groups between policy and conditional presence]. In K. Sandell (ed.), *Att bryta innanförskapet: Kritiska perspektiv på jämställdhet och mångfald i akademin [Breaking insiderness: Critical perspectives on equality and diversity in academic]*. Gothenburg, Sweden: Makadam, pp. 11–24.

de Saussure, F. (1915/1972), *Course in general linguistics*. Chicago: Open Court.

Schilt, K. & Westbrook, L. (2009), Doing gender, doing heteronormativity: "Gender normals," transgender people, and the social maintenance of heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, *23*(4), pp. 440–64.

Schrock, D. & Schwalbe, M. (2009), Men, masculinity, and manhood acts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *35*, pp. 277–95.

Sefton, M. (2011), "Core values timeout": A counter-hegemonic discursive device in police jargon. In L.E. Lauritz & M. Ghazinour (eds.), *Nordisk polisforskning: Konferensskrift från den tredje Nordiska polisforskningskonferensen, Umeå 2010*

[Nordic police research: Conference proceedings from the third Nordic police research conference, Umeå 2010]. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå universitet, pp. 28–50.

SFS (Svensk författningssamling [Swedish constitution]) 1974:152. *Kungörelse (om beslutad ny regeringsform) [notification (on a determined new governmental form)]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Justitiedepartementet [Justice department].

_____. 1984:387. *Polislag [Police law]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Justitiedepartementet [Justice department].

_____. 1999:130. *Lag om åtgärder mot diskriminering i arbetslivet på grund av etnisk tillhörighet, religion eller annan trosuppfattning [Act on measures against discrimination at work due to ethnic background, religion, or other beliefs]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Integrations- och jämställdhetsdepartementet [Department of integration and equality].

_____. 2008:567. *Diskrimineringslag [Discrimination law]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Arbetsmarknadsdepartementet [Ministry of employment].

Shore, L.M., Randel, A.E., Chung, B.G., Dean, M.A., Ehrhart, K.H. & Singh, G. (2011), Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management*, *37*(4), pp. 1262–89.

Silverman, D. (1993), *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction*. London: Sage.

Simmel, G. (1908/1970), *Kamp! [Fight!]* Transl. B. Lennartsson & A. Zug. Uppsala, Sweden: Argos. [Available in English as: Conflict and the web of group affiliations]

Sirin, S.R., McCreary, D.R. & Mahalik, J.R. (2004), Differential reactions to men and women's gender role transgressions: Perceptions of social status, sexual orientation, and value dissimilarity. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *12*(2), pp. 119–32.

Sklansky, D.A. (2005), Police and democracy. *Michigan Law Review*, (103), pp. 1699–1830.

_____. (2008), *Democracy and the police*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Skolnick, J.H. (2011), *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society*. (4th ed.) New Orleans: Quid Pro Books.

Smith, D.E. (1974), Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry*, *44*(1), pp. 7–13.

SOU [Statens offentliga utredningar (Swedish Government Official Reports)] 2007:39. *Framtidens polis – krav och förväntningar [The police of the future – demands and expectations]*. http://www.regeringen.se/49bb8f/contentassets/4d061bdad2974f0e901ad75639e74866/framtidens-polis-sou-200739.

_____. 2007:50. *Mångfald är framtiden [Diversity is the future]*. www.regeringen.se/rattsdokument/statens-offentliga-utredningar/2007/06/sou-200750.

Stenmark, M. (2005), *Polisens organisationskultur: En explorativ studie [The police's organizational culture: An exploratory study]*. PhD dissertation. Umeå, Sweden: Umeå university.

Stockholmspolisen [Stockholm police] (2008), *Årsbok 2008 [Yearbook 2008]*. Polismyndigheten i Stockholms län *[The police authority in Stockholm county]*.

Styhre, A. (2020), *Indie video game development work: Innovation in the creative economy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sundevall, F. (2014), Porr i vapenskåpet och bögkompani på Gotland: Sexualitet i lumpen [Porn in the weaponry and the fag regiment on Gotland: Sexuality in the army]. In A.M. Forssberg & K. Kronberg (eds.), *Lumpen: Från mönstring till muck [The army: From mustering to demobbing]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Atlantis, pp. 150–71.

Swan, E. (2017), What are white people to do? Listening, challenging ignorance, generous encounters and the "not yet" as diversity research praxis. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *24*(5), pp. 547–63.

Svensk Polis [Swedish police] (2000a), Insändare: "Ni försöker normalisera ett sjukt beteende" [Letter to the editor: "You're trying to normalize sick behavior"], nr. 7.

_____. (2000b), Insändare: "Homosexualitet är en avvikelse liksom kriminalitet" [Letter to the editor: "Homosexuality is deviant, as is criminality"], nr. 8.

Svensson, I. (2007), *Liket i garderoben: En studie av sexualitet, livsstil och begravning [The body in the closet: A study of sexuality, lifestyle, and funerals]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Ordfront.

Svensson, P. (2019), *Diskursanalys* [Discourse analysis]. Lund, Sweden: Studentlitteratur.

Sveriges Radio [Swedish radio] (2009), Intern kritik mot polisens HBT-utbildning [Internal criticism against the police's LGBTQ+ training]. http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=83&artikel=2588460.

SVT (Sveriges Television) [Swedish television] (2018), Den svenska välfärden: Polisen [Swedish welfare: The police]. https://www.svtplay.se/video/16631614/den-svenska-valfarden/den-svenska-valfarden-den-svenska-valfarden-polisen?start=auto(3/16/2018).

Sydsvenskan [South Sweden newspaper] (2009a), Polis: "Den lille jävla apejäveln" [Police: "That little fucking ape fucker"]. https://www.sydsvenskan.se/2009-02-05/polis-den-lille-javla-apejaveln.

_____. (2009b), "Neger Niggersson" figur i polisens internutbildning ["Nigger Niggersson" in police's internal training]. http://www.sydsvenskan.se/sverige/neger-niggersson-figur-i-polisens-internutbildning.

_____. (2009c),"Jag är jättebesviken" ["I am really disappointed"]. https://www.sydsvenskan.se/2009-02-21/jag-ar-jattebesviken.

Tajfel, H. & Turner, J.C. (1979), An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, pp. 33–47.

Tiby, E. (1999), *Hatbrott? Homosexuella kvinnors och mäns berättelser om utsatthet för brott [Hate crime? Homosexual women and men's narratives about being at risk of crime]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Department of Criminology, Stockholm university.

Tracy, S.J., Razzante, R.J. & Hanna, K.N. (2020), Creating the being of inclusion in organizations. In M.L. Doerfel & J.L. Gibbs (eds.), *Organizing inclusion: Moving diversity from demographics to communication processes*. London: Routledge, pp. 129–49.

Tyler, M. (2019), Reassembling difference? Rethinking inclusion through/as embodied ethics. *Human Relations*, *72*(1), pp. 48–68.

Tyler, M. & Cohen, L. (2008), Management in/as comic relief: Queer theory and gender performativity in the office. *Gender, Work & Organization*, *15*(2), pp. 113–32.

Uhnoo, S. (2019), Ethnic police humor as ethnic boundary-making in the Swedish police force. *Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice and Criminology*, *7*(3), pp. 173–88.

Urde, M. (2003), Core value-based corporate brand building. *European Journal of Marketing*, *37*(7/8), pp. 1017–40.

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

Wagner, K. (2017), *Pojkarna och de ensamma poliserna [The boys and the solitary police officers]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Natur & Kultur.

Van Maanen, J. (1974), Working the street. In H. Jacob (ed.), *The potential for the reform of criminal justice*, 3. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 83–130.

_____. (1975), Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *20*(2), pp. 207–28.

_____. (1979), The fact of fiction in organizational ethnography. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *24*(4), pp. 539–550.

_____. (2010), Identity work and control in occupational communities. In S.B. Sitkin, L.B. Cardinal & K.M. Mijlsma-Frankema (eds.), *Organizational control*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 111–166.

Weick, K.E. (1976), Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *21*(1), pp. 1–19.

Weinberg, G. (1972), *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: Saint Martin's Press.

Wennstam, K. (2016), *Flickan och skammen: En bok om samhällets syn på slampor [The girl and the shame: A book about society's view of sluts]*. Stockholm, Sweden: Bonniers.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987), Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, *1*(2), pp. 125–51.

Westin, C. & Nilsson, A. (2009), *Attityd- och bemötandeproblem inom polisen [Problems with attitudes and reception within the police]*. Rapport till Rikspolisstyrelsen [Report to the Swedish National Police Board].

Wieslander, M. (2014), *Ordningsmakter inom ordningsmakten: Diskurskamp, dilemma och motstånd i blivande polisers samtal om mångfald [Powers within power: Discourse struggles, dilemma, and opposition in police trainees' conversations about diversity]*. PhD dissertation, Karlstad University Studies.

_____. (2016), *Den talande tystnaden: Utvärdering av anställdas uttrycksmöjligheter i polisområde Östergötland [The loud silence: An evaluation of employees' opportunities to speak in the Östergötland police]*. Arbetsrapport för Polisen [Working report for the police]. https://polisen.se/PageFiles/640967/Rapport%20Interna%20samtalskulturer%2020160831.pdf.

_____. (2018), Marginalised voices in the inclusive recruitment discourse: A dilemma of inclusion/exclusion in the (Swedish) police. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, *9*(1), pp. 61–77.

_____. (2019), Controversial diversity: Diversity discourses and dilemmas among Swedish police recruits. *Policing and Society*, pp. 1–17.

_____. (2021), Challenging and destabilizing official discourses: Irony as a resistance resource in institutional talk. *Culture and Organization*, *27*(1), pp. 16–32.

Williams, C.L., Giuffre, P.A. & Dellinger, K. (2009), The gay-friendly closet. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, *6*(1), pp. 29–45.

Zanoni, P. & Janssens, M. (2004), Deconstructing difference: The rhetoric of human resource managers' diversity discourses. *Organization Studies*, *25*(1), pp. 55–74.

Zanoni, P., Janssens, M., Benschop, Y. & Nkomo, S. (2010), Guest editorial: Unpacking diversity, grasping inequality: Rethinking difference through critical perspectives. *Organization*, *17*(1), pp. 9–29.

Index

Ahmed, Sara 123n31, 146, 159n40, 161n69, 171, 175, 176, 178
AIDS 23–24
Alvesson, Mats 16n25, 29, 88, 152
auditable 150–151

Beckert, Jens 154
benevolent discrimination 176
branding 153–156, 161n67
Broomfield, John 82, 152
Brunsson, Nils 29
Burke, Marc 26–27
Burrell, Gibson 98
Butler, Judith 99, 100

collegial stigmatization 9, 40, 51–58
Collins, Joshua 172
Colvin, Roddick 15n18, 25, 37n39, 116
Connell, Raewyn 89, 92
contact hypothesis 5, 115
core values work 132, 135–136, 143, 147, 149–150, 152, 154
corporeal and intimate 10, 104–107, 119–120, 164, 168, 172
culture 3, 6, 8–10, 12, 16n25, 17n43, 22–24, 27–29, 30, 32, 34, 36n35, 44, 49, 53, 60, 61n15, 74, 80–85, 88, 91, 93–94, 100, 101n1, 108–109, 112–113, 119, 123n31, 132, 138, 146, 160n45, 166, 170, 171, 176–178, 180, 181, 181n3, 183; of silence 112, 122n19
cynicism 151, 154, 156, 160n55, 165, 177
Czarniawska, Barbara 12, 18n48

decoupling 10, 125, 129, 131–132, 141, 146, 149–156, 157, 157n2, 179
Deetz, Stan 130
de-heteromasculinization 10, 104, 114–119, 120, 124, 165–166
democracy 3–6, 8, 15n10, 130, 162, 180–181
dilemma of equality 144
dirt 9, 39–40, 44, 46, 48, 50, 52, 56, 59–60, 60n6, 62, 162, 163, 166, 169–170
discredited, discreditable 19, 39, 40, 46, 47, 50, 52, 56–58, 60n1, 71, 120, 162–163
diversity 2–4, 5, 6–8, 10, 12–13, 16n29, 25–26, 28–30, 32–33, 37n56, 38n73, 44, 68, 120, 123n31, 124–125, 126–127, 129, 131, 134, 136–140, 141, 144, 146–147, 149–152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 160n56, 161n69, 162, 165–167, 170, 175–181, 182n26
diversity training 1, 10, 12, 30, 64, 98, 124, 125–132, 134–137, 139–145, 147, 148, 150, 151–155, 158n17, 160n53, 175, 179
Dobbin, Frank 175
doing gender 86n5
doing heteronormativity 196
Douglas, Marry 9, 39, 40, 46, 48, 60, 60n6, 169
Due Billing, Yvonne 88, 152–153
du Gay, Paul 152–153

efficiency 15n19, 50
espirit de corps 128
exclusion 1–3, 8–10, 12–13, 19–25, 27, 31–32, 34, 39–60, 62–85, 86n6, 86n14, 88, 98, 101, 104, 113, 115, 117, 146, 152–153, 154, 156, 159n39, 161n65, 162–164, 166–172, 176–177, 179, 180, 184
exposure of heteronormativity 115

femininity 19, 63, 89, 92, 99, 101, 120, 164, 172–174
Finstad, Liv 15n12, 15n13, 15n17, 86n8, 102n10, 110
formalization and inclusion 175

gender 5, 6, 9, 11, 14n5, 16n29, 18n46, 24–25, 29, 36n17, 37n43, 63, 69, 81–82, 85n4, 86n7, 87n21, 88–89, 99, 104, 123n31, 131, 137, 152, 164, 169, 172, 174, 180, 181n12, 182n28, 183; doing gender 86n5
Goffman, Erving 39, 40, 46, 50, 57, 59, 60, 60n1, 61n19, 103n23, 147, 149, 150, 159n41
Görtz, Daniel 109, 121n14
grabbig, grabbighet 77, 79, 81, 82, 86n15, 88, 163
Granér, Rolf 7, 16n25, 22, 32, 33, 108, 122n22, 131–132, 135

happy talk 171
hate crime 25, 36–37n37, 64–65, 113, 126, 130–132, 134, 144, 158n28, 160n51, 177
hegemonic masculinity 89, 92
heteronormativity 9, 31, 62–63, 74–83, 84–85, 85n3, 85n4, 97, 99, 163–164, 167–168, 171, 174; doing 81–82; exposure of 115
heterosexual matrix 10, 99–101, 104, 107, 164, 174
Hirschman, Albert 62, 85n2
Höglund, Linda 83
Holgersson, Stefan 29, 159n45, 160n51
homophobia 14n5, 21, 27–29, 31, 36n17, 56, 59, 64, 66, 80, 84, 112, 114, 123n28, 145, 146, 148, 153, 163, 170; democratic problem 66
homosexuality described as a problem 20, 41, 52, 53, 58–59, 72, 84, 97, 98, 146, 163, 167

identity work 10, 20, 151–156, 157, 166, 177
imagined future 154
impression management 10, 125, 147–156, 157, 165, 166, 175, 177
inclusion: collective process 9, 44, 63–74, 83, 85, 156, 163, 164, 167, 168, 172, 178, 180; periphery 166
insider, researcher as 183, 185n1

jargon 10, 13, 34, 49, 75, 79–82, 84, 104, 107–114, 118, 119, 120, 121n12, 123n26, 163–165, 184

Kalev, Alexandra 175
knowledge-intensive police work 181

laddishness 79, 81, 82, 86n15, 163
Lander, Ingrid 33
language and group membership 122n18
language's relationality 38n73, 109, 123n32, 140
Lapsley, Irvine 149
leadership-based stigmatization 9, 41–51, 59
legalization 2
legitimacy 4–6, 15n13, 15n17, 16n29, 26, 127, 129, 150–151, 154, 158n14, 160n53, 174
Leinen, Stephen 26–27
LGBTQ+ 1, 3 5, 12, 13n2, 14n6, 16n23, 18n46, 24–25, 30, 53, 67–70, 73, 75, 84, 115, 116, 123n24, 125, 126–128, 132, 136, 137–139, 142, 144, 146–150, 155, 156, 157, 163, 165, 166, 170, 176, 178, 180, 181, 182n27; voice 51, 63, 64, 69, 74, 83, 84, 86n7, 146, 166
Loftus, Bethan 28, 44, 109, 121n7, 140
loose coupling 125, 147, 157n2

macho 10, 34, 81, 86n15, 88–101, 104, 116, 117, 119–120, 124, 164, 165–168, 172–173
Malinowski, Bronislaw 13
Markusson Winkvist, Hanna 20
masculinity 10, 34, 63, 88–89, 92–94, 96, 98–100, 101, 103n23, 114, 116, 119, 120, 164, 172–174, 181n8, 183
masculinity work 10, 92–94, 101, 164, 173
masculinized organizations 3, 14n7, 162, 172
moral panic 20–22

narrative interviews 12
Norrhem, Svante 20, 21, 35n10

occupational branding 153
outsider, researcher as 27, 183
overpolicing 4, 15n12, 15n13, 22, 50, 59, 63

Panter, Heather 14n5, 37n48, 159n38, 183, 185
passing 60, 61n19, 72, 103n23
peripheral inclusion 10, 18n45, 162, 166–167, 168, 181n1
persistence 60, 168–172
Petersson, Otto 4, 15n17, 16n29
Power, Michael 150
Prasad, Pushkala 30, 151, 158n17, 160n53, 160n55, 175
Pringle, Judith 98–99, 123n31

qualitative method 13

raw but cordial 10, 104, 107–114, 117, 119, 120, 123n26, 124, 131, 164, 167, 168, 173
real police work 10, 124–157, 158n19, 165, 167, 177
recoupling 155
RFSL 22, 23, 36n23, 69, 126, 127
risky position 33
Rizzo, Dominico 22, 36n17
Romani, Laurence 176
Rumens, Nick 82
Rydström, Jens 20

same-sex sexual relations 19–20, 25, 44, 58, 162; illegal 25
Sandell, Kerstin 82
Schwan, Matilda 34
sexualization 94–101, 104, 120; gendered 96
silence 2, 3, 20, 30, 51, 58, 62, 63, 66, 69, 73, 81–84, 86n16, 107–108, 111–113, 114, 122n20, 146, 163, 165, 166, 167, 171; culture of 112–113, 122n19; spirals of 6, 16n23, 113, 116, 123n24
silencing 3, 9, 21, 35n12, 62–74, 75, 81, 83–85, 111–114, 115, 145, 162, 163, 166, 167, 168, 170
Simmel, Georg 84, 167
stigma 19, 21, 24, 39, 40, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56–60, 60n1, 61n19, 62, 67, 162, 166, 169, 170, 184; resource for exercising power 47, 50, 58, 162
stigmatization, collegial 53
stigmatizing leadership 9, 41–51
Stonewall 22, 23
street justice 7, 29
struggle 21, 27, 42–43, 45, 55, 65, 66, 84, 93, 107, 117, 162
Swan, Elain 176
symbolic capital 151, 156, 160n52

Tiby, Eva 23, 36n23
tick box mentality 149

underpolicing 4, 15n12, 15n13, 22, 59, 66, 163

values 4, 6, 7–9, 12, 16n25, 32, 39, 65, 81, 88, 124, 125, 127, 128, 132–139, 143, 147–150, 152, 153, 154, 156, 158n21, 159n45, 176, 177
Van Maanen, John 7, 16n32, 17n43, 122n17
voice 2, 3, 8–9, 21, 22–25, 35n12, 51, 62, 63–74, 83–85, 85n2, 86n7, 113, 116, 120, 123n24, 133, 144, 146, 153, 162, 163–164, 166, 167, 168, 170, 172, 179–180

Wagner, Katia 109
West, Candace 63, 85n4, 89
white spaces 44, 109, 121n7, 140
Wieslander, Malin 109, 112, 121n12, 122n19, 122n20, 145, 159n38, 159n45
Williams, Christine 82, 87n20
women within the police 2, 7, 11, 15n14, 17n35, 25, 26, 28, 90, 100, 102n9, 105, 116, 152, 169, 180, 182n27

Zimmerman, Don 63, 85n4