CRISIS IN POLICE RECRUITMENT: PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION AND CHANGES IN GENERATIONAL PREFERENCES

by

G. M. COX

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

December 2011

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Rod Hissong, my dissertation committee chair, for the advice and mentorship he offered me during this long journey. I would also like to thank Dr. Sherman Wyman and Dr. Alejandro Rodriguez the other members of my dissertation committee for their tireless efforts to not only help me be a better scholar, but also for their valuable feedback and knowledge of the subject area.

I am also grateful to the dedicated, challenging, and insightful men and women who have answered the call to be professors in the School of Urban and Public Affairs. I especially want to thank Dr. James Cornehls for making me step outside my world view and seeing things from a different perspective.

Along my journey, I have had many supporters without whom I would never have been able to complete this arduous journey toward the achievement of PhD. I want to thank Dr. Melba Benson for her faith in me and for helping me get admitted into the doctoral program. I owe the men and women of the Corsicana and Murphy Police Departments, who not only supported me during this period in my life, but who also served as my sounding boards, mentors, and research participants. I could not have completed this dissertation without the leadership, coaching, and encouragement of my current city manager, Mr. James Fisher. He is an inspiration to me and I, truly, appreciate his friendship.

During the many years it has been since I started the quest to achieve my PhD, I have talked to many of my cohorts in public safety about the evolving crisis among the human resources we count on to do the job on the streets of our cities. I also had the help of the chiefs of police of many of cities, in particular, the north central part of Texas we know as the Dallas-Ft. Worth Metroplex. I owe these men and women a great debt of gratitude that I will never be able to repay. Hopefully, the results contained in this dissertation might have made their

contributions and their tireless efforts to put up with me during the survey period something of a down payment on a balance owed these incredible men and women.

Finally, I want to thank my family for their encouragement and support. My Mother, Evelyn Philpot, while she may not know it, has served as my role model that provided me with the will power and courage to go on when many thought I could not accomplish this task. My children, Olivia, Frank, Gwen and Katie were and are my inspiration. These kids had to put up with many hours of my not being part of family functions and my endless explanations of public administration theory and many points beyond.

I saved the last person that I owe so much for the most incredible person in my life, my wife, Kathy. Without her support, encouragement, understanding and love, I could never have even started the program much less make it to this point. She gave so much and got so little back from me.

November 22, 2011

ABSTRACT

CRISIS IN POLICE RECRUITMENT: PUBLIC SERVICE MOTIVATION AND CHANGES IN GENERATIONAL PREFERENCES

G. M. Cox, PhD

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2011

Supervising Professor: Rod Hissong

The purpose of this research project was to determine if a downward trend exists in the number of people who are motivated to become police officers and to explore whether there has been a shift in motivational factors among the three major generational groups to serve as police officers. Furthermore, it hypothesized that incumbents in the police service, across generational lines, have changed in their public service motivation to serve as police officers.

The research project utilized two survey instruments. The first survey focused on police chiefs and human resource directors. The primary objective for surveying this group was to determine if there is a perceived reduction in the number of qualified people who are motivated to serve as police officers.

The second survey group was incumbent police officers, below the rank of police chief. The survey instrument asked a number of questions and statements to determine if, among the various generational groups, there is a shift in public service motivation and motivational factors to serve as police officers.

The various subgroups among the survey participants were also evaluated according to years of service, ethnicity, sex, and education. In addition, all participants were grouped into their generational cohort.

The results of this research project could have serious policy implications for strategic human resource management in the police service. Police chiefs, human resource directors, and police recruiters, it is hoped, will be able to glean real world information about what is motivating the next generation of potential police applicants and focus on those motivational factors that will maximize their ability to attract, hire, and retain police officers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

He who knows only his own side
of the case, knows little of that.

J. S. Mill, *On Liberty*

1.1 Problem Overview

According to Martin (1988), all employees in an organization, public or private, are motivated at some level to work. Granted, some are more motivated than others and for different reasons. McDougall (1908) opined that people are instinctual and motivated by work and love (p. 35). Maslow (1954) suggested that humans are driven by five basic human needs: physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization. Herzberg (1966) theorized that individuals were focused on two separate sets of factors: hygiene and motivators. Hygiene factors were mainly clustered around concerns for maintenance, such as pay, security, co-workers, general working conditions, and policies. Motivational factors were considered more intrinsic, such as altruism, accomplishment, and challenging work. Martin (1988) contends that both Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory and Herzberg's Hygiene-Motivation Theory have failed to be supported empirically. However, these two theories form the foundation of many assumptions associated with personnel management practices in place today that cut across both the public and private sectors.

Yet, attempting to determine what motivates people to become police officers has been taken for granted. Little research has been conducted that attempts to identify what motivates a person to pursue a law enforcement career. Some administrators might believe that people interested in public safety occupations, police in particular, are motivated by job security, money, excitement, altruism, and prestige. If that were the case, then there should be no concerns relative to the future for filling police positions since the dynamics of such employment have not changed, dramatically, over time. Police work is still exciting and full of opportunities to

help people, serve justice, and be recognized as a professional. The problem with this paradigm is growing evidence that people, in sufficient numbers, do not seem to be interested, or as interested, in public safety service as was once believed (Brawner, 2002).

In the last decade, the number of qualified applicants for police officer positions has declined substantially. According to the National Institute of Justice, law enforcement departments, particularly smaller agencies, are finding it increasingly difficult to attract qualified applicants (Koper, 2004). The police personnel crisis, according to Stockton (2007), is real. He describes the present situation as the "perfect storm" (p. 10). This perfect storm is the confluence of factors such as a decline in the number of viable people applying for entry level positions and the rapidly approaching number of officers reaching retirement age. This appears to be a trend across the United States. Law Enforcement News posited that agencies are finding it increasingly difficult to attract and retain qualified applicants, across the nation, in an ever increasingly competitive employment environment (Nislow, 2000).

To exacerbate the situation, Baby Boomers' retirement will increase the demand for their replacements. Twenge, et al, (2010), estimates that more than 75 million Baby Boomers will retire soon and that organizations must develop the capacity to understand the values of the new generation of workers if they want to recruit and retain them. Many agencies are considering reducing entry-level requirements for qualified applicants so that agencies can meet the growing demand (Nislow, 2000).

In addition, Trahant (2008) posits that a future crisis he calls a "tsunami" is quickly approaching the federal government where he suggests that 90% of the Baby Boomers holding federal jobs will retire soon (p. 35). In a study by Crewson (1995), it was discovered that voluntary and involuntary separations did not adversely affect the federal government applicant pools or retention; however, his findings suggested that state and local governments were adversely impacted by persons leaving public sector jobs at these levels. The decline in applicant interests associated with public service does not appear to be concentrated at the local or even state levels.

1.1.1 Impact

The generational changing of the guard is not unique to the present. The distinct differences in values between the generations are what make the current generational shift unique. In the past, the differences between generations were less pronounced and fewer generational categories were at play. Scholars of generation changes contend at least four different generations interact within the labor force in general and the public safety sector in particular. The Silent generation, the oldest generation, includes those born before 1946. The Baby Boomers are children born to returning veterans of WWII and Korea, born in 1946 to 1963, inclusive. The first of the Baby Boomers reached full retirement age recently. Generation Xers were persons born from 1964 to 1982. The last generation in this quartet of age groups is Generation Y, born between 1983 and 2000.

Law enforcement agencies could be faced with an inadequate supply of candidates who fit the existing profiles of the ideal police officer. According to the ideals of representative democracy, the future hiring pool should be a reflection of the heterogeneous make-up of our communities. This research project is focused on identifying the strain between the needs of organizations and the supply of qualified, interested, applicants. Furthermore, this growing gap between need and supply could suggest a much deeper issue relative to a change in public service motivation (PSM) of the primary emerging employment group, Generation Y. This trend, if true, could result in fewer and fewer people who are motivated to be police officers or able to qualify with the profession's requirements.

1.1.2 Generational Issues

This "demand and supply" model has serious policy implications: communities could, for example, implement benefits/salary packages designed to attract Generation X and Generation Y applicants. This study will benefit police makers, the heads of law enforcement agencies and their human resource counterparts, by identifying the variables most important in attracting applicants to a law enforcement career. By isolating and identifying motivational and de-motivational factors that provide the proper mix of inducements, policy makers can improve their

odds of attracting candidates to careers in law enforcement. They could discover that they will need to determine what the relative value of an officer is compared to the limited number of applicants they might receive. Otherwise, recruitment may not improve and they might have to cope with a constant "vacancy" sign hanging from the human resources department. Finally, this research could suggest necessary changes in the way people are recruited and hired in the 21st Century. This research may reveal that recruitment methods that were effective in attracting Baby Boomers and Generation X are ineffective in attracting Generation Y. This paradigm shift is a particularly salient issue for the larger metropolitan areas since these cities create such large demands for applicants.

1.1.3 Public Service Motivation

The research questions posed in 1.1.2 will be explored from within the context of Public Service Motivation (PSM) theory. PSM theory is a relatively new construct developed primarily by Perry and Wise (1990). However, according to Crewson (1997) meaningful research in this up-and-coming field went dormant for almost 20 years from the early work of Warner, Van Riper, Martin and Collins in 1963 (p. 500). The primary features of this theory are that people are motivated to work in public service agencies by the intrinsic reward of public service rather than an extrinsic need, such as a salary. While there are other facets of the PSM, this project will focus on the basic premise of the public service motivation theory as it relates to the preferences of incumbent police officers.

First, the project will attempt to determine if a shift has occurred in the motivational factors that influence incumbents to remain in their chosen profession. Then, the project will attempt to determine if incumbent officers, controlling for length of service, are motivated to remain in the profession by the same factors that motivated them to enter the profession. Finally, police officers will be asked whether they would recommend their profession. This research addresses generational and experiential changes across the population chosen for this research project. According to Perry and Hondeghem (2008), areas that focus on shifting

motivational issues along generational lines deserves exploration through further research (p. 297).

1.1.4 Methodology

This project was a survey research design utilizing a questionnaire to measure certain preferences and perceptions among incumbent police officers, police chiefs, and human resource directors. The study groups were derived from the various agencies identified as being part of the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). This population represents a fairly large population of individuals, approximately 11,000 incumbent police officers, serving in various sized agencies, from two police officers to departments with several thousand sworn personnel.

Developing a random sample of incumbent police officers to provide for more statistical rigor would be almost impossible. The group being utilized along with the size of the area represented, suggest that the outcome of this project should have considerable implications and generalizability for policy makers across the spectrum of law enforcement agencies of all sizes.

The surveys were administered by an on-line survey process utilizing Survey Monkey. The data was collected over an estimated 30-day period. A number of descriptive statistics were collected along with questions directed at assessing preferences and opinions. The primary statistical methodology that was utilized for assessment of the ordinal level variables was ordinal regression.

1.2 Summary

This project focuses on how public service motivational factors may vary across the generations of current police officers. It will also explore the perspectives of police chiefs and human resource directors regarding the interest of people becoming officers currently and in the future.

The project will have two primary areas of interest: Generational issues and public service motivation. The hypotheses of this project are directed at determining whether there has

been a shift among various motivational factors and preferences among the generational groups. Assessment of the feedback as to respondents' willingness to serve for service sake or more extrinsic rewards, such as money, was accomplished.

The policy implications related to outcomes of this research are varied and far-reaching. Policy-makers will be more knowledgeable when they consider and/or implement new recruitment campaigns and retention programs. They will be better able to capitalize on the positive motivators that attract and/or retain officers while simultaneously reducing or eliminating organizational structures and policies that dissuade potential candidates from applying or that encourage current officers to leave the profession.

1.3 Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study, there will be various terms that require further explanation so that the reader may more clearly comprehend them within the context that they are being utilized in the study.

Traditionalist Generation: Those persons born before 1946

Baby Boomers: Those persons born between 1946 and 1963, inclusive

Generation X: Those persons born in 1964 through 1982, inclusive

Generation Y: Those persons born in 1983 through 2000, inclusive

Generation Me: Cross section of those persons born in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s (Twenge, 2008)

Echo Generation: Children of baby boomers, also known as Generation X

Silent Generation: also known as Traditionalist Generation

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

> Whatever people believe, on subjects on which
> it is of the first importance to believe rightly,
> they ought to be able to defend against at
> least the common objections.
>
> J. S. Mill, *On Liberty*

2.1 Review of the Literature

One of the major concerns of this study was to determine if there is, in fact, a dwindling pool of qualified interested applicants for entry-level law enforcement careers. According to Koper (2004), about 20 percent of law enforcement agencies in the United States experienced a decrease in officer ranks in the 90's. Most of this decrease can be attributed to recruitment difficulties and retention problems (p. ii). Lewis and Frank (2002) concluded in a study that was accomplished using data from the 1998 General Social Surveys that respondents were less likely to pursue employment in the public sector than those who participated in the same survey in 1988, which points to a relative downward trend in people, generally, pursuing public sector jobs.

Naber Technical Enterprises (2004) indicates that recruitment, hiring, and retention of police officers in the U. S. has reached a crisis level in some jurisdictions. This assessment is repeated in a Law Enforcement News article that indicated that the "thin blue line" cannot get much thinner (Nislow, 2001, p. 3). Rooks (2003) reported that a local chief in North Carolina had vacancies, but cannot find anyone to fill them. A report in Law Enforcement News indicates that a robust economy, coupled with retirement and attrition, has created a personnel crisis for some departments (Nislow, 2000). Clearly, it appears that applicants for entry-level positions in law enforcement may be more than a localized phenomenon. The review of the literature indicates that this trend, while more focused at the local and state levels, may also be a national issue. According to Hague (1998), there appears to be a discernable increase in public employee

turnover and a reduction of highly viable applicants seeking public service jobs as a result of a confluence of economic, political, and social factors.

Included within the parameters of this research project is the confluence of two factors – generational issues and public service motivation (PSM) – that might offer some explanatory power as to why people do or do not pursue law enforcement careers. Brewer, Selden, and Facer (2000) suggest that PSM is among one of the most important topics being investigated among those in public administration and public management. Furthermore, they issued a call for further research that focuses on whether PSM changes over time. Since sparsely little current longitudinal work associated with law enforcement personnel exists, this project will attempt to bridge this gap by reviewing perceptions of three generations of currently serving police officers.

Among generational issues salient to this study, Twenge (2006) points out that the Me Generation, a composite of Gen X and Gen Y, has never experienced a time when it was expected to put duty above self (p. 1). Lancaster and Stillman (2010) suggest that a large divide exists between what organizations know about the current generations working within their businesses and how Gen Y is challenging them in heretofore unimagined ways. These challenges include how Gen Y utilizes technology, career expectations, parental involvement in job offer negations, work-life balance and instant gratification (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). The literature review starts with an overview of generational issues and transition into public service motivation.

2.1.1 Generational Issues

Another major focus of this research is the question of generational differences emerging among the population groups known as Generation X and Generation Y. McCafferty (2003) relates that each generation has developed its own personality that distinguishes it from the other. Furthermore, their differences, if any, are evaluated on the impact those differences are having on entry level applications for law enforcement employment.

Mensik (2007) defines the Baby Boomer generation as people born between 1943 and 1960. She further defines Generation X as persons born between 1961 and 1981 and Generation Y as those born between 1982 and 2000 (Mensik, 2007, p. 483). Lancaster and Stillman (2010) defined the generations as Traditionalist born prior to 1946, Baby Boomers born 1946 to 1964, Generation X born 1965 to 1981, and Generation Y 1982 to 2000 (p. 5). Twenge (2006) points out that every generation is affected by the events of its times, and these events shape the general culture that, in turn, shapes them. Literally, we are a product of what impacted us when we were at an impressionable age. Baby Boomers (1943-1960) witnessed the Cold War, many were veterans of Viet Nam, and many were affected by World War II and Korea (McCafferty, 2003, p. 79). Additionally, McCafferty points out that the Baby Boomer can be described as possessing highly adaptive behaviors to stress, discipline, and authority (p. 79).

Furthermore, Generation X (1961-1981) and Generation Y (1980-2000), according to McCafferty (2003), have been exposed to a world of liberalism, egalitarianism, and individualism (p. 79). Martin (1988) predicted beginning in the 1990s managers would begin the organizational transition from a formal autocratic environment to a more informal structure as a result of these generational changes. A transformation where first names only replace the formal, rigid, Mr. or Mrs. and last name form of address. Members of Generation X have been molded by their experiences in a world where crime, drugs, and gangs appear to be almost common place. They had to deal with desegregation, cultural diversity, and drive-by shootings (McCafferty, 2003, p. 79).

Twenge (2006) synthesizes those who were born in the 1970's, 1980's and 1990's into a category referred to as "Generation Me" (p. 3). They tend to be self-absorbed, self-reliant and prone to ideals of success and being well-to-do financially, she further explains. Generation X's focus is on a career that is challenging, offers them the opportunity to balance work and family, and provides them with fun and excitement (McCafferty, 2003, p. 82). By implication, law enforcement agencies must be willing to modify their work environments if they are going to

attract qualified applicants from this pool of applicants. Also, this generation is the most technologically proficient and mobile generation; therefore, Generation Xers are less interested in a single job for the rest of their lives. They are comfortable with the fact that they may and probably will have more than three or four jobs, even occupations, during their lifetimes.

While Generation Y displays many of the same characteristics of Generation X, they appear to be more closely aligned with their grandparents' generation on family values. They are more optimistic and appreciate the subtleties of spiritual love (McCafferty, 2003, p. 81). Lancaster and Stillman (2010) identified seven trends that make up the M-Factor (M stands for Millennial): parenting, entitlement, meaning, great expectations, the need for speed (in the pace of life), social networking, and collaboration (p. 6). They suggest that the M Generation, also known as Millennials or Generation Y, are different from the previous generations and identified the primary differences by way of the seven factors listed.

Each generational cohort appears to have a unique focus that is the foundation of their group identity. These focal points seem to indicate an overarching factor that impacts the generational groups in areas of career and life pursuits. McCafferty (2003) indicates that Generation X is motivated by pleasure (p. 82). The primary motivation for the Baby Boomer was money (p. 81). For Generation Y, the primary motivations are a need for entertainment and an opportunity for career growth (p. 81).

2.1.2 Police Applicant Trends

How police departments and human resource professionals have structured their recruitment, retention and promotion systems have not changed much over the years. Officers today are recruited much the same way Baby Boomer officers were recruited 30 years ago. This project will attempt to determine if generational changes have outpaced hiring practices. Messer (2001) indicated that a major source of applicants for entry-level police officers for the next 20 to 30 years will come from Generation X. He further identifies that agencies will not only need to recognize this fact, but also start to develop plans and initiatives intended to capitalize

on the skills and demands that this group will bring to their departments.

David Frost (2003) reports that law enforcement agencies will be faced with an increasing retirement of “Boomers,” which continue to create a need to fill vacancies from the compete with the other public and private sector agencies for applicants from among a new generation of technically proficient applicants. Many, if not all, law enforcement agencies are poorly positioned to deal with this vacuum of retiring officers or the competitive atmosphere they are finding themselves in for applicants.

Mineard (2003) points out that among the most difficult problems facing law enforcement agencies has been the decline in qualified entry-level applicants. Furthermore, he identified that this problem has been symptomatic for the past 10 years. Brand (1999) indicates that the values of the new applicant pool have changed, and these changes will pose serious implications for agencies attempting to recruit and retain the Generation X employee.

Charrier (2000) has indicated that law enforcement employers must market their opportunities differently if they are going to attract the Generation X applicant. Charrier further identifies that Generation X has different concerns and motivations than previous applicant pools. Brand (1999) suggests that Generation X employees may require increased training related to applied ethics. McCafferty (2003) echoes this warning for Generation Y employees. Mineard (2003) indicates that Generation X values time off, is willing to relocate, wants more direct roles in their work environment and desires to have jobs that compliment their lives (p.1). Twenge (2006) along with Lancaster and Stillman (2010) point out that Generation Y accepts that they will have many employers and are more than willing to seek other jobs when and if their needs are not being met in their current positions.

Shift work is a fact of life for law enforcement agencies. The public expects and demands full-time coverage of their communities by full-time, well trained, competent, empathetic, and professional law enforcement officers. However, it is this feature of the law enforcement profession that might have the most negative impact upon the Generation X and

Generation Y applicant pool. According to Mineard (2003), shift work is a major concern to Generation X. Agencies must be willing and able to modify shift work to provide for more stabilization in the workplace and less officer dissatisfaction. Modifying shift rotations and providing for more stabilization will be necessary to attract the Generation X and Generation Y. Martin (1988) suggests that a public service organization can improve its recruitment efforts by providing the following(p. 126):

- proactive organizational climates;
- competitive salary and benefit schedules;
- rational and understanding administrators;
- adequate program funding;
- aggressive public relations programs;
- modern physical plants, attractive facility grounds and landscaping;
- average or better perks for employees;
- recognition for good performance; and,
- a high level of employee morale.

Apparently, a number of recruitment enticements such as sign-up bonuses, cash rewards, more vacation time, and other employment perks are not having the positive impact on recruitment that some jurisdictions thought they might (Messer, 2001, p. 3). The incentives needed are less about tangibles and more about intangibles, such as flexible work schedules, sabbaticals (especially for long tenure incumbents), educational opportunities and incentives, participation in goal setting and work standards, and limiting intrusion into “personal” life (Mineard, 2003; McCafferty, 2003; Koper, 2004).

2.1.3 Public Service Motivation

Clearly, there is a range of reasons, contextual and value laden, why one seeks one kind of career versus another. One theoretical area that attempts to answer why some people choose public service, versus public sector employment, is Public Service Motivation (PSM) (Perry & Wise, 1990; Perry, 1996; Perry, 1997; Crewson, 1997; Naff & Crum, 1999; Brewer, Selden & Facer, 2000; Houston, 2000; Wright, 2001; Bright, 2005; Moynihan & Pandey, 2007; Vandenabeele, 2008; Christensen & Wright, nd, accessed 08/2010; Perry & Hondeghem, 2008). Houston (2006) suggests that a key premise of PSM is that people who serve in the

public sector are motivated by a lifetime commitment to others that affects society with a focus on benevolence. Reward preference suggests that individuals who choose to work for non-profit organizations or government entities, with an overarching focus on the opportunities to serve others, value money less than other people (Pandey & Stazyk, 2008).

According to this developing theory, there are indeed differences why people choose public service rather than private employment. Most of those differences can be identified as intrinsic motivators, feeling of accomplishment and service, rather than extrinsic variables, such as pay, promotions, and benefits (Crewson, 1997, p. 501). Perry and Wise (1990, p. 368) defined PSM as "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily and uniquely in public institutions and organizations." Chetkovich (2003) indicates that the motivation of applicants for public service jobs does, in fact, differ from applicants for private sector jobs. However, Steen (2008) also suggests that PSM applies to non-governmental organizations, performing essentially public service, as well.

Perry and Wise (1990) created a matrix to explain PSM between motives and dimensions. The motives were identified as rational, affective, and normative (p. 369) The dimensions were listed as attraction to public policy making, public interest, compassion, and self-sacrifice (Perry & Wise, 1990, p. 369). Crewson (1995) suggests that public service, focusing on federal employees' attitudes as points of reference, provides certain inducements to government employment, such as, benefits, job security, and the importance of government work (p. 637). Building on their previous work, Perry and Hondgehem (2008) suggest that the relationship of altruism, pro-social behavior, and public service motivation serve as synergistic elements with each other rather than competing constructs. Furthermore, Perry, Brudney, Coursey and Littlepage (2008) find further evidence of the validity of the construct of PSM in a research project involving winners of the Daily Point of Light Award.

Perry and Wise (1990) suggest that there is a positive correlation to one's PSM and his or her choice of a career in public service. PSM is a relatively new construct that was proposed

by Perry and Wise as describing a set of preferences associated with the public service rather than the private sector (1990). However, Gabris and Simo (1995) contend that the PSM construct fails as an independent variable to predict career choice in the public service. Rather, they suggest that a person who chooses public service is more likely guided by personal experiences, education, prior employment, labor markets, professional networks, and happenstance (p. 39). Naff and Crum (1999) found through their research involving almost 11,000 federal employees, that the construct for PSM is a valid concept.

Pandey and Stazyk (2008) suggest that other factors have been identified as related to PSM by virtue of an on-going, relatively young, field of inquiry in public service motivation. Among the factors that have been identified as being positively associated with a higher PSM are education, age, and gender (Pandey & Stazyk, 2008, p. 102). Other researchers have found a profound impact that service organizations make on PSM through institutionalization of a service (Brewer, 2003; Houston, 2000; and Perry, 1997). In a study conducted by Brewer, Seldon and Facer (2000), utilizing a Q-sort methodology, discovered that money was not a primary motivator associated with PSM. Furthermore, the most commonly identified motives among their participants were making a difference in the community and attention to equity issues, both individual and societal (p. 260). Houston and Cartwright (2007) conducted a study linking public service and spirituality.

Leisink and Steijn (2008) posit person-environment fit with the relative important processes of recruitment, selection and PSM (p. 119). However, within this framework offered by Leisink and Steijn (2008), are four areas of fit also related to PSM (p. 120): person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor. In other words, individuals who might be motivated by PSM to work in the public sector might also be influenced by associations within a particular job setting, rather than just intrinsic rewards. Christensen and Wright (nd, accessed 8/2010), found in a study they conducted a relatively weak or no relationship to person-organization or person-job fit and PSM (p. 17).

Other researchers posit that certain organizations create cultures that promote positive public service sentiments (Kaufman, 1967; DiIulio, 1994; Perry 1997; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). Maesschalck, van der Wal and Huberts (2008) suggest a nexus with PSM and ethical conduct within public organizations. This nexus is strained by the contest between public administration values and new public management practices of maximizing outputs while minimizing costs.

One of the major questions explored in this project is how well public service motivation (PSM) explains the motivation to become a police officer. Several studies have indicated a connection between high group identity and public service motivation (Kaufman, 1967; Ellickson, 2002, Steijn, 2004). The affect that PSM has on one's choice to become a police officer is important to this research project. Yet, sparse research of this question has been evaluated utilizing police officers as participants.

Thompson and Bono (1993) conducted motivational research involving volunteer fire fighters. However, this research is only marginally associated with PSM theory. Jurkiewicz and Massey (1997) conducted research concerning factors that motivate municipal employees among five suburban communities. This piece of research includes individuals who may have been police officers; however, duties were not reported in the results and stands in contrast to a relative void of research directed at police officers. Yet, their findings are nonetheless enlightening and, generally, supportive of the PSM construct. Jurkiewicz and Massey (1997) focused their project on the differences between supervisory and non-supervisory personnel. However, the results can be interpreted as an analysis about what motivates these public employees as a group. Most interesting, among these research findings, was the groups' high importance of a stable work environment.

In another study, Jurkiewicz, Massey and Brown (1998) compare public sector and private sector employees on 15 motivational factors. The public sector group included police officers among the respondents although the results were not reported for job type. The

researchers utilized a rating scale, from 1 to 15 of “wants” and “gets.” The research confirmed that public employees were different from their private-sector counterparts in choosing job stability and security over pay. Perry and Hondeghem (2008) recommend future research to identify how current employees of public agencies identify with their roles and identities (p. 306). This project answers that call to research and explores just those issues related to incumbents and the various generational groups to determine if there is a marked difference in PSM.

Perry and Hondeghem (Eds., 2008) posit that the real answer to the question of why one should study PSM is that the construct is located at the juncture of public and organizational life. Because of this, the study is not only ripe for scholarly exploration, but is a hugely important topic (p. 7). According to these authors, the construct is located at the confluence of three intellectual divides, which are (p. 7):

1. The nature of ‘human nature’: rational versus other-regarding actors;
2. Appropriate organizational incentive systems: individual versus collective incentive structures; and
3. Responsive institutional designs: new public management versus collective designs.

Wright (2008) points out that research that utilizes an employee’s perception as it relates to behavior is problem laden. He suggests that the PSM theory allows for three major research areas: that it provides greater opportunity to satisfy certain needs than the work in private sector organizations; that these opportunities attract individuals with matching needs or values; and that public employees with higher public service motivation will exert greater effort in their work because they find the nature of work itself rewarding (p. 85-86).

Horton (2008) suggests that public service has more than one meaning. One such meaning is that of a function carried out by people working in government. Another is work funded by government. Yet another is any function provided to the public. Finally, public service can describe the motivation one has for a sense of duty, responsibility for the welfare of citizens, or the common good of the population as a whole (p. 17).

Koehler and Rainey (2008) point out that the theory of public service motivation is a

result of an interdisciplinary evolution of various theoretical frameworks. They include in their framework, sociobiology, evolutionary psychology, developmental psychology, social psychology, organizational behavior, economics, sociology, and political science. While they point out that none of these theories alone, or in combination, fully explain public service motivation, the motive of altruism and self-sacrifice are not antithesis of self-interest. They go on to suggest that individuals must still balance self-interest with the interest of serving the public. One might conclude that this calculus of varying motives, intrinsic versus extrinsic, is not a zero-sum game, but one in which a win-win situation can and has resulted. Perry and Vandenabeele (2008) suggests that public service motivation stands in contrast to the rational choice paradigms of self-interested, self-maximizing individuals who choose careers and jobs based on extrinsic, money-related, factors. Rather, those persons who choose to pursue public service occupations are motivated by intrinsic, altruistic, rewards.

Brewer, Selden, and Facer (2000) create a typology of public servants based on their answers to a survey of 40 questions. The four types were identified as samaritans, communitarians, patriots, and humanitarians (p. 64). Samaritans are differentiated by their positive feelings for doing public service while expecting those in need to help themselves. Communitarians are driven by civic duty and public service; however, they do not have the same connectedness to the needy or ideals of giving back to the community. Patriots exhibit characteristics that would suggest that they would risk great harm and take great risk in order to serve the public. Humanitarians are the consummate self-sacrificing individuals who do not seem to be overly concerned with their own interests and are focused on the ideals of social justice.

How one sees oneself also has a great deal to do with whether he or she might endeavor to be a public servant. Erickson (1946) suggests that the identity is an important aspect of the self. In other words, one sees one's self in a certain light, or through a certain lens, and how they see themselves defines them. One could surmise from this seemingly internal

conflict and dialogue that one tends to justify his or her own motives as altruistic, or intrinsically motivated, if the concept of self is positively associated with those motives (Perry & Vandenabeele, 2008).

On a PSM comparative level, several researchers have identified the generalizability of PSM to other countries. In a study conducted by Bastick (2000) on the motivation of people to become teachers in Jamaica, internal, external, and altruistic factors were significantly and positively associated with the choice to become public school teachers and related the results to Maslow's theory of motivation (p. 347). Buelens and Van den Broeck (2007) in a study conducted among 3,314 Belgium private and public sector employees, found that the parameters of PSM theory held true among their research subjects. Kim (2009) conducted similar research of public servants in Korea. He found that, for the most part, PSM could be generalized to this country's public servants as well. This suggests something of a transnational relationship to applicability of public service motivation theory. This transnational linkage to PSM suggests that the underlying and stated assumptions about PSM have broad application to the purposes of this research project.

2.2 Summary

A review of the literature suggests that the crisis in blue is not localized and is a real problem. Furthermore, background information points to differences in motivations among the various generational groups. Those differences may explain the relative lack of interest by some age group cohorts from pursuing police careers. Clearly, experts in PSM suggest that individuals who pursue public sector careers, regardless of other demographic characteristics, are motivated differently from people who pursue other non-public service career paths. Perry (2010) points out that research reinforces the belief that PSM is positively associated with attraction-selection-retention of people to public service (p. 687). Those who choose public sector employment are motivated more by intrinsic rewards than extrinsic ones. One should note that extrinsic motivators are not of no value to people who pursue public service careers.

They are just not at the top of a long list of characteristics that impact career choices. Finally, generational groups have different career goals that organizations can utilize, regardless of the sectors they represent to impact their ability to recruit, retain, and promote people.

Furthermore, based on this review, little research exists evaluating the construct of PSM with police officers. This project should contribute to the body of research already in place that evaluates PSM and those who serve as police officers. The generational differences that seem to exist may or may not be universally applicable to police officers. Again, this research project attempts to evaluate generational circumstances affecting applicant interest in seeking law enforcement careers.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH PROJECT

3.1 Research Objectives

The first purpose of this research project was to identify if shifts exist in motivational preferences among the various generational cohorts who make-up the current applicant pools for police officers. Closely related to this research topic is the question of whether, among the various generational groups currently serving as police officers, if a relationship to the construct of public service motivation (PSM) can be identified. Furthermore, the current situation with law enforcement applicant pool rates will be investigated. One reason this research is necessary is to determine if there is a perceived decrease in the number of applicants, which indicates at least a relationship that can be projected into the future with some accuracy. Additionally, if there is a significant reduction in entry-level applicants, can the relative factors associated with this decline be identified? Finally, assuming that a relationship can be identified that affects preferences and motivators, then policy alternatives that could have a positive impact on this trend can be explored.

As a result, this research project, will determined whether this is a social phenomena that can be identified or just another economic cycle. Consistent with the study's findings, policies could be formulated and implemented by some yet unspecified set of strategies that might positively impact and improve the numbers of quality, qualified applicants.

3.1.1 Theoretical Concerns

Economic theory would suggest that people are motivated to work for the marginal utility of the remuneration they will receive for their efforts. Work for pay then is one of the primary motivators for individuals to work, particularly for another person or entity. This is what Crewson (1997) has labeled as an extrinsic reward (p. 501). Vroom (1964) suggests that

expectancy theory contributes to the motivation of people as well. According to Vroom's VIE theory, or Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy, people are motivated by any number of factors, intertwined in a personal calculus of motivators. Valence relates to factors associated with how attractive or non-attractive a motivator is to the individual. Instrumentality refers to how the person perceives the outcome to be in his or her best interest. Expectancy is a calculation between a person's perceived effort and an outcome that is most desirous, or at least with the least negative consequence.

According to research conducted by other PSM scholars, several socio-demographic characteristics have been identified as relevant to PSM research: age, sex, and education (Pandey and Stazyk, 2008). These authors also point out that factors associated with the demographic factors have some positive relationship with PSM.

After evaluating these theories of why people work and considering that police departments tend to pay a competitive salary, then other organizational, generational or cultural issues may be present that might explain a decline in applicants for entry level police occupations. Issues that may have a negative appeal to applicants are shift work (working variable shifts, holidays, and weekends), relatively poor media presentation of police (Holzer & Rabin, 1987), and relative shift of importance being placed on leisure activity values versus work values by Generations X and Y (Lancaster & Stillman, 2010; Mensik, 2007; McCafferty, 2003; Twenge, 2006).

Koper (2004) identified a number of issues that might explain the relative decline in entry-level applicants for police officer (p. 2):

- Strong economy drawing applicants away from law enforcement to higher paying jobs.
- Increased educational requirements for applicants.
- Unusually high attrition rates due to "baby boomer" retirement.
- Negative publicity relative to the police use of force and allegations of racial profiling.

Consider also that people do work in the law enforcement field rather than more lucrative employment opportunities in which they could receive greater salary versus less

danger. This apparent “difference” may be the areas that entities need to capitalize on and increase attention to so that they might attract the new employee.

Martin (1988) conducted a pilot study of professional staff members of, what he calls a human service organization, to explore what motivates people to do a better job. In his study, granted the size of the sample was relatively small, 28 people, his dichotomous questions (Yes/No) focused on motivational factors associated with productivity. While his research is not directly related to the nature of the inquiry of this project, the results bear reporting. The following items were believed by the respondents to be motivating factors for productivity (p. 102): higher salary (56%), cash awards (22%), more feedback (52%), recognition (78%), more training (44%), time-off award (41%), better insurance benefits (7%), better supervision (30%), hiring better employees (37%), protected breaks (4%), and better promotional opportunities (50%). One can deduce from this limited study that these professionals were motivated by intrinsic rewards, such as feedback and recognition, at least as much as by extrinsic rewards, like higher salaries, training, time-off, and better supervision.

Identifying these contexts and values of the differences among the present generations making up the applicant pool will prove useful for strategic human resource management (SHRM). Some of these differences may be: quality-of-life issues, control over leisure activities, and relative negative social status of law enforcement.

3.1.2 Research Hypotheses

Based on a careful review of the literature and considering the topics of interest in this project, a number of research hypotheses were developed. Each hypothesis is focused at the central issues raised in this project. Primarily, three areas were evaluated in this project. First, generational differences and preferences associated with public service motivation were evaluated. Second, the perceptions among those persons most strongly associated with human resources in local police departments, police chiefs and HR professionals, were collected relative to issues surrounding present and future applicant trends. Finally, officers were asked to

rank order motivators and de-motivators for people interested in pursuing law enforcement careers. Based on the review of the literature and relative topics associated with career choice, several hypotheses were developed to explore in this research project.

The following hypotheses were evaluated in this research project:

1. There is a perceived decline in the number of applicants for entry level police positions.

2a. Individuals, across several generational populations of police officers, have shifted their preferences for the reason they originally chose the police career; and,

2b. they are not likely to recommend police careers to others.

3. Individuals who have chosen careers as police officers have shifted their primary motivating factors from intrinsic to extrinsic rewards.

4. Incumbent police officers perceive the existence of a relatively poor social prestige (employment externalities) associated with serving in police agencies.

5. There is a perceived shift among police officers, particularly of the youngest incumbents, known as Generation X and Generation Y, which has caused a greater interest in their preferences for control over leisure activities, regardless of salary.

3.1.3 Study Methodologies

Surveys were developed with two study groups in mind. The first group consisted of chief police administrators and human resource directors of cities in the North Central Texas Council of Governments service area. This group was chosen because it is fairly representative of the major metropolitan areas throughout the state of Texas and because this group is identifiable, accessible, and responsive to requests for assistance in research. The purpose of using this group is to identify if they perceive an applicant crisis exists and to identify variables that they believe are significant to recruiting potential applicants.

The second group was a pool of incumbent police officers from the same political entities and geographical area as group one. This group was chosen as being representative of those among the various generational groups who chose to become police officers. By surveying this group of practitioners, it is hoped that insight might be developed, relative to generational differences, variables that impacted their decision to choose to become police officers, and other issues cogent to the research project.

The populations for the surveys were incumbent police officers, chiefs of police and human resource (HR) professionals identified in the north central Texas Metroplex served by the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). A list of agencies and their electronic mail addresses was obtained from various sources, including internet searches to identify the email addresses of chiefs and HR professionals. Contact was made with each agency identified to enlist their participation in the study. This contact was accomplished either by telephone, mail, or electronic mail. Furthermore, most of the law enforcement agencies in the north central Texas Metroplex are members of the North Texas Police Chiefs Association (NTPCA), which has monthly meetings and has its own home page on the World Wide Web. The NTPCA endorsed this research project through its list serve and encouraged its members to take the Chief Survey and pass along the Officer Survey link to their subordinates with encouragement to take the survey.

The Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex is a composite of over 130 local governments in two counties, Dallas and Tarrant. If one enlarges the area to include the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), a voluntary association of local and county governments, it is composed of 16 counties and over 230 member jurisdictions (NCTCOG, 2007). This study did not actively survey any county law enforcement agencies, such as sheriff or constables departments, or university police departments. However, it is possible due to networking of the various chiefs and HR professionals throughout the north Texas area that officers from these agencies did receive an invitation to participate in the survey. If this occurred, the results of the survey should not be affected since the answers to the questions would still apply and any answers that were received should not skew the results.

This research project utilized Survey Monkey for disseminating and collecting the answers to the surveys. A questionnaire was developed to collect various responses to statements and questions designed to solicit feedback that might identify attitudes and opinions relative to motivators and de-motivators associated with choosing to become a police officer.

Plus, specific questions were designed to collect opinions of both police chiefs and HR professionals about the current personnel situation and future applicant trends.

The Officer Survey was pilot tested at a relatively small local police agency in the north Texas region, and later, this agency was excluded from the actual survey process. The agency was composed of approximately 21 sworn police officers. The “Chiefs/HR” survey, hereinafter referred to as the “Chief” survey, was pilot tested utilizing a local HR manager and a fire chief with a fair understanding of the issues being surveyed. Due to the limited number of agencies located within a reasonable distance and the limited number of chiefs and HR professionals within the test region, this group was considered sufficient for purposes of the pilot study. While these groups may not be representative of the target populations and were not randomly selected, they provided invaluable feedback that resulted in minor changes and additions to the final survey instruments.

Based on the feedback and evaluation of the surveys returned by the “officers” group, “job security” was added to the list of “motivators” found in question 14 of the Officer Survey. Furthermore, it appeared that the rank ordering of the motivators and de-motivators from 1 being the least important to 8 being the most important was confusing. Therefore, the rank ordering was changed to indicate that the rankings were 1 to 8 with 1 being the most important to 8 being the least. For consistency, this rank ordering scheme was also applied to the ranking of de-motivators listed in question 15 of the Officer survey. No material changes were made to the Chief/HR Professional survey based on feedback for the pilot group participants.

3.1.4 Study Design

This project was cross-section survey research conducted in the spring of 2011. Agencies and individuals were enlisted to participate in the project via personal contact, emails, or list serves of various professional groups in north Texas. The survey period lasted approximately four weeks for both groups.

The informed consent form is attached and is located in Annex A. The surveys instruments for Groups 1, Chiefs and HR Professionals, and Group 2, Incumbent Police Officers, are attached to this proposal as Annex B and C. The IRB approval letter is attached and is found in Annex D. The surveys were distributed through Survey Monkey. Participants followed the link provided by Survey Monkey to the respective surveys. Once there, each subject was informed of his or her right to accept or decline to participate in the research project. A participant could skip any question or decline to answer any part of a question without nullifying his or her survey.

3.1.5 Limitations of Surveys

Surveys have their strengths and weaknesses, and our society is among the most surveyed in history. Participants have developed something of a rebound effect to surveys. Some resistance to taking surveys has developed, over time, which could have negative impacts on this study. However, considering the methodologies available, the use of surveys should pose limited negative impacts (Bradburn, Sudman & Wansink, 2004). Another negative aspect of questionnaires is language. Depending upon the education and social experiences of the target populations, questions incorporated into the questionnaires could be confounding or misunderstood. The questionnaires were evaluated for succinctness, clarity, and verbiage. In order to reduce the negative aspects and limitations of the surveys, every attempt was made to write in clear and simple language in order to obtain reliable feedback.

The strength of this methodology is its ability to reach numerous participants with relative ease and reliability. Costs were reasonable, both in development and implementation stages. The quantification of results, depending upon the study design, will be facilitated by the use of a survey. Statistical analysis of survey data is reasonably straightforward and valid.

3.1.6 Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was conducted from data gathered on the internet administered surveys. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 19.0, was utilized to

perform the basic statistical analyses of the data drawn from the questionnaires. A series of t-tests, ANOVAs, non-parametric analysis and linear and/or ordinal regression was utilized, depending upon the type of data and groups being evaluated.

The groups are not of equal size in either the Chief/HR or the Officer groups. Where the survey population is made up of two groups, such as the Chief/HR groups, a t-test will be utilized to determine if the means significantly differ.

For the Officer cohort, the primary respondent groups were generational. Therefore, the surveys collected demographic information that identified the respondents into four groups: Traditionalist, Baby Boomer, Generation X and Generation Y. In addition, Generation Y was, initially, subdivided into two distinct groups: Gen Y1 and Gen Y2. Further, it was believed that dividing this cohort into two groups would garner further information about expressed preferences among those in this youngest cohort.

Upon reviewing the frequency tables for the officer respondents, results revealed that that only one Traditionalist participated in the survey. Therefore, this case was re-coded into the Baby Boomer cohort. For Generation Y, however, upon review of the data, only five cases were reported as being part of Gen Y2 (19 to 23 years of age). Therefore, Gen Y2 was re-coded into one group, Gen Y.

The Officer Group was divided into three groups, for the most part to evaluate generational differences across the dependent variables. The methodology utilized to determine whether the means between these groups was significantly different than what one could expect by chance was the ANOVA. To further evaluate where the differences lie, if noted in the ANOVA, a Post Hoc test was utilized.

Several questions on the Officer survey were answered with a “yes” or a “no.” On those questions, a Chi-Square statistic was utilized to determine if the means were significant. Crosstabs was used, where appropriate, to determine relationships between the dependent and

independent variables within the parameters of the variables and the assumptions accompanying a particular statistical test, and the nature of the distributions.

3.1.6.1 Dependent Variables

The project utilized several dependent variables to identify staffing issues, PSM, and indicators that identify factors that motivated respondents to choose to be police officers. Additionally, factors the incumbents perceive to be de-motivators of individuals who might choose to become police officers were evaluated. Included in the surveys were several variables that represented the construct of PSM and the relative changes across generational groups as to the strength of various independent variables on PSM. Furthermore, the question of the declining applicant pools is the focus of the surveys taken by to police chiefs and human resource directors. The Officer group was also asked for its perceptions related to the applicant trends; however, their answers will be included for comparison purposes. Group means were determined and measured against an expected mean to evaluate whether the observed means differed from what one might expect by chance.

3.1.6.2 Independent Variables

Independent variables were those identified as being able to identify the motivation and generational preferences associated with choosing a law enforcement career, such as: gender, age, education levels, ethnicity, years of service or tenure, and generational cohorts. Dummy variables were created for several nominal and ordinal level variables for analysis purposes. Chiefs and HR professionals will be coded as an independent variable. Generational groups will be coded as an independent variable in the Officer survey.

3.1.6.3 Ordinal Regression

The surveys measured associations of attitudes or perceptions across several cohorts of police officers, chiefs of police, and human resource directors. The variables in this research design are primarily ordinal. However, several dichotomous variables are included and where practicable they will be recoded into dummy variables for analysis purposes. Therefore, the

primary statistical analysis to determine effects, across independent variables, on dependent variables will be ordinal regression (Norusis, 2010).

3.1.6.4 Cross-Tabulations

All variables will be evaluated utilizing cross-tabulations as well as Chi-Square tests, where appropriate. However, as in the Officer groups, there are three groups and a t-test is inappropriate to measure whether there is a statistical difference between the means. Therefore, an ANOVA was utilized to measure whether the means are statistically different. If differences are identified, a Post Hoc test utilizing a Tukey's B statistic will identify if and where the means differ.

3.1.6.5 Descriptive Statistics

The collected descriptive data adds to the general field of knowledge relating to how officers, across various demographics, are alike or different on a number of variables such as, education levels, experience, race, and gender. For analysis purposes, several independent variables were dummy coded.

3.1.7 Methodological Concerns

Generalizability is limited and will remain a major concern since respondent groups were limited to police chiefs, human resource directors, or incumbent police officers in the North Texas Metroplex. However, limitations of availability and identification of participants proved too costly to approach a higher level of inclusion and, therefore, confidence. The additional costs associated with broadening the response groups may have offered no significant contribution to the outcome of the research project and related policy implications. Furthermore, the North Texas Metroplex is fairly representative of these population groups in other metropolitan areas within Texas. Additionally, this research focuses on chiefs and police officers who must meet minimum standards for licensing in Texas. Therefore, it is believed that the respondents, in general, will not be that different from a group of chiefs and officers that might have been drawn from the entire Texas police population. Since HR professionals are vetted by their respective

employers as qualified to perform functions associated with human resources duties, it is assumed that they are not that unusual from others who perform those duties in similar governmental entities.

The report of the research attempts to identify most of the limitations and concerns related to reliability issues. Every attempt to openly address bias as well as data collection and dissemination problems is, to the extent possible, identified throughout this paper. The results of this study, while only generalizable within this small population sample, may be applicable to other populations and regions with an understanding of these limitations. Any conclusions, recommendations, or anticipated actions should be interpreted within this context and these perspectives.

As with any research project, bias is present within the interpretation and understanding of the data. When and where possible, biases are openly identified and fully discussed. Within this set of biases is the belief that without major systemic changes in whom and how law enforcement agencies recruit, law enforcement agencies are headed for a major crisis in the delivery of critical public safety services. Additionally, it is recognized that what is written about, how the report of findings is written, and who might read it contain biases that could have significant negative and positive impacts on both individuals and institutions.

Undoubtedly, the need to remain as objective as possible is imperative. This researcher endeavored to remain objective, cognizant of biases, and attempted to provide both transparency and rigor to the results of this research.

Finally, this study is important and provides information that could not only result in a shift in policies and practices relative to those recruited for entry-level police positions, but also how they are treated once hired. The failure to make adjustments by law enforcement agencies as they relate to the “new” police recruit could have serious adverse implications for the public’s safety. Twenge (2006) emphasizes that the attempts at altering the cultural cues and guiding belief systems are futile. What must be embraced, she comports, is their uniqueness and

attitudes, while counting the generational negative traits with specific, unique, methods for countering them.

3.1.8 Institutional Review Board

This research project was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Texas at Arlington and was approved as proposed, with minor changes. See Appendix D for a copy of the approval letter. Compliance with standards established by the IRB was of primary importance to the research design ultimately utilized in the study. This application received an expedited review and approval. This project received a waiver, and the informed consent notice was included in the survey instrument (see Appendix A).

The ethical questions and concerns associated with conducting studies with human subjects as outlined in the *Belmont Report* were strictly observed during the development and execution of this research project. As a result, minimal negative or adverse impacts were experienced by participants in this study.

3.2 Summary

This project collected data utilizing the services of Survey Monkey to administer an on-line survey, and the project focused on two primary subgroups: Chiefs of Police/HR professionals and incumbent police officers below the rank of chief of police. Separate surveys were developed for each research group. The surveys were pilot tested and changes were made to the original survey designs and questions as a result of the pilot testing. The surveys were designed to address issues and concerns identified as germane to the research hypotheses.

The invitation to participate in the research project and take the surveys was distributed through a combination of personal email contacts and redistributed, by request, to other participant groups, such as the HR professionals and incumbent officers. Contact information was initially identified by searching the internet for organizational email addresses. Where

organizational or personal contact could not be established, telephone calls were made to obtain email addresses. The primary organizations utilized in this project were of municipal organizations throughout the north central Texas metro area known as North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG).

The survey period lasted for just over 30 days. Once the survey period was closed, Survey Monkey was utilized to stop the receipt of further responses and data analysis was initiated. The data was statistically evaluated by utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 19.0. Various statistical methods were utilized in the analysis of data to include cross-tabulations, t-tests, Post Hoc tests, non-parametric tests, and regression analysis. The data collected was utilized to evaluate the perceptions and attitudes of the respondents relative to five research hypotheses.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Purpose

The purposes of the surveys were to assess practitioners and subject area experts as to their perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs as they relate to people choosing to serve as police officers. Focus was on the current and future trends of applicants for entry-level police officers. Additionally, of primary importance to this project was whether there are differences among the various age groups as to motivators and de-motivators related to choosing a career as a police officer.

Two different groups of individuals were surveyed to determine their opinions on a selected number of questions. The first group was made up of chiefs of police or human resources directors or professionals. The second group was made up of incumbent police officers below the rank of chief of police. The survey populations were of individuals who work in north Texas. Specifically, the survey populations were people who work in municipal governments in the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG).

The surveys were distributed via a system of professional contacts and networking capabilities. Primarily, the invitations to take the Chief and Officer surveys were distributed, directly to chiefs of police of the various police agencies, via email addresses. Assistance was also requested to have those chiefs redistribute the invitation to their HR professionals, if they had one. Additionally, utilizing a networking approach, the invitation to take the HR survey was also distributed by a city manager and HR manager, not otherwise associated with this research project.

4.1.1 Chiefs/HR Professionals Survey

The number of chiefs and human resource (HR) professionals serving the area

identified as the North Central Texas Council of Governments was approximately 200. From this number, utilizing a response rate calculator, with a 5% tolerance for error and a 95% confidence level, 132 completed surveys were identified as the preferred return rate. However, it should be noted that not all cities have both a chief of police and an HR professional. The final number of completed surveys for this group was 164. However, of this 164, only 122 respondents replied to question 16 of the Chiefs/HR Survey, hereafter referred to as the Chief Survey that identified which of these two types of individuals the respondent identified with – Police Chief or HR professional.

For purposes of analysis, the respondents to all of the questions on the Chief Survey are identified as one of these two of professionals. Forty-two individuals did not answer question 16. They may have been individuals who started taking the survey, reached question 16, decided that he or she should not have been taking the survey, and declined to answer this question. Therefore, for purposes of this research project, only 122 surveys of the Chiefs/HR group will be included in the analysis.

While the target for this project was a confidence level of 95% with a 5% error rate, which would have required 132 completed surveys, the actual number of valid returned surveys of 122 meets the 95% confidence level with a 5.5% error level. The number of completed surveys utilized in the remainder of the data analysis for this research project meets the 90% confidence level with a 4.7% error level or meets the 99% confidence level with a 7.3% error level. Missing cases are still found throughout the completed surveys and will be accounted for in the analysis that follows.

4.1.2 Officer Survey

According to the estimates derived from information available from the NCTCOG web page, 11,000 individuals were estimated as individuals who would identify with the label of police officer. Utilizing a response rate calculator, the number of surveys that would be needed to reach a 95% confidence level with a 5% error rate would be 371.

The actual number of completed surveys was 1,001. However, several respondents did not answer question 24 of the Officer Survey. This question asked the respondent to identify what age group, defined by a range, he or she would identify. These ranges were predetermined for the purposes of this project and are identified in Chapter 1. Several hypotheses revolve around the age group that a respondent would identify with. For purposes of this project, it was particularly important that respondents choose what age group they belonged to so that their answers could be analyzed against this project's hypotheses. Therefore, of the 1,001 completed surveys, only 914 respondents answered question 24. The data set was coded to exclude all cases that omitted question 24. This number does not include missing cases on the various questions asked in the survey. Missing cases are still present and will be accounted for in the analysis. Utilizing a response rate calculator, 914 returned surveys satisfy the 99% confidence level with a 4.1% error rate. This number of returned surveys far exceeds the goal of 95% confidence with a 5% error rate.

4.1.3 Descriptors

Referring to Table 4.1, 69 (56.6%) of the respondents on the Chief Survey were chiefs of police and 53 (43.4%) were HR professionals. Eighty (66.1%) were male and 41 (33.9%) were female. One case did not respond to this question and will be treated as missing. Of the 106 respondents, 87.6%, were white; five (4.1%) were black; one (.8%) was American Indian; six (5.0%) were Hispanic; and three (2.5%) were other races.

The educational background indicated that one (.8%) had a high school diploma or GED; 26 (21.3%) had some college; 29 (23.8%) had a bachelor's degree; 18 (14.8%) had some graduate hours; 44 (36.1%) had graduate degrees; and four (3.3%) had some post graduate college hours. Their experience, defined as how long on the job, indicated that three (2.5%) had been on the job for under a year; 26 (21.3%) had been on the job up to five years; 18 (14.8%) had 6 to 10 years experience; 15 (12.3%) between 11 and 15 years; 15 (12.3%) had 16 to 20 years experience; and 45 (36.9%) had over 20 years on the job.

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics of Police Chiefs and Human Resource Directors

Profession (n=122)	Sex (n=121)	Ethnicity (n=121)	Age Group (n=121)	Tenure (n=122)	Education (n=122)
Chief: 56.6%	Male: 66.1%	White: 87.6%	Gen Y: 0.8 %	<1yr: 2.5%	HS/GED: .8%
HR Dir.: 43.4	Fem.: 33.9	Af.Am.: 4.1	Gen X: 30.6	1-5 yrs.: 21.3	Some Col. Hrs: 21.3
		Hisp.: 5.0	Baby Boom: 66.9	6-10 yrs.:14.8	Col. Deg.: 23.8
		Am. Ind.: 0.8	65 & over: 1.7	11-15 yrs.:12.3	Some Grad. Hrs: 14.8
		Other: 2.5		16-20 yrs.: 12.3	Grad Degree: 36.1
				20 & over: 36.9	Post Grad Hrs: 3.3

Eighty-one (66.9%) of the respondents were between 47 to 64 years of age. Two (1.7%) were 65 or older. Thirty-seven (30.6%) of the respondents reported that they were 28 to 46 years of age and only 1 (.8%) reported being 24 to 27. There was one missing case in the ethnicity and age group descriptors.

Table 4.2 describes the respondents on the Officer Survey. Of the 1,001 people who responded to the survey, only 914 cases will be utilized for this study. These 914 cases represent, as explained above, individuals who identified with one of five generational groups. Of these 914 cases, one (.1%) was 65 or older; 248 (27.1%) were in the Baby Boomer group; 605 (66.2%) were in Generation X; 55 (6.0%) were in Generation Y1; and 5 (.5) were in Generation Y2. For purposes of this study, the 65 or older case was re-coded into the Baby Boomer group and the Generation Y2 was included in the Generation Y group.

Educationally, 30 of the respondents (3.3%) had a high school diploma or GED while 301 (33.0%) had some college. Three hundred thirty-nine (37.1) had a bachelor's degree and 88 (9.6%) had some graduate hours. Of those remaining, 129 (14.1%) had a graduate degree; 14 (1.5%) had some post-graduate hours, and 12 (1.3%) had a post-graduate degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., etc.).

The respondents had a wide variety of experience on the job as police officers. Seventeen (1.9%) had less than one year of service while 148 (16.2%) had one to five years experience. One hundred sixty-nine (18.5%) had six to 10 years and 175 (19.2%) have been police officers between 11 and 15 years. Of the top two most experienced groups of respondents, 147 (16.1%) have been police officers between 16 and 20 years with 256 (28.1%) having been on the job for over 20 years.

Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of Officers

Variable	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Age Groups			
65 and Up	1	.1	.1
Baby Boomer	248	27.1	27.1
Gen X	605	66.2	66.2
GenY1	55	6.0	6.0
GenY2	5	.5	.5
Total Valid	914	100.0	100.0
Education			
HS/GED	30	3.3	3.3
Some College	301	32.9	33.0
Bachelor Degree	339	37.1	37.1
Some Grad Hrs	88	9.6	9.6
Grad Degree	129	14.1	14.1
Some Post Grad	14	1.5	1.5
PostGradDegree	12	1.3	1.3
Total Valid	913	99.9	100.0
Experience			
<1 year	17	1.9	1.9
1 to 5 years	148	16.2	16.2
6 to 10 years	169	18.5	18.5
11 to 15 years	175	19.1	19.2
16 to 20 years	147	16.1	16.1
>20 years	256	28.0	28.1
Total Valid	912	99.8	100.0

4.1.4 Comparable Descriptors

In order to have some idea of the representativeness of the respondent groups, several data searches were conducted. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), sponsored by the U. S. Department of Justice, publishes an analysis, conducted every four years, comparing police departments across several demographic and departmental characteristics. The most current published report is *Local Police Departments, 2007*. Another set of data is available through the

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards and Education (TCLEOSE). Descriptive analysis of both sets of data is included for comparison of the sample set with the populations identified as police officers from the two data sources mentioned. The TCLEOSE numbers are the latest figures available (02/24/11). According to TCLEOSE, there are 75,343 license police officers in Texas. Referring to Table 4.3, 11.06% of the licensed peace officers in Texas are female, 88.92% are males and 15 people (0.02%) did not identify their sex. According to the report, 64.29% are white, 24.15% are Hispanic, 10.26% are black, 1.1% are Asian, 0.37% are American Indian, and 0.33% are mutlti-cultural or of unknown ethnicity.

Table 4.3 Demographics of Peace Officers

	Sample	Texas	US (DJS)
	Percent of 907	Percent of 75,343	Percent of 463,147
White	84.8	64.29	74.7
Black	4.6	9.74	11.99
Hispanic	7.4	24.15	10.3
American Indian	0.9	0.37	0.7
All Other	2.3	1.44	2.3
	Percent of 909		
Female	13.8	11.06	11.9
Male	86.2	88.92	88.1

Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

According to the BJS 2007 report, referring to Table 4.3, local police departments in the United States employed 463,147 police officers. Of that number, 74.7% were white, 11.9% were black, 10.3% were Hispanic, 0.7% were American Indian, Alaskan Native or Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2.3% were identified as all other races. According to the report, 88.1% are male.

Of the 914 valid cases indicating generation, only 909 responded to the question about sex with 784 (86.2%) males and 125 (13.75%) females. Ethnically, 769 (84.8%) respondents were white, 42 (4.6%) were black, 8 (.9%) were American Indian, 67 (7.4%) were Hispanic, and 21 (2.3%) identified with the other. No respondents identified with the label “Middle Eastern.” Included in the Officer Survey, 784 (85.8%) were males and 125 (13.8%) were females. Five respondents failed to answer this question and will be treated as missing cases. (See Table 4.3)

TCLEOSE records indicate that 2,040 active licensed peace officers were born before 1946 (refer to Table 4.4). The report indicates that Baby Boomers, those peace officers born from 1946 to 1963, inclusive, represented 29.80%, or 22,081, of the active licensed peace officers. Generation X was the largest groups of active serving peace officers with 42,915 (57.92%) of the total. Finally, those officers born between 1983 and 2000, inclusive, represent 9.52%, or 7,052 officers, of the total. According to this report, there are only 74,088 licensed peace officers indicating that there are approximately 1,255 licensees unaccounted for by date of birth. These cases will be treated as missing cases. The percentages of the total will be developed utilizing the 74,088 reported licensees.

Table 4.4 Licensed Texas Peace Officers by Generation

Birth Years	1913-45	%	1946-63	%	1964-82	%	1983-00	%
Generation	Traditionalist		Boomer		Gen X		Gen Y	
Number	2,040	2.75	22,081	29.80	42,915	57.92	7,052	9.52

Percentages figured utilizing 74,088

Utilizing the data from both TCLEOSE and BJS, it would appear that the sample group of police officers for this study is fairly representative of the peace officer populations both at the state and national level. However, Texas appears to be under-represented in the white officers and over-represented in Hispanic officers compared to the national study. Comparing the research group against the state police officer demographics, whites are over-represented, while blacks and Hispanics are under-represented. This could be explained by the ethnic differences that could be found across the United States as well as Texas, compared with the north Texas region. It is expected that the overall representation for Texas for Hispanics would be larger than the national level and larger still for Texas as a whole compared to north Texas. The ratio of male to female is slightly over-represented by females in the study group.

Statistics for age groups were not available in the national study. However, utilizing TCLEOSE data, Baby Boomers and Gen Y appear to under-represented with Gen X being over-represented in the incumbent study group. Comparing gender with the national and state statistics, the incumbent group appears to be over-represented among females.

4.1.5 Hypothesis 1

There is a perceived decline in the number of applicants for entry level police positions.

During the research project, virtually every police department previously identified in this project was contacted to determine if longitudinal records of applicant pools could be obtained. This data, if available, might add to the richness of the assessment of this hypothesis. Ideally, the subjects most knowledgeable about why he or she chose not to pursue a career as a police officer would be those who entered into the process and then took themselves out of the pool of eligible applicants for reasons unknown. However, no information could be located that could identify this cohort for contact or follow-up.

Leisink and Steijn (2008) point out that one of the most needed areas for future research relative to the evaluation of effective recruitment and selection processes is longitudinal studies. Early on in the research project a deficiency in the departments that were keeping accurate records, over a longer period of time, that could be analyzed for trends was recognized. Alternatively, asking subject area experts who have daily experience and long-term perceptions with and about applicant pools and future personnel needs, was the best option for evaluating this hypothesis.

The primary respondents for analysis of whether there is a perceived shortage of persons seeking entry-level police jobs were police chiefs and HR professionals. These men and women deal with vacancies, strategic human resource management (SHRM), recruitment and retention more than any other group. As such, it is unlikely that any group of individuals exists who would have a better understanding of the current and future trends of people seeking police jobs. Additionally, this group of professionals has the best understanding of the current and future needs within this vitally important career field. However, for information purposes only, the officer respondents were also asked for their perceptions and the statistics for their responses are included. Since this hypothesis was not related to a generational difference, further analysis beyond the group means will not be conducted on the officer responses.

For ease of explanation and referral, all statements and questions asked respondents on both surveys will be referred to as questions. Respondents were asked five questions on the Chief and Officer Surveys to ascertain their perceptions, attitudes, and agreement or disagreement, as to past, present, and future conditions as they relate to people applying for entry-level police jobs. The null hypothesis is that the subject area experts perceive no decline in the number of applicants for entry-level positions. Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 on the Chief survey were designed to solicit feedback that relates to H1. Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 19 on the Officer Survey were directed at incumbent police officers as to their attitudes and opinions to address this hypothesis.

All these questions, on both surveys, solicited responses on a 5-point Likert-scale with 1 being Strongly Disagree and 5 being Strongly Agree. Three (3) represented a “No Opinion” option. A “No Opinion” middle score was recommended by Bradburn, et al (2004), so that respondents are not forced to make a choice when, in fact, they might not have one or were ambivalent about the question. Forcing respondents to either disagree or agree, might result in numerous incidents of respondents skipping the question. The responses were not reverse-coded. A low mean would indicate attitudes or perceptions closer to the strongly disagree or disagree end of the continuum. A larger mean would indicate general agreement with the statement.

A dummy variable for Profession was created with 0 = Chiefs and 1 = HR professionals. A cross-tabulation of questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 was conducted to determine if any were dependent upon professional groups, identified as chiefs or HR professionals. On the Officer Survey a dummy variable for Generations with 0 = Baby Boomers, 1 = Generation X and 2 = Generation Y was utilized as the independent variable.

On the Chief Survey, a t-test was conducted for the analysis since only two population means were being compared (Salkind, 2011). The grand means for all questions associated

with this hypothesis were computed and t-tests accomplished to determine if the observed values were different than what might be expected by chance.

When asked if people are just as willing to become police officers today as five (5) years ago (Q1), the group mean for the Chief/HR professionals was 3.32 (sd = 1.108). A mean closer to 1 indicates a disagreement with the statement and a mean closer to 5 indicates agreement with the statement. A t-test was utilized to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The evaluation indicated a test value of t = 3.187, df = 121, significant (2-tailed) at $p \leq .002$ and a mean difference of .320. This indicated that the mean was statistically significantly different from chance and that Chiefs/HR professionals perceive that people are just as willing today as five (5) years ago to become police officers.

On this question, 56.5% of the Chief Survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement while 71.7% of the HR professionals agreed or strongly agreed. The mean for chiefs was 3.16 (sd = 1.133), and for HR professionals the mean was 3.53 (sd = 1.049). The t-test was conducted between these two groups at the .05 level of significance ($p \leq .05$). The results were that the test value was -1.841, with 120 degrees of freedom, and a p value of .068 and a -.369 mean difference. Therefore, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of their perceptions of the willingness of people to become police officers today versus five (5) years ago.

Relative to question 1 on the Officer Survey, the group mean was 3.28 (sd = 1.064). A mean closer to 1 indicates a disagreement with the statement, and a mean closer to 5 indicates agreement with the statement. A t-test was utilized to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The result of this evaluation indicated a t = 7.868, df = 913, sig. (2-tailed) $p \leq .000$, with a mean difference of .277. This indicated that the group mean of Officers is significantly different from chance and

that officers agree that people are just as willing today to become police officers as five (5) years ago.

When asked if people are just as willing to become police officers today as ten years ago (Q2), the Chief/HR professionals group mean was 2.87 (sd = 1.142). A t-test was utilized to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The mean for question 2 was determined not to be significantly different than what might be received by chance, t = -1.268, df = 121, sig (2-tailed) p = .207, mean difference -.131.

On question 2, 41.5% of the HR professionals disagreed or strongly disagreed while 59.4% of Chief survey respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The mean for Chiefs was 2.75 (sd = 1.104) and for HR professionals was 3.02 (sd = 1.185). A t-test was conducted between these two groups at the .05 level of significance ($p \leq .05$). The results were that the test value was -1.275, with 120 degrees of freedom, and a p value of .205 and a -.265 mean difference. Therefore, there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups in terms of their perceptions of the willingness of people to become police officers today versus ten (10) years ago. In conclusion, relative to whether respondents on the Chief Survey perceive whether people are just as willing to be police officers today as 10 years ago, the analysis is inconclusive and suggests no significance.

Relative to question 2 on the Officer Survey, the group mean was 2.95 (sd = 1.51). A t-test was utilized to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The result of this evaluation indicated a t = -1.408, df = 913, sig. (2-tailed) $p \leq .160$, with a mean difference of -.054. This indicated that the group mean of Officers was not significantly different from chance.

It is interesting that on both the Chief/HR and Officer respondents analysis that the means were not considered significant for perceptions related to 10 years ago versus today.

This might suggest that the respondents did not have the experiential background to offer a valid opinion.

On question 3, when asked if there were sufficient qualified applicants to meet current needs, the Chief/HR professionals group mean was 2.49 (sd = 1.144). A t-test was utilized to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The analysis indicated a test value of t = -4.905, df = 121, significant (2-tailed) at $p \leq .000$ and a mean difference of -.508. This result indicated that the mean was statistically significantly different from chance and that Chiefs/HR professionals perceive that there are not sufficient qualified applicants to meet current needs to fill vacancies.

On question 3, 73.9% of the Chiefs and 60.4% of the HR professionals disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The mean for Chiefs was 2.32 (sd = 1.078) and the mean for HR professionals was 2.72 (sd = 1.199). The t-test was conducted between these two groups at the .05 level of significance ($p \leq .05$). The results were that the test value was -1.926 with 120 degrees of freedom, and a p value of .056 and a -.398 mean difference. This was statistically significant at the $p < .10$ level, which would indicate that there was a difference between the two groups in terms of their perceptions of whether there were sufficient applicants to meet current needs. A t-test for equality of variances for this question indicated an F = 4.445 and significance of p = .037 on the Levene's Test. The results indicate that Chiefs believe more strongly that there is a lack of applicants to meet current needs.

Relative to question 3 on the Officer Survey, the group mean was 2.55 (sd = 1.111). A t-test was conducted to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The result of this evaluation indicated a t = -12.312, df = 911, sig. (2-tailed) $p \leq .000$, with a mean difference of -.453. This indicated that the group mean of Officers is significantly different from chance and that officers generally disagree with the statement that there are sufficient qualified applicants to meet current needs.

When asked if there are sufficient qualified applicants to meet future needs (Q4), the

group means for Chief/HR professionals was 2.60 (sd = 1.187). The results of the t-test indicated a test value of t = -3.677, df = 120, significant (2-tailed) at $p \leq .000$ and a mean difference of -.397. This indicated that the mean was statistically significantly different from chance and that Chiefs/HR professionals slightly disagree with the statement that there are sufficient applicants to meet future needs. On question 4, 69.5% of the Chiefs and 52% of the HR professionals disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The mean for Chiefs was 2.41 (sd = 1.102) and 2.87 (sd = 1.253) for HR professionals. A t-test was conducted between these two groups at the .05 level of significance ($p \leq .05$). The results were that the test value was -2.140, with 119 degrees of freedom, and a p value of .034 and a -.460 mean difference. This was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, which would indicate that there was a difference between the two groups in terms of their perceptions of whether there were sufficient applicants to meet future needs. A t-test for equality of variances indicated an F = 5.913, sig. at p = .017 on the Levene's Test. Chiefs believe more strongly that there is a lack of applicants to meet future needs.

Relative to question 4 on the Officer Survey, the group mean was 2.45 (sd = 1.090). A t-test was conducted to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The result of this evaluation indicated a t = -15.198, df = 907, sig. (2-tailed) $p \leq .000$, with a mean difference of -.550. This indicated that the group mean of Officers is significantly different from chance and that officers generally disagree with the statement that there are sufficient applicants to meet future needs.

When asked if the respondents believed there is a shortage of qualified applicants pursuing law enforcement careers (Q10), the group mean for Chief/HR professionals was 3.24 (sd = 1.121). The results of the t-test indicated a test value of t = 2.32, df = 121, significant (2-tailed) at $p < .05$ and a mean difference of .238. This indicated that the mean was statistically significantly different from chance and that Chiefs/HR professionals agree with the statement that there was a shortage of qualified applicants pursuing law enforcement careers.

Relative to question 10, 69.6% of Chiefs agreed or strongly agreed, while 52.8% of the HR professionals disagree or strongly disagree with this statement. The mean for Chiefs was 3.51 (sd = 1.052), and the mean for HR professionals was 2.89 (sd = 1.121). A t-test was conducted between these two groups at the .05 level of significance ($p \leq .05$). The results were that the test value was 3.139, with 120 degrees of freedom, and a p value of .002 and a .620 mean difference. This was statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level, which would indicate that there was a valid difference between the two groups in terms of their perceptions of whether there were was a shortage of applicants seeking law enforcement careers. A t-test for equality of variances indicated an F = 1.153, sig. at p = .285 on the Levene's Test. Chiefs believe more strongly that there is a lack of people pursuing law enforcement careers.

The results on question 10 pose an interesting proposition. Chiefs and HR professionals are on opposite ends of the spectrum on their perception of people pursuing law enforcement careers. This may present an interesting opportunity for discussion between the Chiefs who lead the men and women performing law enforcement duties in our communities as police officers and the professionals tasked with strategic human resource management (SHRM) responsibilities within the various governmental entities.

Relative to question 19, officers were asked if they believe that a shortage exists in the number of people willing to become police officers. The group mean for Officers was 3.38 (sd = 1.196). A t-test was conducted to evaluate whether this mean was different than expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of 3. The result of this evaluation indicated a t = 9.608, df = 911, sig. (2-tailed) $p \leq .000$, with a mean difference of .380. This indicated that the group mean of Officers is significantly different from chance and that officers agree with the statement that there is a shortage of qualified applicants willing to pursue law enforcement careers.

Based on the assessment of the opinions garnered from the answers provided from both subject area experts and people who work on the street as police officers, one could

deduce that there is now and will likely continue to be a decline in the number of people willing to become police officers. Therefore, the null hypothesis that there is not a perceived decline in the applicant pool is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis that there is a perception of a decline in applicants now and for the foreseeable future.

4.1.6 Hypothesis 2a

Individuals, across several generational populations of police officers, have shifted their preferences from the reason they originally chose the police career.

The Officer Survey had several questions designed to measure perceptions relative to preferences associated with choosing the law enforcement career referenced by respondents according to their generational categories. The null hypothesis is that the generational groups have not shifted their preferences for the reason they originally chose the police career. Questions 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 were intended to solicit the respondents' perception relative to motivators to become police officers. The dummy variable for Generations with 0 = Baby Boomers, 1 = Generation X and 2 = Generation Y was utilized as the independent variable. All questions were coded 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly disagree. A mean closer to 1 indicates general disagreement, while a mean closer to 5 indicates agreement. These questions were designed to solicit beliefs and attitudes about whether officers were motivated by desires to help people or because of the economy. Questions 12 and 13 are proxies for job satisfaction since they are framed against whether one would choose law enforcement as a career or not regardless of the state of the economy and the motivator of money.

Question 9 asked respondents to indicate their attitude about whether they became police officers out of their desire to help people. The group mean was 4.05 (sd = .950), which indicated that the group as a whole had a strong agreement with this statement. A t-test was utilized to evaluate whether the group mean was significantly different than might be expect by chance and was compared with an expected mean of 3. The results indicated that $t = 33.235$, degrees of freedom = 906, $p \leq .000$.

A cross tabulation was conducted to determine if the desire to help people was dependent upon generational identities. The mean for Baby Boomers was 4.00 (sd = 1.069), for Gen X 4.08 (sd = .900), and Gen Y 4.00 (sd = .921). Over 82% of Baby Boomers, 86.5% of Gen X and 86.7% agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Since the respondents have been divided into three groups, an ANOVA was conducted to determine if the means of Baby Boomers, Generation X and Generation Y differed statistically. The result was F(2,904), .689, $p > .05$. The means of the three generational groups were not significantly different.

When asked if they chose to become police officers because of the state of the economy (Q10), 86.2% of the Baby Boomers, 89% of Gen X and 85% of Gen Y disagreed or strongly disagreed. The group mean was 1.77 (sd = .885). A t-test was utilized to determine if the group mean was different than what might be expected by chance and evaluated against an expected mean of three (3). The results were t = -41.907, df = 908, $p \leq .000$. The group mean was statistically different than what might be expected by chance. This would indicate that, as a group, the officers had a strong disagreement that they chose to become police officers because of the state of the economy.

Utilizing cross tabulation, the mean for Baby Boomers was determined to be 1.86 (sd = .966), 1.73 (sd = .848) for Gen X, and 1.83 (sd = .886) for Gen Y. An ANOVA was conducted to compare the means among the three generational groups. The results indicated that the means were not significantly different, statistically, F (2, 906) = 2.252, $p > .05$.

Question 11 asked officers about attitudes related to whether they would seek other career opportunities when the economy improves. The group mean was 1.45 (sd = .733). According to the t-test conducted against and expect mean of 3, t = -63.917, df = 909, $p \leq .000$, the group mean is different and statistically significant from what one could expect by chance.

The mean for Baby Boomers was 1.44 (sd = .701), for Generation X 1.44 (sd = .730) and 1.49 (sd = .898) for Generation Y. Conducting an ANOVA to determine if the means are different, resulted in F (2, 907) = .121, $p \geq .05$. The means were not different, statistically, from

one another. The analysis suggests that officers would not seek other careers pursuits if the economy were to improve.

Question 12 asked respondents whether they would stay in law enforcement regardless of the economy. The group mean was 4.54 (sd = .732). The t-test to determine whether the group mean was significantly different from chance, again measured against an expected mean of 3, indicated that t = 63.385, df = 908, $p \leq .000$. The group mean is different, significantly, than one would expect by chance.

The mean for Baby Boomers was 4.55 (sd = .718), for Gen X 4.54 (sd = .723) and for Gen Y 4.48 (sd = .873). The means would indicate that the three groups agree or strongly agree with the statement. The ANOVA determined that the three means were not significantly different from each other, $F (2, 906) = .193$, $p > .05$.

Finally, respondents were asked to rate their attitude about a statement that indicated if given another opportunity to select a different career other than law enforcement, they would not make the same choice (Q13). Among the Baby Boomers, 79.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, while 79% of Gen X and 91.7% of Gen Y also disagreed or strongly disagreed. The group mean for this question was 1.95 (sd = 1.203). The t-test measured against an expected mean of 3 indicated that t = -26.388, df = 910, $p \leq .000$. The group mean is statistically significant.

The mean for Baby Boomers was 2.02 (sd = 1.256), for Gen X 1.96 (sd = 1.200), and for Gen Y 1.55 (sd = .910). According to the ANOVA evaluation of these means, $F (2, 908) = 3.822$, $p < .05$, the means are statistically different from one another. A Post Hoc test utilizing a Tukey's B, with an alpha of 0.05, was performed to determine where the difference was. The results indicated that Gen Y differed significantly from Baby Boomers and Gen X.

Based on the overall evaluation of the five questions utilized to explore this hypothesis, the null that states that there is no difference between the generational groups as to why they chose their profession and cannot be rejected. The three generational groups are strikingly

similar in their attitudes about why they chose their law enforcement careers. It is interesting to note that the generational groups are not dissimilar relative to their choice to become police officers and that they would not leave the career field regardless of the state of the economy. Finally, when assessing the outcome of question 13, one must keep in mind that the Gen Y group also represents the least tenured officers among the respondents and possibly still enamored with the profession.

4.1.7 Hypothesis 2b

They are not likely to recommend police careers to others.

The surveys for Chiefs and Officers were designed to capture the respondents' relative pride and satisfaction with their chosen professions. Question 9 on the Chief Survey and questions 16, 17, and 18 on the Officer Survey were designed to capture the respondents' opinion about whether they would or would not recommend the law enforcement profession to others. The null hypothesis is that they would recommend the police career to others. Chiefs and HR professionals were asked if they would recommend the law enforcement profession to others with a "yes" or a "no." They were not asked whether they would recommend the profession to other family members or their children.

Officer respondents were asked if they would recommend the law enforcement career to a relative, a child, and others, in this particular order, with either a "yes" or "no" answer. For purposes of this hypothesis, the primary group of interest is the Officer cohort. However, the Chief/HR group was asked a question intended to solicit feedback as to their perception of this question. The analysis for the answers on the Chief Survey is included only for comparison purposes rather than as explanatory value for evaluation of the hypothesis. Since these questions are nonparametric in nature, a Chi-Square (X^2) test will be utilized, rather than a t-test, to determine interdependence (Salkind, 2011; Steinberg, 2011). Those individuals who took the Chief Survey indicated that 90.8% (109 of 120) would recommend the law enforcement

career to others. Table 4.5 shows the values, including missing cases, for this question for the Chief Survey. The Chiefs' mean was 1.09 (sd = .284) and the HR professionals' mean was 1.10 (sd = .300). The group mean was 1.09 (sd = .290). A Chi-Square statistic was calculated to determine if the group mean was different than what might be expected. The test value was 80.033, df = 1, and a p of < .001, which would indicate that the group mean is statistically significantly different than what might be expected or predicted.

Table 4.5 Recommend Law Enforcement Career – Chief Survey

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	109	89.3	90.8	90.8
No	11	9.0	9.2	100.0
Total Valid	120	98.4	100.0	

A cross tabulation was calculated to determine if recommending the career field was dependent on the professional group. The Pearson Chi-Square test value was .043, with a p value of > .10. The test, assuming df = 1 and an alpha = .05, indicated that the critical value that leaves .05 in the right hand tail was 3.84. Therefore, since the test value was less than the critical value, there is no significant difference between Chiefs and HR professionals in their recommendation to others as it relates to choosing a law enforcement career. The mean for Chiefs was only slightly more positive than for HR professionals.

However, referring to Table 4.6, the recommendation seems to shift as it relates to whether an officer would recommend the law enforcement career to a relative or child. Of the officer respondents 73.5% would recommend the law enforcement career to a relative. However, only 58.4% of officers would recommend a law enforcement career to one of their children. The trend reverses for incumbent police officers as to whether they would recommend the law enforcement career to people who are not relatives.

Finally, the officer respondents would seem to agree with the chief respondents, when controlling for whether the person being advised was a relative, in that 83% would recommend the career field to other people. The group mean for "relative" was 1.27 (sd = .442), 1.42 (sd =

.494) for “child” and 1.17 (sd = .377) for “others.” A mean closest to 1 would indicate a “yes” and mean closer to 2 a “no.” A one sample Chi-Square test was conducted to determine if the answers that were received were significantly different than what might have been expected.

Table 4.6 Recommend Law Enforcement Career – Officer Survey

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Relative				
Yes	670	73.3	73.5	73.5
No	241	26.4	26.5	100.0
Total Valid	911	99.7	100.0	
Child				
Yes	527	57.7	58.4	58.4
No	376	41.1	41.6	100.0
Total Valid	903	98.8	100.0	
Others				
Yes	750	82.1	83.0	83.0
No	154	16.8	17.0	100.0
Total Valid	904	98.9	100.0	

The result for “relative” was $X^2(1)$, 202.021, $p < .001$, which indicates that the means were statistically significantly different than what might be expected. As for “child” the Chi-Square test was $X^2(1)$, 25.250, $p < .001$ and for “others” the Chi-Square results were $X^2(1)$, 392.938, $p < .001$. These results indicate that the answers to these questions were significantly different than what might be expected.

Considering further the breakdown by generational group, the mean for Baby Boomers on “relative” was 1.29 (sd = .457), 1.25 (sd = .436) for Gen X and 1.25 (sd = .437) for Gen Y. On “child”, the mean for Baby Boomers was 1.39 (sd = .489), for Gen X 1.43 (sd = .496) and for Gen Y 1.36 (sd = .483). When asked if they would recommend the law enforcement profession to other people, the means for Baby Boomers were 1.21 (sd = .409), for Gen X 1.16 (sd = .366), and for Gen Y 1.12 (sd = .324).

A cross tabulation was calculated to determine if career recommendation to a relative was dependent upon generational groups. The Pearson Chi-Square test value was 1.560 with a p value of > .10. The test, assuming df = 2 and an alpha = .05, indicated that the critical value

that leaves .05 in the right hand tail was 5.99. Therefore, since the test value was less than the critical value, there is no significant difference between the generational groups in their recommendation to relatives as it relates to choosing a law enforcement career.

A cross tabulation was calculated to determine if career recommendation to a child was dependent upon generational groups. The Pearson Chi-Square test value was 2.186 with a p value of > .10. The test, assuming df = 2 and an alpha = .05, indicated that the critical value that leaves .05 in the right hand tail was 5.99. Therefore, since the test value was less than the critical value, there is no significant difference between the generational groups in their recommendation to relatives as it relates to choosing a law enforcement career.

A cross tabulation was calculated to determine if career recommendation to other people was dependent upon generational groups. The Pearson Chi-Square test value was 4.712 with a p value of < .10. The test, assuming df = 2 and an alpha = .05 indicated that the critical value that leaves .05 in the right hand tail was 5.99. However, the test, assuming df = 2, and an alpha = .10 indicated that the critical value that leave .10 in the right hand tail was 4.00 Therefore, since the test value was greater than the critical value, there is a statistically significantly difference between the generational groups in their recommendation to other people as it relates to choosing a law enforcement career. This would lead to the conclusion that while all three generational groups would recommend the law enforcement career to other people, Gen Y would recommend the law enforcement career more often.

Based on the evaluation of the answers to the questionnaire, Chief/HR professionals would overwhelmingly recommend the career of law enforcement to others. However, considering that the best recruiters for a career field are its practitioners, one could conclude from the responses of line police officers that they are less likely to recommend the law enforcement career to a relative or child. Officers, however, are just as likely as Chiefs and HR professionals to recommend the career to other people.

The null hypothesis for chief/HR respondents cannot be rejected in favor of the

alternative. However, the primary group of interest for this hypothesis was the Officer cohort. Based on the evidence presented, it is statistically significant that all three generational groups would recommend the profession to others. The null hypothesis is, therefore, not rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. The Officer group across all generational groups would recommend the career field to others; however, Gen Y would recommend the career field to others more often than the other two groups. This may be explained by the fact that this group is the youngest and most likely the least experienced group of officers in the survey population.

4.1.8 Hypothesis 3

Individuals who have chosen careers as police officers have shifted their primary motivating factors from intrinsic to extrinsic rewards.

Questions 5 and 6, on both the Chiefs/HR and Officer Surveys were designed to solicit attitudes about extrinsic motivators, such as money or income, and a desire to help people, an intrinsic motivator, for choosing to become police officers. The null hypothesis states that police officers have not shifted their primary motivating factors from intrinsic to extrinsic reward. Questions 14 and 15 on the Officer survey were designed to solicited attitudes about motivators and de-motivators as they relate to choosing to become police officers.

On questions 5 and 6, the questions asked the respondents to rate their attitudes towards the statements utilizing a Likert-type scale from 1 being strongly disagree to 5 being strongly agree. Three (3) indicated a “no opinion” on the statement. The ratings were not re-coded; therefore, a low mean would indicate more of a disagreement with the statement. A high mean would indicate more of an agreement with the statement.

Question 14 lists a number of factors considered motivators and asks the respondent to rate the factors from 1 being the most important factor to 8 being the least important. Each factor could only be rated one time. However, a factor could be skipped, which explains why some factors have different cases. These non-ratings are treated as missing cases for analysis purposes.

Question 15 lists a number of factors identified as de-motivators. Respondents rate the factors from 1 to 7, most to least de-motivating. Again, each factor can only be rated one time and a factor could be skipped. An ordinal regression will be utilized to further analyze the results of the ratings given by the respondents for both question 14 and 15.

Respondents on the Chief Survey were divided into two groups: Chiefs and HR professionals. This variable was dummy coded as 0 = Chiefs and 1 = HR professionals. The primary interest of this research is generational differences as it concerns officer participants. Therefore, the respondents on the Officer survey were divided into three distinct group codes as 0 = Baby Boomer and up, 1 = Generation X, and 2 = Generation Y.

When asked whether people who are interested in becoming police officers were motivated by money (Q5), 75.4% (52) of the Chiefs and 80.4% (41) of the HR professionals disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The group mean for this question, relative to the Chief survey respondents was 2.27 (sd = .976). Of this group, 93 of 120 (77.5%) respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. To further evaluate these findings, a t-test of the group mean was conducted against an expected mean of 3. The t-test indicated that the group mean was significant at the $p \leq .001$, with a t of -8.227 and 119 degrees of freedom. One can conclude that the result was different than what may be expected by chance.

The mean for Chiefs was 2.26 (sd = 1.038) and 2.27 (sd = .896) for HR professionals. A t-test was conducted to determine if the means of the two groups, Chiefs and HR professionals, were significantly different statistically from each other. The t-test for equality of means results were t = -.075, df = 118, Sig. (2-tailed) .940, with a mean difference of -.014, which indicated that the means were not statistically different from each other. According to the Levene's test for the equality of variances, the F was 1.855 with a p value of .176, which indicated that the variances were not statistically significantly different.

Chiefs and HR professionals did not believe that people who might seek law

enforcement jobs are motivated primarily by money. That is not to say, however, that money does not enter into the calculus of individuals considering a law enforcement career.

For Officers, the group mean for question 5, was 2.19 (sd = 1.076). A t-test was conducted to determine if this mean was significant at the $p \leq .05$ level, against an expected mean of 3. The results of that test indicated a t of -22.530, df = 904, $p \leq .001$ level. The group mean, according to this test, is statistically significantly different than what might be expected from chance.

The mean for Baby Boomers was 2.22 (sd = 1.080), 2.19 (sd = 1.070) for Gen X and 2.08 (sd = 1.124) for Gen Y. As previously mentioned, since this cohort consists of three groups, an ANOVA was considered the most valid test to determine if the means were statistically different from each other. The ANOVA indicated an F (2, 902) of .420 with a value of .657. This result exceeds the critical value of $p < .05$ and indicates that the three means are not statistically significantly different from each other. Clearly, Officers believe that people who are interested in pursuing police careers are not motivated by money; however, they are not different, generationally, from each other.

On question 6, when chiefs and HR professionals were asked for their opinion about whether people who are interested in choosing a police career were motivated by feelings of helping people, 73.9% (51 of 69) of the Chiefs respondents agreed (48) or strongly agreed (3) with this statement. Of the HR professionals, 71.7% (38 of 53) agreed with this statement. Among this group, no respondents strongly agreed with this statement. The group mean was 3.59 (sd = .800). A t-test was conducted to determine if the observed group mean was statistically significant against an expected mean of 3. The result was a t of 8.142, df = 121, observed significance (2-tailed) was .000, and a mean difference of .590. This result indicated that the group mean was different than what might be expected by chance.

The mean for Chiefs was 3.58 (sd = .881) and 3.60 (sd = .689) for HR professionals. A t-test for equality of means was conducted to determine if these means were different from each

other, statistically. The resulting t of -.164, with 120 degrees of freedom, resulted in an observed p value of .870 (2-tailed), with a mean difference of -.024. The test to determine the equality of variances indicated an F of 2.739 at p .101 on the Levene's Test. The results of this test indicate that no statistical significant differences in variances among Chiefs and HR professionals were found.

On question 6, the mean for the Officer cohort was 3.78 (sd = .797). A t-test to determine if the group mean was statistically different from what one might get by chance was conducted against an expected mean of 3. The t was 29.384, df = 906, an observed significance of .000 (2-tailed), and a mean difference of .777, which indicated that the group mean was statistically significantly different from one might expect from chance.

The mean for Baby Boomers was 3.82 (sd = .734), 3.76 (sd = .824) for Gen X and 3.77 (sd = .767) for Gen Y. An ANOVA was conducted to determine equality of means. The reported F (2, 904) of .512 had a p of .599, indicated that the means are not statistically significantly different from each other. The results of this analysis would indicate that Officers would agree or strongly agree that people interested in pursuing police careers are motivated by feelings of helping others.

Based on the analysis for both Chiefs/HR professionals and Officer groups for questions 5 and 6 people are not motivated more by money compared to feelings of helping other people. Test results against the stated hypothesis indicated that insufficient evidence exists to reject the null hypothesis at this point. It does not appear that generational groups have shifted their motivations from feelings of helping others to money. For further analysis, we turn to questions 14 and 15.

Question 14 identified eight (8) factors: income, benefits, opportunities for self-improvement, retirement benefits, prestige, job security, promoting justice, and helping people as motivational factors associated with choosing to become police officers. The respondents were asked to rank, from 1 being the most important motivator to 8 being the least important

factor, what they believed motivated them to seek a law enforcement career. It is important to note that this question focused on the incumbents' decision to select a police career. The rankings were not reverse-coded prior to the analysis. Therefore, a higher mean would indicate a lower ranking of the variable and a low mean a higher importance.

The top four motivators identified by the groups, except job security, are considered intrinsic variables. They were "Helping People" (mean = 2.90), "Promote Justice" (mean = 3.30), "Job Security" (mean = 3.88), and "Prestige" (mean = 4.56). The last four factors, except "Self-improvement," are considered extrinsic motivators. They were "Retirement Benefits" (mean = 4.99), "Self-Improvement" (mean = 5.14), "Benefits" (mean = 5.31), and "Income" (mean = 5.36). Benefits and income were rated either 7th or 8th by all three groups. Table 4.7 describes the group mean, along with the means and rankings of the group and by generation.

Table 4.7 Ranking of Positive Motivational Factors

Rankings	Group Mean/N/Rank	Baby Boomer Mean/N/Rank	Gen X Mean/N/Rank	Gen Y Mean/N/Rank
Helping People	2.90/798/1	2.92/205/1	2.90/536/1	2.91/57/1
Promote Justice	3.30/856/2	3.34/224/2	3.30/574/2	3.21/58/2
Job Security	3.88/889/3	3.68/242/3	3.92/589/3	4.24/58/3
Prestige	4.56/843/4	4.75/225/4	4.50/561/4	4.49/57/4
Retirement Benefits	4.99/815/5	4.98/221/5	4.99/540/5	4.98/54/5
Self Improvement	5.14/799/6	5.0/206/6	5.20/537/6	4.98/54/6
Benefits	5.31/802/7	5.20/204/8	5.34/540/7	5.48/58/8
Income	5.36/822/8	5.09/215/7	5.46/550/8	5.39/57/7

These ranking tend to indicate that the generational groups are very close in the primary motivators that entered into their decision making process to choose to become police officers. Furthermore, intrinsic factors are listed as being most important in the motivators, across generational groups, for having chosen to become police officers. The only exception was job security which was rated as 3rd most important by all groups and is considered an extrinsic motivator.

A t-test was conducted of the group means to determine if they were different than could be expected by chance. The test was conducted against an expected mean of 4. The

results of the analysis are reported in Table 4.8. All the factors, except job security, were significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. Job security was significant at the $p \leq .10$ level. This would indicate that all motivational factors appear to be important to incumbents in why they chose to become police officers at either the $p < .05$ or $< .10$ level.

Table 4.8 Results of t-test for Motivational Factors

Factor	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff
Income	18.942	821	.000	1.358
Benefits	20.516	801	.000	1.312
Self Improvement	15.528	798	.000	1.135
Help People	-14.447	797	.000	-1.096
Retirement Benefits	13.991	814	.000	.985
Prestige	6.844	842	.000	.565
Promote Justice	-9.575	855	.000	-.699
Job Security	-1.708	888	.088	-.121

Three of the top four motivators identified by the cohort of respondents were intrinsic motivators. Job security, number three, is the only motivator of the top four that might be considered an extrinsic motivator. Clearly, respondents are concerned with job security, more than prestige of the job, retirement benefits, opportunities for self-improvement, work related benefits, and income.

An ANOVA was conducted to determine if the means of the three groups were statistically different. The results of this analysis are found in Table 4.9. There were three primary groups to be analyzed in this section. The three groups were defined by generational groupings. The groups were dummy coded with 0 = Baby Boomer, 1 = Gen X and 2 = Gen Y.

Table 4.9 ANOVA of Motivational Factors

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Income					
Between Groups	21.397	2	10.699	2.543	.079
Within Groups	3445.450	819	4.207		
Total	3466.847	821			
Benefits					
Between Groups	4.771	2	2.385	.727	.484
Within Groups	2621.299	799	3.281		
Total	626.070	801			

Table 4.9 – Continued

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Self Improvement					
Between Groups	7.145	2	3.573	.836	.434
Within Groups	3400.257	796	4.272		
Total	3407.402	798			
Help People					
Between Groups	.062	2	.031	.007	.993
Within Groups	3663.508	795	4.603		
Total	3663.570	797			
Retire Benefits					
Between Groups	.005	2	.002	.001	.999
Within Groups	3289.818	812	4.052		
Total	3289.823	814			
Prestige					
Between Groups	10.673	2	5.336	.930	.395
Within Groups	4820.554	840	5.739		
Total	4831.227	842			
Promote Justice					
Between Groups	.855	2	.428	.094	.911
Within Groups	3895.383	853	4.567		
Total	3896.238	855			
Job Security					
Between Groups	18.197	2	9.098	2.028	.132
Within Groups	3974.683	886	4.486		
Total	3992.880	888			

The ANOVA indicated that there were no statistical differences between the means at the $p \leq .05$ level. However, the F for "Income" was just under $p < .10$. A Post Hoc test utilizing Tukey's B failed to indicate any statistical significance between the means of the three groups.

An ordinal regression was conducted of the eight variables, identified as motivators, to determine if any relationships between the dependent variables and the independent variables existed. Ordinal regression is similar to a logistic regression and is related to the proportional odds model of an event occurring, different from zero, and is particularly valid where the variables are ordinal level (Norusis, 2010). Ordinal regression must be assessed with three other analyses (Garson, 2011): model fitting, goodness-of-fit, and test of parallel lines. Refer to Appendix E for the analysis results. It is also noted that the analysis utilized for goodness-of-fit and the test of parallel lines are subject to error in cases of large sample sizes (Garson, 2011,

p. 5).

The independent variables were re-coded into dummy variables for generation, short and long tenure versus medium tenure, sex, race, and education. The purpose of this analysis was to identify any independent variables that have a proportional odds relationship with the dependent variable that are the best predictors for persons who may be interested in pursuing police careers. For a complete review of the ordinal regression tables conducted on all eight dependent variables, refer to Appendix E.

For the dependent variable “benefits”, the independent variables “generation” (Baby Boomer) and “race” (whites) were significant at the $p \leq .10$ level. Baby Boomers had an estimate of -.543, Wald = 2.697, df = 1, and p of .101. This finding would suggest that Baby Boomers are less likely to be positively influenced to choose to become a police officer based on benefits. Race (whites) had an estimate of .290, Wald = 2.654, df = 1, and p of .103. Whites are more likely to choose to become police officers based on benefits. Upon review of the Wald statistics for the significant independent variables in the current model, no other model of independent variables could be identified that might increase the size of the Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) of .010. This is similar to an R-Squared statistic; however, interpretation of the total relationship explained utilizing the Pseudo R-Squared is not as straightforward (Garson, 2011). However, it should be noted that according to the model fitting analysis for this factor the assumption for this model was violated, and the results should be evaluated accordingly.

The dependent variable “self-improvement” had a statistically significant relationship with “race” (whites) also with an estimate of -.319, Wald = 3.119, df = 1 and a p of .077. Whites, it suggests, are less motivated by opportunities for self improvement as a motivator to choose to become a police officer than all other races. The Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) for this model was .013. However, according to the model fitting analysis for this factor the assumption for this model was violated and the results should be evaluated accordingly.

Upon review of the results, the only independent variable with a statistical significance

of p < .05, for the dependent variable, “help people,” was race (whites) with an estimate of -.490, Wald = 7.344, df = 1, p .007. The Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) for this model was .014. Interpreting this finding would suggest that whites are less motivated in helping people as a motive for choosing to become a police officer compared to all other races. However, according to the model fitting analysis for this factor the assumption for this model was violated, and the results should be evaluated accordingly.

For the dependent variable “prestige,” the independent variable “gender” (males) had an estimate of -.632, Wald = 11.962, df = 1, p .001. The Pseudo R-Square for this model was .019. This model could not be modified to improve the Pseudo R-Square. This finding would suggest that males are less motivated by ideals of prestige as a motivator to choose to become a police officer than females. All other analyses relative to this model indicated no violations of assumptions for model fitting, goodness-of-fit, and test of parallel lines.

Generally, it is clear that other factors, unidentified by this research project, have a significant impact on what motivates a person to choose to become a police officer. While the models chosen for this analysis controlled for the various independent variables believed to have some relationship with choosing to become a police officer, the amount of the relationship explained in the current models, while significant, was very low. Possibly, geography or place of employment may be a factor that was not considered in this project. These omitted factors may have some impact on income, benefits, or other factors that may be considered important for one to choose the law enforcement career.

For purposes of this hypothesis, the analysis of those items identified as motivators in question 14 has failed to indicate any significant relationship that would justify the rejection of the null hypothesis. With the exception of the rating of job security as number 3 most important motivator, respondents clearly indicated perceptions that would suggest a very high level of intrinsic motivation for having chosen to become police officers.

Relative to this research project, a process of reframing the motivators for one’s own

choice for choosing to become a police officer was undertaken. In this case, respondents were asked to rate several factors identified as de-motivators that negatively influence others from choosing to pursue law enforcement careers. Of those factors previously listed as motivators, seven (7) factors with slight changes in factor labeling were listed as de-motivators.

Question 15 identified seven factors that might be associated with factors that in the respondents' opinion were de-motivators for choosing to become police officers. The de-motivating factors were: opportunity for self-improvement, benefits, money, public perception, working holidays, lack of control over work schedules, and shift work. The respondents were asked to rate the factors from one (1) being the most important de-motivating factor to seven (7) being the least important de-motivator. Table 4.10 shows the group ranking and its mean along with the various generational group means.

Table 4.10 Ranking of Negative Motivational Factors

Rankings	Group Mean/N/Rank	Baby Boomer Mean/N/Rank	Gen X Mean/N/Rank	Gen Y Mean/N/Rank
Shift Work	2.76/821/1	2.57/214/1	2.76/552/1	3.60/55/4
Lack Control Over Work Schedules	2.88/856/2	2.87/227/2	2.89/574/2	2.85/55/1
Work Holidays	3.01/830/3	3.11/219/3	2.97/554/3	3.09/57/2
Pub Perception	3.77/849/4	3.84/226/4	3.80/567/4	3.13/56/3
Money	4.25/839/5	4.32/224/5	4.25/558/5	3.88/57/5
Benefits	5.25/850/6	5.20/225/6	5.26/569/6	5.29/56/6
OpSelfImprovement	5.78/878/7	5.58/236/7	5.84/583/7	5.98/59/7

The results of the rankings were not reverse-coded. Therefore, a relative low mean indicates a high ranking and a mean closer to 7 indicates a low ranking. The number one negative motivational factor was "shift work" (mean = 2.76) followed by "Lack of Control Over Work Schedules" (mean = 2.88), "Working Holidays" (mean = 3.01), "Public Perception" (mean = 3.77), "Money" (mean = 4.25), "Benefits" (mean = 5.25), and "Opportunity for Self-Improvement" (mean = 5.78) last. Baby Boomers and Gen X respondents ranked all de-motivators the same 1 to 7. However, Gen Y rated "Lack of Control over Work Schedules", with a mean of 2.85 (n=55), as its number one de-motivator, "Work Holidays" (mean = 3.09, n = 57)

2nd, “Public Perception” (mean = 3.13, n = 56) as 3rd, and “Shift Work” (mean = 3.60, n = 55) as 4th. The last three de-motivators, “Money,” “Benefits,” and “Opportunity for Self-Improvement” were rated 5th, 6th, and 7th by all generational groups.

The questions were further evaluated for the three generational groups. Question 24 of the Officer questionnaire asked respondents to classify themselves into one of five age groups. The age ranges for these groups were identical to those groups identified in Chapter 1. However, those age groupings were re-coded into three groups, 0 = Baby Boomer and up, 1 = Generation X, and 2 = Generation Y.

A t-test was conducted of question 15 to determine those factors that are perceived as de-motivators across the generational groups against an expected mean of 4. All factors were significant at the .001 level ($p \leq .001$). Table 4.11 further describes the test results.

Table 4.11 Results of t-test for Negative Motivational Factors

Factor	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Diff
Shift Work	-21.068	820	.000	-1.235
LackControlWkSched	-21.826	855	.000	-1.117
Work Holidays	-19.759	829	.000	-.986
Public Perception	-3.348	848	.001	-.232
Money	3.998	838	.000	.246
Benefits	24.616	849	.000	1.247
OpSelfImprovement	33.722	877	.000	1.779

An ANOVA of the factors in question 15 was conducted. Refer to Table 4.12 and Table 4.12 – Continued for details. Three factors were considered statistically significantly different: “shift work,” $F(2,818)$, 8.323, $p \leq .001$; “public perception,” $F(2,846)$, 3.075, $p \leq .05$; and “opportunities for self-Improvement” (OpSelfImprove), $F(2, 875)$, 2.84, $p < .10$.

Table 4.12 ANOVA of Negative Motivational Factors

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Shift Work					
Between Groups	46.142	2	23.071	8.323	.000
Within Groups	2267.487	818	2.772		
Total	2313.630	820			

Table 4.12 – Continued

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Work Holidays					
Between Groups	3.143	2	1.571	.761	.468
Within Groups	1708.684	827	2.066		
Total	1711.827	829			
LackCtrlWkSched					
Between Groups	.101	2	.050	.22	.978
Within Groups	1916.217	853	2.246		
Total	1916.318	855			
PublicPerception					
Between Groups	24.951	2	12.476	3.075	.047
Within Groups	3432.337	846	4.057		
Total	3457.289	848			
Money					
Between Groups	9.052	2	4.526	1.432	.239
Within Groups	2642.368	836	3.161		
Total	2651.421	838			
Benefits					
Between Groups	.707	2	.353	.162	.851
Within Groups	1851.411	847	2.186		
Total	1852.118	849			
OpSelfImprove					
Between Groups	13.837	2	6.919	2.843	.059
Within Groups	2129.297	875	2.433		
Total	2143.134	877			

A Post Hoc test utilizing Tukey's B statistic indicated that the mean for Gen Y was significantly different than the means for both Baby Boomers and Gen X on both “shift work” and “public perception” as de-motivators. The Post Hoc test for “OpSelfImprove” did not indicate a significant difference. Generation Y perceives that people are more affected by negative perception of police officers than Baby Boomers and Generation X in this factor being a de-motivator to choosing a police career. However, Generation Y’s perception is that persons interested in seeking a police career are less affected by shift work than either Baby Boomers or Generation X.

An ordinal regression was conducted of the seven variables, identified as de-motivators, or negative motivational factors, to determine if any relationships between the dependent variables and the independent variables existed. The independent variables re-

coded into dummy variables were generation, short and long tenure versus medium tenure, sex, race, and education. Ordinal regression, again, is similar to a logistic regression and is related to the proportional odds model of an event occurring that is statistically significantly different from zero (Norusis, 2010). The goal was to identify any independent variables that have a proportional odds relationship with the dependent variable that are the best predictors for factors that negatively influence persons who may be interested in pursuing police careers. Upon review of the results, several independent variables were significant with the various dependent variables at the $p \leq .05$ and $p \leq .10$ levels. Again, for further information, refer to Appendix E, to review the ordinal regression tables.

For the dependent variable, "shiftwork," gender (male = 0), Generations (0 and 1) and Short Tenure compared to Medium Tenure (Medium Tenure = 0) were found to be significantly related. The independent variable Gender, males = 0, the estimate was -.293, Wald 2.578, df = 1, $p < .10$. This would suggest that males perceive that shift work, as a de-motivator, is less of a deterrent to people pursuing police jobs. The independent variable, Generation, Baby Boomer = 0, the estimate was -.657, Wald 3.811, df = 1, $p < .10$ and Gen X = 1, the estimate was -.546, Wald 3.565, df = 1, $p < .10$. This suggests that both Baby Boomers and Gen X perceive shift work to be less of a de-motivator for those considering a career in policing compared to Gen Y. Finally, the independent variable, Short Tenure (compared to Medium Tenure = 0), with an estimate of -.338, Wald 2.848, df = 1, $p < .10$. This finding suggests that Medium Tenured respondents perceive shift work to be less of a deterrent for individuals interested in pursuing a police career than Short Tenured police officers. Changing the model to account for just these three variables in the model failed to improve the Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) from .032. In fact, reducing the model to these three factors reduced the Pseudo R-Square.

According to the goodness-of-fit analysis for the ordinal regression for "shiftwork," the results for the Pearson Chi-Square of 316.161, df = 269, $p < .05$ suggest a violation of this model. However, as was previously pointed out, this analysis is subject to error for large sample

sizes. Therefore, interpretation of the significance of this variable must be weighed against this condition.

The results of the ordinal regression for the dependent variable, “lack of control over work schedules” (LackControlWk), identified the independent variable, “gender” (male = 0), as being significant with an estimate of .395, Wald 4.770, df = 1, $p < .05$. However, the Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) for this model was only .008. Reviewing the Wald numbers failed to identify other variables that might create a better model to increase the size of the Pseudo R-Square. The interpretation of this finding suggests that males perceive lack of control over work to be more of a de-motivator to people who may be interested in choosing to become police officers than do females. The model fitting analysis indicates a violation of the assumptions of this test. The test of parallel lines indicates a possible violation of the assumption that this model is a well fitting model. However, as with the goodness-of-fit test, this test is subject to error from large sample sizes. Appropriate consideration must be given to this finding.

Reviewing the results for the dependent variable, “public perception” (PubPerception), the independent variable, “generation” (Gen X = 1) had an estimate of .515, Wald 3.148, df = 1, $p < .10$. The Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) for this model was very small at .011. Reducing the model to fewer independent variables did not improve the explained relationship of the model. Tests for model fitting, goodness-of-fit, and test of parallel lines indicate a problem with this model. The model fitting test indicates that the research model, compared against the full model, is not a good model. However, the other two tests are subject to error with high sample sizes. Accordingly, appropriate consideration must be given to this finding.

For the dependent variable, “opportunity for self-improvement” (OpSelfImprove), “race” (whites = 0), “generations” (Baby Boomer = 0) and “Long Tenure compared to Medium Tenure” (Medium Tenure = 0) were found to be significant. The estimate for “race” (whites = 0) was .400, Wald 5.043, df = 1, $p < .00$. This finding indicates that whites consider the opportunities for self-improvement to be more of a de-motivator to people who might be interested in pursuing a

police career than “other” races. Generations, Baby Boomers specifically, with an estimate of -.973, Wald 7.902, df = 1, $p < .05$ with a statistical significance of $p < .05$, perceive opportunities for self-improvement to be less important as a de-motivator.

Finally, medium tenured officers with an estimate of -.467, Wald 7.447, df = 1, $p < .05$, perceive that opportunities for self-improvement are less of a de-motivator to person interested in pursuing a law enforcement career than do long tenured officers. The Pseudo R-Square (Negelkerke) for this model was .028. Again, this indicates a very small portion of the relationship is explained in this model. However, changing the model to include only those factors with a Wald of 5 or higher did not improve the Pseudo R-Square score. In fact, the overall score went down, which means even though most of the other independent variables, although not statistically significant, did add explanatory power to the model.

According to the regression models run, there were no significant relationships between the dependent variables “working holidays,” “money” and “benefits.” This is not to suggest that these variables are not important to people who may be interested in pursuing a police career. The results of this analysis suggest that they are not considered statistically significantly different than what the group as a whole believes are good predictors of choosing to become a police officer.

As the analysis concerns de-motivators, the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. The hypothesis that the generations have shifted their preference for control over extrinsic factors is confirmed by the analysis. Utilizing an ANOVA, Gen Y indicated that “lack of control over work schedules” was its number one ranked de-motivator, which was different from Baby Boomers and Gen X. However, Gen Y indicated that they were less concerned with “shift work” than were Baby Boomers and Gen X. This result clearly indicates a shift, although in a direction that was not expected.

4.1.9 Hypothesis 4

Incumbent police officers perceive the existence of a relatively poor social prestige

(employment externalities) associated with serving in police agencies.

Respondents were asked to rank their perception of the affects of negative publicity on the choice of people willing to become police officers. The null hypothesis states that incumbent officers do not perceive relatively poor social prestige associated with serving in police agencies. Question 7 on both the Chiefs/HR and the Officer surveys asked respondents to rank their perception that the negative general media presentation of police officers discourages people from considering a law enforcement career, from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Again, the question was coded with strongly disagree with a 1 through 5 for strongly agree. While chiefs HR professionals were asked to express their perception on this question, for purposes of the hypothesis, the Officer group is the primary focus for analysis. The Chief/HR group statistics will be included for comparison only.

When asked if negative publicity presented by the media discourages people from seeking law enforcement careers (Q7), 62.3% (43 of 69) of Chiefs agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Of the HR professional group, only 24.5% (14 of 53) likewise agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. The oppositional positions of these two groups resulted in a group mean that was very nearly the same as the predicted mean of 3. The mean for the Chief group was 3.07 (sd = 1.081). A t-test to determine if the group mean was significantly different from what might be expected by chance compared against an expected mean of 3 was conducted. The observed value was t = .670, with 121 degrees of freedom, a p value of .504, and a mean difference of .066, which indicates that the mean of the group is not that statistically different than what might be expected by chance.

For Chiefs, the mean was 3.35 (sd = 1.069) and 2.70 (sd = .992). A t-test was conducted to determine if the equality of means was statistically significantly different. The observed t of 3.433, df = 120, and a significance of $p \leq .001$ indicates that the means are statistically different from each other. The test for equality of variances resulted in an F of 1.180 and a significance of .280 on the Levene's Test, which indicates that the variances are not

statistically significantly different. This analysis suggests that Chiefs consider the negative depiction of police officers by the media as being more of a discouragement to potential applicants than do HR professionals.

On this question (Q7), incumbent officers indicated a group mean of 3.34 (sd = 1.127), which is more to the agree end of the spectrum. A t-test was conducted of this group mean against an expected mean of 3. The observed t was 8.979, df = 907, a sig. (2-tailed) of .000, and a mean difference of .336. This test indicated that the group mean is different than what one might expect by chance.

Furthermore, 53.4% (132 of 247) of the Baby Boomers agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. For Gen X, 58.7% (352 of 601) also agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. Gen Y respondents agreed or strongly agreed with this statement 70% (42 of 60) of the time.

Further analysis of the answers to this question by the incumbent officers indicated that the mean for Baby Boomers was 3.25 (sd = 1.105), for Gen X 3.34 (sd = 1.126), and 3.65 (sd = 1.91) for Gen Y. An ANOVA was conducted to determine if the means were different statistically from each other. The results were F (2, 905) of 3.046, p of .048. This finding suggests that the means are statistically different; however, it does not indicate where the difference is. A Post Hoc test utilizing a Tukey's B statistic was conducted to determine where that difference might be. The result was that Gen Y was statistically different from both Baby Boomers and Gen X. The mean for Gen Y was 3.65, which is a mean closer to agree than disagree. Therefore, Gen Y considers negative publicity to be more of a discouragement to people interested in pursuing a law enforcement career than do either Baby Boomers or Gen X.

Considering the results of this analysis, the null hypothesis that negative publicity has no impact on people who are interested in seeking law enforcement careers is rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. Furthermore, the perception of Gen Y is statistically significantly different from Baby Boomers and Gen X in their perception of whether negative publicity is a

discouragement to people pursuing a law enforcement career; therefore, the null hypothesis that the generational groups are not significantly different from each other on this perception is also rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis.

While Chiefs and HR professionals differ significantly from each other on their perception, this difference does not offer explanatory value to the measurement of the research hypothesis. It is interesting to note that these two groups are diametrically opposed to each other on their perception of whether negative media portrayal of police officers has a discouraging impact on those who might be interested in pursuing a law enforcement career. This should point to a need for dialogue between these two important players in SHRM for police agencies.

4.1.10 Hypothesis 5

There is a cultural shift among police officers, particularly of the youngest incumbents, known as Generation X and Generation Y, which has caused a greater interest in their preferences for control over leisure activities, regardless of salary.

Question 8 on both the Chief/HR Professional and Officer surveys was designed to answer this hypothesis. The primary group of interest for this hypothesis is the incumbent officer group. However, the analysis on the Chief survey is included for comparison purposes. The item asks respondents for their perception of a statement stating that work schedules of police officers discourages people who may be interested in a law enforcement career from pursuing a police job. The null hypothesis states that there has been no cultural shift among officers that has caused a greater interest in their preferences for control over leisure activities, regardless of salary. Respondents were asked to rate their perception on a Likert-scale from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree. As utilized previously, a rating of 3 indicates a “no opinion” or ambivalence option.

When Chiefs responded to this statement, 66.67% (46 of 69) agreed or strongly agreed with this statement, whereas 30.2% (16 of 53) of the HR professionals did so. The group mean

was 3.12 (sd = 1.057). A t-test was conducted to determine if this mean is statistically significantly different from an expected mean of 3. The results indicated that the observed value was 1.285, df = 121, p = .201, and a mean difference of .123. Based on this t-test, the group mean is not significantly different from the expected mean.

The mean for Chiefs was 3.42 (n = 69) (sd = .991). The mean for HR professionals was 2.74 (n = 53) (sd = 1.022). A t-test for equality of mean was conducted to determine if the means of these two groups was statistically significantly different from one another. The t was 3.730, df = 120, sig. (2-tailed) was .000, and a mean difference of .684. A t-test for equality of variance was conducted with an F of .061 and a significance of .806 in the Levene's Test, which means the variances were equal. This would indicate that the Chiefs consider work schedules to be more of discouragement to potential candidates than HR professionals.

When the incumbent officers were asked their perception of this statement, 61.3% of the Baby Boomers (152 of 248) indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. For Gen X, 60% (363 of 605) stated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Of the Gen Y respondents, 58.33% (35 of 60), agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. The group mean was 3.36 (sd = 1.052). A t-test of the group mean was conducted against an expected mean of 3. The observed t was 10.314, df = 912, was significant (2-tailed) at the .000 level, with a mean difference of .359.

The mean for Baby Boomers was 3.36 (sd = 1.060), for Gen X the mean was 3.35 (sd = 1.042), and for Gen Y the mean was 3.42 (sd = 1.139). An ANOVA was conducted of the generational means to determine if they were statistically significantly different. The F (2, 910), was .105, with a p of .901. The means were not statistically different from each other.

Taken as a whole, one can deduce that Chiefs, Baby Boomers, Gen X, and Gen Y police officers believe that the work schedules of police officers discourages people who might be interested in seeking a law enforcement career. However, HR professionals do not believe that work schedules pose such a deterrent. Finally, since this hypothesis is focused on

incumbent police officers along generational lines, it is statistically significant across all generational groups that they believe work schedules are statistically significant and relate to their interest of controlling their work schedules. While it is not possible, given the parameters of this question, to link work schedules alone to interests of leisurely activities, one can deduce a connection between work schedules and interests in leisure activities of people who might seek a law enforcement career.

Based on the overall analysis, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected in that there does not appear to be a shift among the generational groups. While all three generational groups believe that work schedules, alibi preference for leisure activities, is statistically significant, there does not seem to be a shift across the generational groups, particularly among the two youngest cohorts of incumbent police officers, Gen X and Gen Y.

4.2 Summary

This research project resulted in a number of interesting, unexpected, and enlightening findings. The difficulty with this type of research, particularly when one is attempting to determine what motivates and de-motivates people relative to career choices, is that most people will inform you of why they made a decision based on the most positive light that their decisions, or outcomes, places them. However, it is always hoped by a process of anonymity, almost made certain by survey research methodologies, that the responses are more open, honest, and truly reflective of “real world” perceptions relative to the interests of the research project.

Many questions were asked of both Chief/HR professionals and incumbent police officers that attempted to identify and isolate perceptions held by the various respondent groups that answered the stated hypotheses contained in the research project. The size of the respondent groups was large enough to consider the results statistically significant. However, not all of the responses were statistically significantly different so as to reject the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the various respondent groups. As a result, even when

the alternative hypotheses could not be accepted, the results were different from what was expected, and these findings, in and of themselves, were valuable findings.

First, the alternative hypothesis for H1 is accepted, and the null hypothesis is rejected. Chiefs/HR respondents, the primary focus group for this hypothesis, indicated that there is a perceived shortage of persons interested in pursuing entry-level police jobs. This substantiates the “crisis in blue” portion of this research project.

The null hypothesis for H2a cannot be rejected based on the results of the statistical analysis. Of interest, were the questions related to the state of the economy and whether, given a change in the economy, the officers would change careers. This question served as a proxy for job satisfaction and while not specifically a topic of interest in this project, does indicate that incumbent police officers, across all generational groups, are very satisfied with their careers. This reinforces the idea that a profession’s best recruiters are its own participants. This is good news for law enforcement agencies since they can build on this relative job satisfaction scale for development of a strategy to counter the crisis in blue cycle that most chiefs believe exists at the entry-level police level.

Both respondents groups, Chiefs/HR professionals and incumbent officers, would recommend the law enforcement career to other people. Therefore, the null hypothesis for H_2b cannot be rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. However, of interest is the relative decline of the positive recommendations by incumbent officers when that “other” person is either a relative or an adult child. The numbers then start to decline from relative to the lowest level of recommendation for a child. This could lead one to conclude that while incumbent officers are satisfied with their own career choice, there are factors that would influence them to not recommend the job to family members, children least of all.

According to the data analysis, the null for H3 cannot be rejected for motivators. The research did not indicate that the generational groups have shifted their career preferences from intrinsic to extrinsic motives. However, this is one area that was unexpected compared to what

one is led to believe from the literature review, at least as it relates to generational shifts. Clearly, across all generational groups, intrinsic motivators are still predominant as the reason one seeks to pursue public service. Therefore, PSM is supported in this research. Public service motivation was significantly important to all groups with Gen Y having the highest mean of the three groups. This finding is also supported when evaluating questions 14 and 15. However, on the de-motivator side of this question, there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, the research hypothesis is accepted in that there has been a shift among generational lines at least as that shift relates to control of work schedules. Gen Y listed this as the number one de-motivator to people pursuing entry-level positions. Whereas, Baby Boomer and Gen X rated it number two.

The null hypothesis for H4 is rejected in favor of the alternative. Both the Chiefs and incumbent police officers, the primary respondent groups for this project, indicated that relative negative portrayal of police officers by the media, a proxy for how the respondents perceive prestige, discourages persons who might be interested in pursuing law enforcement careers. It was interesting to find that HR professionals did not find negative publicity, or negative portrayal, of police officers to be a discouragement. This area, one might suggest, needs further exploration and dialogue between the various shareholders in recruiting, hiring, and retaining people for law enforcement careers to determine how this situation might be overcome or at least minimized.

Finally, the null hypothesis for H5 is not rejected. The primary focus for this hypothesis was on the relative attitudes of the various generational groups as to a desire to control their work schedules in favor of more opportunities to participate in leisure activities. Across all three generational groups, this factor was considered significant as it discourages people who might be interested in pursuing a law enforcement career. However, there was no statistically significant shift among the three cohorts. Therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMATION

When bad men combine, the good must associate;
else they will fall one by one, an unpitied sacrifice
in a contemptible struggle.

Edmund Burke
Thoughts on the Cause of
Present Miscontents

5.1 Conclusions and Recommendations

This research project has identified a significant phenomenon that has the potential for broad spectrum impacts on the policing profession directly and the public's safety indirectly. The applicant pool for entry-level police officers appear to have been constantly dwindling in the past ten years with no indication that this trend will reverse itself in the future without a direct attempt to change it. However, before this trend can be reversed or at least responded to, the variables that are causing this trend need to be identified. Once these variables are identified that have been positively associated with why an applicant applies for an entry level law enforcement position, policy formulation that might reverse this trend can be implemented.

The goal of this research project is to identify if there was a perceived decline in applicants interested in pursuing a law enforcement career. The data suggests that there is a real decline in persons who are applying to become entry-level police officers. While this research project did not directly address what can be done about this decline, information gleaned from this project can be utilized to build on the factors that promote a public safety career and minimize or address those factors that are considered negative influences. Police chiefs, HR professionals, city councils, city managers, and the public, in general, have a vested interest in aggressively pursuing strategies and tactics that can avert what is expected to be a crisis when those currently identified as Baby Boomers retire. Plus, the largest group identified

in this research occupying incumbent positions located at the upper end of the age scale, Gen X, are rapidly approaching retirement age or are making plans to transition out of law enforcement.

These two emerging trends will result in a crisis that, without attention, will leave many cities challenged to respond to human resources demands. The strategies and tactics likely to be employed to meet this demand curve might have outcomes that are detrimental to cities. Employers, crime control policy makers, and citizens may have no choice but to respond to this "crisis" with two dominant methods – increased salary demands, assuming throwing money at the employment issue can fix this problem, and exposure to an increase in crime due to an inability to meet human asset demands in police departments. These strategies do not control for population shifts, environmental conditions that might contribute to demands, an increase or decrease in crime, and other public safety issues.

5.1.1 Research Project Findings

Based on this research project, the results show that incumbents are still motivated to serve the public out of a sense of duty, helping people and seeing that justice is done. In addition, job satisfaction among incumbent police officers is high, and most did not enter the police profession due to the condition of our economy; however, some participants were motivated by the state of the economy. It would be interesting to replicate this study, in this same region, over the next decade, to determine if the results experienced in this project remain the same if the economy continues its downward trend (Wright & Grant, 2010). While money was not identified as a primary motivator or negative influence for people either occupying a police job or those who might be interested in pursuing a law enforcement career, money was not a "no factor" variable. Job security was also identified as a major concern to incumbent respondents. This could lead one to conclude that while most people who responded the survey were motivated by intrinsic rewards, one's own self-interest in job security was also important.

One who chooses the law enforcement career is motivated to serve in a public service

environment, but also desires to have job security in conditions that seem somewhat hostile or negative toward police officers. This is particularly important since the actions they take are related to protecting and serving their communities. It is clear that whatever strategy and tactics are enlisted to address the strategic human resource management issues surrounding the law enforcement profession, job security should be considered. Law enforcement agencies must alter their traditional hiring process that focus on behavioral issues such as illegal behavior, drug use and moral turpitude, and include methods that also focus on assessing PSM. Paarlberg, Perry, and Hondeghem (2008) recommend including PSM assessment tactics during the recruitment and hiring process to include multiple screening methods, such as (p. 270): situational judgment tests (SJTs), past-oriented interviews, performance connected to PSM, personality tests, interviews with human resource personnel and coworkers, situational tests, and realistic job interviews.

Generationally, officers, and by inference, those people who might be interested in a police career, are not that dissimilar except for the youngest generation, known as Gen Y. This group has, it seems, shifted, its priorities to include a desire to control work schedules so that they can be more balanced in work–life issues. This trend has been borne out in the literature and in this research project. How can the law enforcement profession address this issue when law enforcement agencies have 24/7/365 missions? Agency administrators should take a fresh look at schedule designs. They should capitalize on what can be done rather than focusing on what cannot be done with work schedules. Alternatives such as 12- and 10-hour shifts should be considered. Reduced work week hours might be an alternative, such as, 14-day schedules that require only 36 hour work weeks that can be achieved in as few as three days during any 7-day scheduling scheme. The point is not what cities, as employers, are giving away in view of personnel costs, but what is being avoided in terms of low recruitment and high turnover.

Based on the opinions of national experts, on differences between generational groups, law enforcement agencies are not exempt from the types of pressures that the younger

generations are bringing to the workplace. Many of those differences have been explored in this project. Some of those differences were dispelled, while others were identified and confirmed. What individual agencies, policy players, and labor groups do with this information will be a product of needs, interests, existing policies, and expectations. What must be done is to focus on the challenges presented by shifting values and interests of the various generational groups. Law enforcement agencies must recruit from these age groups to meet human resource demands.

5.1.2 National Recruitment Developments

Two recent developments deserve mention as possible alternatives or strategies to address the identified issues with applicant pools. Most departments, regardless of size, cannot afford the kind of advertising campaign that can positively impact the rate of police applicants similar to the success the United States military establishment has had since going all volunteer. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) recently launched their "Discover Policing" campaign with mailouts to Chiefs across the nation, informing them of resources available to them for recruiting people (2011). These resources include career information, job boards, online resume services, officer profiles, and agency directories. This is a great start, but what must be implemented is a national advertising campaign, funded by agencies with enough assets to fund such a campaign, which will not be inexpensive.

Another tactic recently implemented by the Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice is the program called, "A Call to Community Service: Law Enforcement Recruitment Toolkit," in conjunction with its "Hiring in the Spirit of Service" initiative. The motto of this campaign is "Serve your Community. Make a Difference."

These programs, while noble in intent and well designed, will not go far enough to help overcome the relative decline in applicant pools at the local level. These "tools" are directed at the local level where money assets are restricted and, thus, their reach will be limited. A national campaign might be implemented, utilizing messages that build on public service

motivation such as the, “Serve your community. Make a Difference.” motto of the new COPS Office initiative. This approach could make significant inroads in overcoming the perception that the media, nationally, regionally, and locally paint police officers in a negative light. In order for this campaign to be effective, it should be sponsored on the national level. That kind of effort will require considerable monetary resources. This campaign could be funded either by IACP or the Department of Justice, via the Community Policing Office (COPs), or a partnership of these entities with the states and cities.

5.1.3 Recruitment in the 21st Century

In order to be more effective at recruiting, particularly with the youngest cohort of the applicant pool, Gen Y, departments must unpack the prevailing hiring practices, policies about application processes, and expectations. Currently, the practice for many agencies subscribes to the belief that a lengthy, exhaustive application and processing period is necessary to determine who among the applicant pools is the most suitable for employment. Based on what has been discovered by reviewing the literature, Gen Y is the instant gratification generation (Twenge, 2006; Lancaster & Stillman, 2010). A department that takes up to a year to process applicants will find the potential candidate turned off, if still available, by this lack of “recognition” of his or her potential. In short, the traditional law enforcement organization with lengthy hiring processes will be too late to the party. The Gen Y applicant will seek out the employer that can move quickly and catches his or her attention most effectively. Many agencies still advertise their vacancies in newspapers. When, as a group, Gen Y rarely if ever reads newspapers, agencies would do better to glitz up their web page and expedite their application process. Agencies would be wise to create a process for keeping interested candidates informed as to the current status of their applications.

Robert Half International (2011) sponsored a survey of Gen Y workers to discover the “why” behind their differences as employees (p. 1). In the report of the survey, many of the myths associated with Gen Y were disputed and clarified. A number of strategies for improving

the recruitment efforts for the Gen Yer were identified. Among the findings of the internet interviews of 1,007 respondents, almost equally distributed among males and females, were certain realities. They are (p. 3-4):

- One-third of Gen Y respondents were concerned about finding/keeping a job, supporting themselves and their families, and "saving enough" money.
- Gen Y is focused on the future and worried about funding their retirement.
- 73 percent worry about balancing professional and personal obligations.
- They want frequent communications with the boss.
- They expect to pay their dues in different ways.

Twenge (2006) offers a litany of suggestions for employers to combat the negative aspects of the Generation Me, including Generations X and Y (p. 212-242):

- First, learn about and understand the various differences among and between the various generations.
- Counter the high entitlement self view and belief of large incomes and rapid promotion with values that support the idea that both come with patience and hard work.
- Let the Gen Me person know he or she is valued by praising and letting them know he or she is appreciated.
- Since this Gen Me cohort is not motivated by a sense of duty or the belief that hard work is rewarding in and of itself, he or she must be individually recognized and praised when high performance is achieved.
- Be direct.
- Since authority, at best, is neutral to the Gen Me person, one may have to work very hard to gain his or her respect. However, he or she is comfortable with making suggestions and participating in discussions when included.
- Gen Me's are "learn-by-doing" employees. Show them, but also allow them to do the tasks.
- Gen Me's are technology savvy employees and are not accustomed to laborious lectures. Use of role play and demonstration is advised.
- Coaching the Gen Me employee to be a bit more respectful to an older generation employee is in order.

- Implement flexible schedules and policies that allow for independence, if possible, because Gen Xer's demand life-work balance.

- Criticize the Gen Me by starting out with a positive comment or praise.

- The average Gen Me will probably have numerous jobs. Therefore, policies should be crafted in such a way as to not disenfranchise them because he or she has held many jobs.
- Salary is hugely important to the Generation Me employee, and policies must be aligned with this belief.

- Gen Me values the benefits package, including retirement packages.

- Since raising a family is of a high importance to the Gen Me employee, implementing policies and practices that enhance this priority will create excellent recruitment possibilities, such as, flexible schedules and the ability to work part-time once he or she has children.

For those agencies that focus on college graduates, Trahant (2008) has made several pointed suggestions to help facilitate recruiting them. Although his focus was on the federal service, his suggestions are valid for all sectors of public service who hope to recruit, hire and retain degreed applicants. His recommended steps are (Trahant, 2008, p. 37-40):

- Focus on streamlining the process
- Appeal to young people's values
- Build a strong agency brand
- Prequalify job candidates
- Use "high-touch" approaches
- Create employee-friendly workplaces
- Don't ignore the other generations

Perkins (2011) suggested at least 23 ways that governmental organizations can improve in their recruiting and retention efforts, which are (p. 2-3):

1. Website marketing – Facebook and Monster
2. Simplified position descriptions – make them exciting and positive; avoid jargon
3. Branding – focus on public service
4. Map your hiring process
5. Create a hiring plan
6. Employee referral program
7. Electronic requisition and applications
8. Career pathways
9. Cal-ICMA coaching program
10. Strategic workforce planning
11. Talent readiness assessment
12. Refine the role of senior managers

13. Conduct “stay” interviews
14. Management assistant or fellowship programs
15. Management talent exchange
16. Mentoring and early career experiences
17. Action learning teams
18. Transfer institutional knowledge
19. Life-work balance
20. Employee orientation or “onboarding”
21. Preventative health care programs
22. Ethics standards
23. Environmental responsibility

Included in this short but useful article is a web link for human resource professionals to get further information, www.icma.org/hiring2.0.

5.1.4 Policy Implications

Policy implications for the “new” applicant and retention of incumbents are numerous and include strategies that include focusing on balancing family and work demands. The Gen Y applicant values a modern and technological advanced workspace. Departments will make huge strides in recruitment opportunities if the young applicants see a modern, clean, and well kept work environment. Include within this space areas that provide for individuality and personal touches.

The Gen Y applicant will require a competitive salary with flexible benefits packages. However, they will demand emphasis be placed on working relationships that capitalize on their collaborative and creative skills developed since they were young. They will require extreme, hands-on, mentoring and ethics training programs that includes complete and honest descriptions of their job duties and work expectations. Gen Y employees will not hesitate to vote with their feet and leave if they feel that they have been misled about what they can expect in the way of pay, training opportunities, work schedules, and opportunities for participation in decisions that affect them. A department should consider implementing participatory management styles and power-sharing mechanisms that will lead the Gen Y employee to believe that their opinions are heard and matter.

The Gen Y applicant, once hired, may need additional training and coaching in anger

management and impulsive behaviors. These young people have been participants rather than competitors. They will need coaching to develop their interpersonal and problem solving skills. These “new” employees do not receive criticism well or at least in the traditional manner. First, praise is always a good place to start when dealing with a shortcoming with any employee, but this is certainly true when dealing with a Gen Y employee. They will respond better if told about something they do well and then transition into the area needed attention. Bottom line, however, is that a Gen Y must be held accountable and early on or he or she will feel compromised and defeated.

Finally, a police department should not forget about the other generations. The Gen X applicant has a great deal to offer and will be on the work scene for another 20 to 30 years. The second-career applicant who brings a good work ethic and stable background is a valuable commodity. This will be especially salient when the crisis in police recruitment hits its apex.

5.2 Summary

One can see that the employment environment for law enforcement agencies is shifting and at an explosive rate. Without a clear idea of what strategies and tactics can be utilized to recruit, hire, and retain peace officers, law enforcement agencies are on a collision course with a serious public safety service failure. The crisis in blue seems to be real. According to results of this research project, the primary focus for recruitment efforts should be a focus on public service and making a difference in society and/or the community.

Law enforcement agencies must become more like light infantry, able to move fast, rather than like slow-moving artillery, in recruiting efforts aimed at the new generation of people for entry-level police jobs. Unpacking and repacking recruitment, processing, hiring, development, and retention systems are necessary if law enforcement agencies are going to be successful in their strategic human resource management objectives.

Finally, chiefs of police and human resource professionals must become equally informed shareholders in this looming crisis. Utilizing current, cutting-edge, generationally

sensitive information to effectively recruit the next generation of applicants will require constant attention and effort, which cannot be accomplished piecemeal.

It is hoped that this project has provided real-world information that will assist shareholders in making informed decisions about personnel management of law enforcement agencies in the 21st Century. This project could not have been possible without the active participation of chiefs, human resource professionals, and police officers who share in one goal: to protect and serve.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT FOR SURVEYS

My name is GM Cox. I am conducting this research project as part of my dissertation at the University of Texas at Arlington. The title of my research project is, “Crisis in Blue: Public Service Motivation and Changes in Generational Preferences to Become Police Officers.” The purpose of this research project is to investigate the current state and future trend of employment in the career field of law enforcement. Your participation is totally voluntary and greatly appreciated and your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitle. You may stop your participation in the study at anytime or not answer any question you find objectionable without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Every attempt will be made to see that your study results are kept confidential. A copy of the records from this study will be stored in Office 501b of University Hall for at least three (3) years after the end of this research. The information may be stored on a password protected computer at UTA.

If, in the unlikely event it becomes necessary for the Institutional Review Board to review your research records, then the University of Texas at Arlington will protect the confidentiality of your consent unless required by law or a court order. The data resulting from your participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. By participating in this research project and taking about 10 minutes out of your day to take this questionnaire, you will be helping advance the state of knowledge about choosing a law enforcement career. You must be over 18 years old to participate in this study. If you have any questions related to this survey or research project, please call me at (972) 468-4212.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY FOR GROUP ONE: CHIEFS AND HUMAN RESOURCE DIRECTORS

Chiefs/Human Resource Professionals Survey

Section 1: Welcome

By choosing “accept” below, you confirm that you have read or had this document read to you. You have been informed about this study’s purpose, procedures, possible benefits and risks, and you have received a copy of this form. You have the opportunity to ask questions at anytime.

You voluntarily agree to participate in this study?

__ Accept __ Decline

Section 2:

Indicate your opinion on the following statements by rating your answers from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree or by rankings, as indicated.

1. People are just as willing to become police officers today as 5 years ago.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

2. People are just as willing to become police officers today as 10 years ago.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

3. Law enforcement agencies are getting sufficient qualified applicants to meet the demand to fill vacancies.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

4. Law enforcement agencies are getting sufficient qualified applicants to meet future needs.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

5. People interested in law enforcement careers are motived to become police officers for money.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

6. People interested in careers in law enforcement are motivated to become police officers by feelings of helping people.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

7. The negative general media presentation of police officers discourages people from considering a law enforcement career.

__ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

8. The work schedules of officers discourages people from considering a law enforcement career.

   __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

9. I would recommend a career in law enforcement to others.

   __ Yes ___ No

10. I believe that there exists a shortage in the number of people willing to become police officers.

    __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

Section 3: Demographic Information

11. Gender

    ____ Male ____ Female

12. Ethnicity

    ___ White

    ___ Black

    ___ American Indian

    ___ Middle Eastern

    ___ Hispanic

    ___ Other

13. What is your level of education

    ___ High School Diploma/GED

    ___ Some college

    ___ Undergraduate Degree

    ___ Some graduate hours

    ___ Graduate Degree (MS, MA, MPA, MBA, etc.)

___ Some post-graduate hours

___ Post-Graduate Degree (PhD, ED, etc.)

14. How long have you been a police chief or HR professional?

___ Less than 1 year

___ 1 to 5 years

___ 6 to 10 years

___ 11 to 15 years

___ 16 to 20 years

___ over 20 years

15. Age Group

___ 65 or Older

___ 47 to 64 years of age

___ 28 to 46 years of age

___ 24 to 27 years of age

___ 19 to 23 years of age

16. I am a: (Choose only one)

___ Chief Police Administrator

___ Human Resources Director/Manager

Section 4: End of Survey

Thank you for participating in this research project.

APPENDIX C

SURVEY FOR GROUP TWO: POLICE OFFICERS

Police Officers (All sworn officers below rank of Police Chief) Survey

Section 1: Welcome

By choosing “accept” below, you confirm that you have read or had this document read to you. You have been informed about this study’s purpose, procedures, possible benefits and risks, and you have received a copy of this form. You have the opportunity to ask questions at anytime.

You voluntarily agree to participate in this study?

__ Accept __ Decline

Section 2:

Indicate your opinion on the following questions by rating your answer from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

1. People are just as willing to become police officers today as 5 years ago.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

2. People are just as willing to become police officer today as 10 years ago.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

3. Law enforcement agencies are getting sufficient qualified applicants to meet the demand to fill vacancies.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

4. Law enforcement agencies are getting sufficient qualified applicants to meet future needs.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

5. People interested in law enforcement careers are motivated to become police officers for money.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

6. People interested in careers in law enforcement are motivated to become police officers by feelings of helping people.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

7. The negative general media presentation of police officers discourages people from considering a law enforcement career.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

8. The work schedules of officers discourages people from considering a law enforcement career.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

9. I chose to become a police officer because of my desire to help people.

   __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

10. I chose to become a police officer because of the state of the economy.

    __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

11. Once the economy improves, I intend to seek other career opportunities.

    __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

12. I intend to make my career in law enforcement regardless of the economy.

    __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

13. If I had an opportunity to make my career choice again, I would NOT choose a career in law enforcement.

    __Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

14. Rate the following motivators that positively influenced your decision to choose a law enforcement career. With 1 being of most influential motivator (each ranking can only be utilized once).

    ___Income

    ___Benefits (Insurance, Vacation, Military Leave)

    ___Opportunities for self-improvement

    ___Helping people

    ___Retirement Benefits (Deferred compensation plans; early retirement)

    ___Prestige of being a police officer

    ___Promoting Justice

    ___Job Security

15. Rank the following items as the negative influences of a person choosing a career in law enforcement. With 1 being the most negative influence and 7 being the least negative influence (each ranking can only be utilized once).

    ___Shift work (Working weekends, night shift, etc.)

    ___Working holidays

    ___Lack of control over work schedules (Choosing which shift to work, days off, or shift rotation).

    ___Public Perception of Police Officers

    ___Money

    ___Benefits

    ___Opportunities for self-improvement

16. I would recommend a career in law enforcement to relatives?

    ____ Yes ____No

17. I would recommend a career in law enforcement to my adult children?

    ____ Yes ____No

18. I would recommend a career in law enforcement to other people?

    ____ Yes ____No

19. I believe that there exists a shortage in the number of people willing to become police officers.

    __ Strongly Disagree __Disagree __ No Opinion __Agree __ Strongly Agree

Section 3: Demographic Information

20. Gender

    ____ Male ____ Female

21. Ethnicity

    ___ White

    ___ Black

    ___ American Indian

    ___ Middle Eastern

___ Hispanic

___ Other

22. What is your level of education?

___ High School Diploma/GED

___ Some college

___ Undergraduate Degree

___ Some graduate hours

___ Graduate Degree (MS, MA, MPA, MBA, etc.)

___ Some post-graduate hours

___ Post-Graduate Degree (PhD, ED, etc.)

23. How long have you been a police officer?

___ Less than 1 year

___ 1 to 5 years

___ 6 to 10 years

___ 11 to 15 years

___ 16 to 20 years

___ over 20 years

24. Age Group

___ 65 or Older

___ 47 to 64 years of age

___ 28 to 46 years of age

___ 24 to 27 years of age

___ 19 to 23 years of age

Section 4: End of Survey

Thank you for participating in this research project.

APPENDIX D

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS
AT ARLINGTON

Office of Research Administration
Box 19188
202 E. Border St., Suite 214
Arlington, Texas
76019-0188

T 817.272.3723
F 817.272.1111

http://www.uta.edu/research
Expertise at UT Arlington
http://www.uta.edu/expertise

March 08, 2011

G M Cox
Dr. Rod Hissong
Program in Public and Urban Administration (Ph.D.)
Box 19588

Protocol Title: *Crisis in Blue: Public Service Motivation and Changes in Generational Preferences to Become Police Officers*

RE: Exempt Approval Letter

IRB No.: **2011-0353e**

The UT Arlington Institutional Review Board (UTA IRB) Chair (or designee) has reviewed the above-referenced study and found that it qualified as exempt from coverage under the federal guidelines for the protection of human subjects as referenced at Title 45 Part 46.101(b)(1)(2). You are therefore authorized to begin the research as of March 02, 2011.

Please be advised that as the principal investigator, you are required to report local adverse (unanticipated) events to this office within 24 hours. In addition, pursuant to Title 45 CFR 46.103(b)(4)(iii), investigators are required to, "promptly report to the IRB ***any*** proposed changes in the research activity, and to ensure that such changes in approved research, during the period for which IRB approval has already been given, are **not initiated without IRB review and approval** except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject."

All investigators and key personnel identified in the protocol must have documented Human Subject Protection (HSP) Training or *CITI Training* on file with this office. The UT Arlington Office of Research Administration Regulatory Services appreciates your continuing commitment to the protection of human research subjects. Should you have questions or require further assistance, please contact Robin Dickey by calling (817) 272-9329.

Sincerely,

Patricia Turpin

Digitally signed by Patricia Turpin
DN: o=The University of Texas System, ou=The University of Texas at Arlington CA, ou=www.verisign.com/repository/CPS Incorp. by Ref.,LIAB.LTD(c)99, cn=Patricia Turpin, email=pturpin@uta.edu
Date: 2011.03.15 17:42:23 -05'00'

Patricia G. Turpin, PhD, RN, NEA-BC
Clinical Associate Professor
UT Arlington IRB Chair

APPENDIX E

ORDINAL REGRESSION TABLES

Parameter Estimates

Income		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14a = 1]	-2.939	.398	54.512	1	.000	-3.719	-2.159
	[Q14a = 2]	-2.152	.380	32.029	1	.000	-2.897	-1.407
	[Q14a = 3]	-1.257	.371	11.457	1	.001	-1.985	-.529
	[Q14a = 4]	-.499	.369	1.835	1	.176	-1.222	.223
	[Q14a = 5]	.100	.368	.074	1	.786	-.622	.822
	[Q14a = 6]	.817	.369	4.891	1	.027	.093	1.541
	[Q14a = 7]	1.438	.372	14.947	1	.000	.709	2.167
Location	[Gender=0]	.068	.180	.143	1	.706	-.284	.420
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.296	.330	.803	1	.370	-.942	.351
	[Generations=1]	.075	.284	.070	1	.791	-.481	.632
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.073	.198	.136	1	.712	-.460	.314
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.087	.165	.276	1	.599	-.410	.237
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.084	.140	.354	1	.552	-.359	.192
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	.253	.177	2.045	1	.153	-.094	.600
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	704.329			
Final	695.933	8.396	7	.299

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	310.208	315	.566
Deviance	301.102	315	.704

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	695.933			
General	653.672	42.262	42	.460

Parameter Estimates

Benefits		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14b = 1]	-3.681	.439	70.208	1	.000	-4.542	-2.820
	[Q14b = 2]	-2.177	.385	31.907	1	.000	-2.932	-1.422
	[Q14b = 3]	-1.327	.376	12.432	1	.000	-2.064	-.589
	[Q14b = 4]	-.651	.373	3.041	1	.081	-1.383	.081
	[Q14b = 5]	.129	.373	.121	1	.728	-.601	.860
	[Q14b = 6]	.922	.374	6.073	1	.014	.189	1.655
	[Q14b = 7]	2.471	.387	40.790	1	.000	1.712	3.229
Location	[Gender=0]	.017	.182	.009	1	.925	-.340	.374
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.543	.331	2.697	1	.101*	-1.192	.105
	[Generations=1]	-.425	.283	2.260	1	.133	-.979	.129
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	.287	.197	2.108	1	.146	-.100	.673
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.154	.169	.828	1	.363	-.177	.485
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.005	.143	.001	1	.973	-.285	.275
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	.290	.178	2.654	1	.103*	-.059	.639
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	665.425			
Final	657.241	8.184	7	.317

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	306.003	322	.731
Deviance	282.415	322	.945

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	657.241			
General	619.435	37.806	42	.656

Parameter Estimates

Self Improvement		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14c = 1]	-3.658	.416	77.177	1	.000	-4.474	-2.842
	[Q14c = 2]	-2.210	.382	33.466	1	.000	-2.958	-1.461
	[Q14c = 3]	-1.416	.376	14.194	1	.000	-2.152	-.679
	[Q14c = 4]	-.691	.373	3.424	1	.064	-1.422	.041
	[Q14c = 5]	-.144	.372	.150	1	.699	-.874	.586
	[Q14c = 6]	.522	.373	1.963	1	.161	-.208	1.253
	[Q14c = 7]	1.277	.376	11.531	1	.001	.540	2.014
Location	[Gender=0]	.060	.184	.107	1	.743	-.301	.422
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.433	.336	1.658	1	.198	-1.092	.226
	[Generations=1]	-.070	.287	.060	1	.807	-.632	.492
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	.193	.202	.920	1	.337	-.202	.589
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.226	.169	1.797	1	.180	-.557	.105
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.174	.143	1.488	1	.222	-.105	.453
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.319	.180	3.119	1	.077*	-.672	.035
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	684.923			
Final	675.014	9.909	7	.194

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	322.255	315	.377
Deviance	299.761	315	.723

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	675.014			
General	626.109	48.905	42	.215

Parameter Estimates

Help People		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14d = 1]	-.791	.377	4.393	1	.036	-1.531	-.051
	[Q14d = 2]	.027	.376	.005	1	.942	-.710	.765
	[Q14d = 3]	.486	.377	1.664	1	.197	-.253	1.225
	[Q14d = 4]	.917	.378	5.882	1	.015	.176	1.658
	[Q14d = 5]	1.465	.381	14.753	1	.000	.717	2.212
	[Q14d = 6]	1.977	.387	26.101	1	.000	1.219	2.736
	[Q14d = 7]	2.672	.402	44.246	1	.000	1.885	3.459
Location	[Gender=0]	.184	.187	.974	1	.324	-.182	.551
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.077	.337	.053	1	.818	-.583	.738
	[Generations=1]	.052	.289	.033	1	.856	-.514	.619
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.154	.200	.589	1	.443	-.546	.239
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.013	.171	.006	1	.940	-.322	.347
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.171	.146	1.377	1	.241	-.115	.457
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.490	.181	7.344	1	.007**	-.845	-.136
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	655.553			
Final	644.562	10.992	7	.139

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	338.040	329	.354
Deviance	303.808	329	.837

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	644.562			
General	612.900	31.661	42	.877

Parameter Estimates

Retirement Benefits		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14e = 1]	-2.652	.399	44.106	1	.000	-3.434	-1.869
	[Q14e = 2]	-1.458	.377	14.918	1	.000	-2.198	-.718
	[Q14e = 3]	-.723	.373	3.758	1	.053	-1.455	.008
	[Q14e = 4]	-.029	.372	.006	1	.939	-.758	.700
	[Q14e = 5]	.591	.373	2.520	1	.112	-.139	1.322
	[Q14e = 6]	1.329	.375	12.557	1	.000	.594	2.064
	[Q14e = 7]	2.407	.384	39.369	1	.000	1.655	3.159
Location	[Gender=0]	.188	.183	1.059	1	.303	-.170	.546
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.096	.336	.082	1	.774	-.563	.755
	[Generations=1]	.064	.290	.049	1	.825	-.503	.632
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.102	.198	.264	1	.608	-.489	.286
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.072	.167	.184	1	.668	-.255	.399
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.043	.141	.091	1	.763	-.235	.320
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	.183	.177	1.075	1	.300	-.163	.530
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	728.827			
Final	725.932	2.895	7	.895

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	338.948	315	.169
Deviance	339.067	315	.168

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	725.932			
General	666.801	59.131	42	.042

Parameter Estimates

Prestige		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14f = 1]	-2.544	.376	45.693	1	.000	-3.282	-1.807
	[Q14f = 2]	-1.716	.370	21.554	1	.000	-2.440	-.991
	[Q14f = 3]	-.983	.366	7.194	1	.007	-1.701	-.265
	[Q14f = 4]	-.450	.365	1.518	1	.218	-1.166	.266
	[Q14f = 5]	-.090	.365	.061	1	.806	-.805	.626
	[Q14f = 6]	.309	.365	.715	1	.398	-.407	1.024
	[Q14f = 7]	.996	.367	7.354	1	.007	.276	1.717
Location	[Gender=0]	-.632	.183	11.962	1	.001***	-.990	-.274
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	Generations=0]	.239	.329	.528	1	.467	-.405	.883
	Generations=1]	.016	.283	.003	1	.954	-.539	.571
	Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	ShortTenure=0]	.008	.197	.002	1	.967	-.379	.395
	ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.015	.162	.008	1	.927	-.333	.303
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.211	.140	2.287	1	.130	-.485	.063
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.025	.174	.020	1	.886	-.366	.316
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p ≤ .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	718.789			
Final	703.428	15.361	7	.032

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	337.062	308	.122
Deviance	301.336	308	.596

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	703.428			
General	663.515	39.913	42	.563

Parameter Estimates

Promote Justice		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14g = 1]	-1.256	.367	11.699	1	.001	-1.976	-.536
	[Q14g = 2]	-.100	.364	.075	1	.784	-.814	.615
	[Q14g = 3]	.604	.365	2.741	1	.098	-.111	1.320
	[Q14g = 4]	.994	.366	7.370	1	.007	.276	1.712
	[Q14g = 5]	1.385	.368	14.168	1	.000	.664	2.106
	[Q14g = 6]	1.950	.373	27.383	1	.000	1.219	2.680
	[Q14g = 7]	2.959	.391	57.211	1	.000	2.192	3.726
Location	[Gender=0]	.108	.180	.364	1	.546	-.244	.461
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.442	.329	1.802	1	.179	-.203	1.086
	[Generations=1]	.357	.283	1.582	1	.208	-.199	.912
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.279	.196	2.030	1	.154	-.663	.105
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.079	.162	.240	1	.624	-.397	.238
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.073	.139	.276	1	.599	-.200	.346
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.229	.174	1.737	1	.187	-.570	.112
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	676.385			
Final	670.625	5.759	7	.568

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	292.726	315	.811
Deviance	290.169	315	.839

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	670.625			
General	635.021	35.604	42	.746

Parameter Estimates

Job Security		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q14h = 1]	-1.695	.362	21.916	1	.000	-2.405	-.985
	[Q14h = 2]	-.781	.358	4.774	1	.029	-1.482	-.080
	[Q14h = 3]	-.075	.357	.044	1	.834	-.774	.624
	[Q14h = 4]	.525	.357	2.162	1	.141	-.175	1.225
	[Q14h = 5]	1.174	.359	10.705	1	.001	.471	1.878
	[Q14h = 6]	1.748	.362	23.260	1	.000	1.038	2.459
	[Q14h = 7]	2.639	.375	49.619	1	.000	1.904	3.373
Location	[Gender=0]	.104	.174	.358	1	.550	-.237	.446
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.212	.320	.439	1	.507	-.839	.415
	[Generations=1]	-.124	.278	.199	1	.656	-.670	.422
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.201	.191	1.117	1	.290	-.575	.172
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.181	.157	1.319	1	.251	-.128	.489
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.005	.136	.001	1	.974	-.263	.272
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	.145	.170	.725	1	.394	-.188	.477
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	756.616			
Final	746.695	9.920	7	.193

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	341.892	329	.301
Deviance	341.645	329	.304

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	746.695			
General	682.394	64.302	42	.015

Parameter Estimates

Shift Work		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15a = 1]	-2.005	.380	27.779	1	.000	-2.750	-1.259
	[Q15a = 2]	-.922	.376	6.011	1	.014	-1.659	-.185
	[Q15a = 3]	.099	.374	.070	1	.791	-.635	.833
	[Q15a = 4]	.724	.376	3.710	1	.054	-.013	1.461
	[Q15a = 5]	1.344	.382	12.413	1	.000	.597	2.092
	[Q15a = 6]	2.000	.395	25.698	1	.000	1.227	2.774
Location	[Gender=0]	-.293	.183	2.578	1	.108	-.651	.065
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.657	.337	3.811	1	.051**	-1.317	.003
	[Generations=1]	-.546	.289	3.565	1	.059*	-1.112	.021
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.338	.200	2.848	1	.091*	-.731	.055
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.184	.166	1.228	1	.268	-.142	.511
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.035	.143	.059	1	.808	-.315	.245
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.011	.181	.004	1	.950	-.365	.343
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	632.841			
Final	607.545	25.296	7	.001

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	316.161	269	.025
Deviance	287.696	269	.207

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	607.545			
General	562.884	44.662	35	.127

Parameter Estimates

Work Holidays		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15b = 1]	-2.465	.384	41.214	1	.000	-3.217	-1.712
	[Q15b = 2]	-.720	.373	3.722	1	.054	-1.451	.011
	[Q15b = 3]	.382	.372	1.050	1	.305	-.348	1.112
	[Q15b = 4]	1.250	.376	11.049	1	.001	.513	1.987
	[Q15b = 5]	1.971	.384	26.311	1	.000	1.218	2.724
	[Q15b = 6]	3.983	.482	68.184	1	.000	3.037	4.928
Location	[Gender=0]	-.184	.183	1.011	1	.315	-.544	.175
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.290	.334	.756	1	.385	-.364	.944
	[Generations=1]	.019	.287	.004	1	.948	-.544	.582
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.180	.200	.813	1	.367	-.571	.211
	ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.098	.166	.345	1	.557	-.229	.424
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	-.054	.142	.142	1	.706	-.332	.225
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.286	.179	2.557	1	.110	-.637	.065
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	549.737			
Final	542.590	7.147	7	.414

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	266.067	269	.539
Deviance	223.425	269	.980

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	542.590			
General	475.358	67.233	35	.001

Parameter Estimates

Lack Control of Work Schedules		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15c = 1]	-.927	.374	6.156	1	.013	-1.659	-.195
	[Q15c = 2]	-.033	.372	.008	1	.929	-.762	.696
	[Q15c = 3]	1.249	.374	11.134	1	.001	.515	1.983
	[Q15c = 4]	2.194	.381	33.211	1	.000	1.448	2.940
	[Q15c = 5]	3.072	.394	60.654	1	.000	2.299	3.845
	[Q15c = 6]	4.016	.429	87.658	1	.000	3.176	4.857
Location	[Gender=0]	.395	.181	4.770	1	.029**	.040	.749
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.056	.335	.028	1	.868	-.600	.712
	[Generations=1]	.099	.289	.116	1	.733	-.468	.666
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	-.146	.197	.547	1	.460	-.532	.240
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.038	.163	.054	1	.816	-.281	.357
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.144	.140	1.056	1	.304	-.131	.419
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.032	.175	.033	1	.855	-.375	.311
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	570.049			
Final	563.677	6.371	7	.497

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	283.455	269	.261
Deviance	229.997	269	.959

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	563.677			
General	495.187	68.491	35	.001

Parameter Estimates

Public Perception		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15d = 1]	-.703	.372	3.572	1	.059	-1.431	.026
	[Q15d = 2]	-.216	.371	.340	1	.560	-.943	.511
	[Q15d = 3]	.108	.371	.084	1	.772	-.619	.834
	[Q15d = 4]	1.250	.373	11.221	1	.001	.519	1.981
	[Q15d = 5]	1.888	.376	25.207	1	.000	1.151	2.626
	[Q15d = 6]	2.363	.380	38.708	1	.000	1.619	3.108
Location	[Gender=0]	-.006	.181	.001	1	.973	-.362	.349
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.433	.333	1.687	1	.194	-.220	1.085
	[Generations=1]	.515	.290	3.148	1	.076*	-.054	1.083
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	.193	.199	.939	1	.332	-.197	.582
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.090	.161	.310	1	.578	-.405	.226
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.034	.140	.061	1	.805	-.239	.308
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.026	.176	.022	1	.881	-.372	.320
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	637.763			
Final	628.587	9.176	7	.240

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	315.706	275	.046
Deviance	283.834	275	.344

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	628.587			
General	.000a	628.587	35	.000

Parameter Estimates

Money		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15e = 1]	-1.744	.378	21.305	1	.000	-2.485	-1.004
	[Q15e = 2]	-.997	.372	7.167	1	.007	-1.726	-.267
	[Q15e = 3]	-.653	.371	3.097	1	.078	-1.380	.074
	[Q15e = 4]	.088	.370	.057	1	.812	-.638	.814
	[Q15e = 5]	1.487	.374	15.805	1	.000	.754	2.220
	[Q15e = 6]	2.590	.385	45.322	1	.000	1.836	3.345
Location	[Gender=0]	-.124	.184	.452	1	.501	-.484	.237
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	.206	.331	.387	1	.534	-.443	.855
	[Generations=1]	.199	.286	.483	1	.487	-.362	.760
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	.182	.200	.828	1	.363	-.210	.573
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	.032	.162	.039	1	.843	-.286	.350
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.080	.142	.318	1	.573	-.198	.358
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	.013	.178	.005	1	.943	-.336	.361
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	593.559			
Final	590.036	3.523	7	.833

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	240.974	263	.831
Deviance	236.108	263	.882

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	590.036			
General	567.020	23.016	35	.940

Parameter Estimates

Benefits		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15f = 1]	-3.860	.449	74.043	1	.000	-4.740	-2.981
	[Q15f = 2]	-2.361	.396	35.592	1	.000	-3.137	-1.586
	[Q15f = 3]	-1.712	.388	19.464	1	.000	-2.473	-.952
	[Q15f = 4]	-1.268	.385	10.842	1	.001	-2.023	-.513
	[Q15f = 5]	-.348	.382	.830	1	.362	-1.098	.401
	[Q15f = 6]	1.906	.390	23.918	1	.000	1.142	2.670
Location	[Gender=0]	.062	.189	.109	1	.741	-.307	.432
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.347	.343	1.021	1	.312	-1.019	.326
	[Generations=1]	-.232	.297	.610	1	.435	-.814	.350
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	.238	.203	1.382	1	.240	-.159	.636
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.027	.168	.026	1	.871	-.357	.303
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.145	.146	.979	1	.322	-.142	.432
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	-.005	.183	.001	1	.978	-.364	.354
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	568.296			
Final	565.464	2.832	7	.900

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	323.727	269	.012
Deviance	270.524	269	.462

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	565.464			
General	535.492	29.972	35	.709

Parameter Estimates

Opportunity for Self-Improvement		Est.	Std. Error	Wald	df	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
							Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Threshold	[Q15g = 1]	-3.918	.434	81.578	1	.000	-4.769	-3.068
	[Q15g = 2]	-3.034	.401	57.177	1	.000	-3.821	-2.248
	[Q15g = 3]	-2.486	.391	40.415	1	.000	-3.253	-1.720
	[Q15g = 4]	-1.589	.383	17.237	1	.000	-2.339	-.839
	[Q15g = 5]	-.843	.380	4.927	1	.026	-1.588	-.099
	[Q15g = 6]	-.132	.379	.122	1	.727	-.875	.610
Location	[Gender=0]	.182	.183	.995	1	.319	-.176	.540
	[Gender=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Generations=0]	-.973	.346	7.902	1	.005**	-1.651	-.295
	[Generations=1]	-.301	.300	1.005	1	.316	-.889	.287
	[Generations=2]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[ShortTenure=0]	.018	.203	.008	1	.930	-.380	.416
	[ShortTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[LongTenure=0]	-.467	.171	7.447	1	.006**	-.803	-.132
	[LongTenure=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Education=0]	.117	.146	.638	1	.424	-.170	.404
	[Education=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.
	[Race=0]	.400	.178	5.043	1	.025**	.051	.748
	[Race=1]	0[a]	.	.	0	.	.	.

Link function: Logit

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant

*p < .10 **p < .05 *** p < .001

Model Fitting Information

Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Intercept Only	581.333			
Final	558.393	22.940	7	.002

Goodness-of-Fit

	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Pearson	301.444	275	.131
Deviance	270.239	275	.570

Test of Parallel Lines

Mode	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Null Hypothesis	558.393			
General	527.277	31.116	35	.656

REFERENCES

Bastick, T. (2000). Why teacher trainees choose the teaching profession: Comparing trainees in metropolitan and developing countries, *International Review of Education,* 46(3 & 4), 343-349.

Benson, B. (2000, January). Why crime declines. The Foundation for Economic Education, *The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty.*

Bradburn, N., Sudman, S. & Wansink, B. (2004). *Asking questions: The definitive guide to questionnaire design – for marketing research, political polls, and social and health questionnaires, revised edition.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brand, D. (1999). The future of law enforcement recruiting: The impact of generation X. *The Police Chief,* 66(8), 52-57.

Brawner, C. (2002). *Perceptions of police work as an occupational choice: A study of criminal justice majors at four midwestern universities (*Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from UMI Microfilm. (UMI #3088018).

Brewer, G. (2003). Building social capital: Civic attitudes and behavior of public servants. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 13(1), 5-26.

Brewer, G., Seldon, S. & Facer II, R. (2000). Individual conceptions of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review,* 60(3), 254-264.

Bright, L. (2005). Public employees with high levels of public service motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* 25(2), 138-154.

Buelens, M. & Van den Broeck, H. (2007). An analysis of differences in work motivation between public and private sector organizations. *Public Administration Review,* 67(1), 65-74.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (2007). *Local police departments, 2007.* U. S. Department of

Justice. Retrieved September 15, 2011, from http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=1750.

Charrier, K. (2000, December). Marketing strategies for attracting and retaining generation X police officers. *The Police Chief*, 67(12), 45.

Chetkovich, C. (2003). What's a sector. The shifting career plans of public policy students. *Public Administration Review,* 63(6), 660-674.

Crewson, P. (1995). Comparative analysis of public and private sector entrant quality. *American Journal of Political Science,* 39(3), 628-639.

Crewson, P. (1997). Are the best and brightest fleeing public sector employment? Evidence from the national longitudinal survey of youth. *Public Productivity & Management Review,* 20(4), 363-371.

Crewson, P. (1997). Public service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 7(4), 499-518.

Christensen, R. K. & Wright, B. E. (nd). The effects of public service motivation on job choice decisions: Exploring the contributions of person-organization fit and person-job fit. Retrieved August 18, 2010, from http://www.pmranet.org/conferences/osu2009/ papers/ c20Robert%20K%20.

Dilulio, J. (1994). Principled agents: The cultural bases of behavior in a federal government bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 4(3), 277-318.

Eisenstein, P. (2002, April) Growing up with generation Y. *Professional Engineering,* 17(2), 32.

Ellickson, M. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *Public Personnel Management,* 31(3), 343-58.

Erikson, E. H. (1946). Ego development and historical change. *Psychology study of the child,* 2, *359-396.*

Foot, D. (2003). Demographic trends and their implications for law enforcement. *Versaterm.*

Spring, 2003

Gabris, G. T. & Simo, G. (1995). Public sector motivation as an independent variable affecting career decisions. *Public Personnel Management,* 24(1), 33-51.

Garson, D. (2011). Ordinal regression. Retrieved October 15, 2011, from http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765.

Hague, M. (1998). Legitimization crisis: A challenge for public service in the next century. *International Review of Administrative Sciences,* 64 (13), 13-26.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man (*2nd Ed.). Cleveland: World Publishing.

Horton, S. (2008). History and persistence of an idea and an ideal. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Houston, D. (2000). Public-service motivation: A multivariate test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 10(4), 713-727.

Houston, D. (2006). "Walking the walk" of public service motivation: Public employees and charitable gifts of time, blood, and money. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 16, 67-86.

Houston, D. & Cartwright, K. (2007). Spirituality and public service. *Public Administration Review,* 67(1), 88-102.

International Association of Chiefs of Police (2011). *Discover policing.* Retrieved September 15, 2011, from www.discoverpolicing.org

Jurkiewicz, C. & Massey, T. (1997). What motivates municipal employees: A comparison study of supervisory vs. non-supervisory personnel. *Public Personnel Management,* 26(3), 367-377.

Jurkiewicz, C, Massey, T., & Brown (1998). Motivation in public and private organizations: A comparative study. *Public Productivity & Management Review,* 21(3), 230-250.

Kaufman, H. (1967). The forest ranger: A study in administrative behavior. *Public Administration*

Review, 67(1), 88-102.

Kim, S. (2009). Testing the structure of public service motivation in Korea: A research note. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 19, 839-851.

Koehler, M. & Rainey, H. (2008). Interdisciplinary foundations of public service motivation. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Koper, E. (2004) Hiring and keeping police officers. U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice: Washington, D. C.

Lancaster, L. & Stillman, D. (2010). *The m-factor: How the millennial generation is rocking the workplace.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Leisink, P. & Steijn (2008). Recruitment, attraction, and selection. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: A call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, G. B. & Frank, S. A. (2002). Who wants to work for the government? *Public Administration Review, 62(4), 395-404.*

Maesschalck,J, van der Wal, Z. & Huberts, L. (2008). Public service motivation and ethical conduct. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: A call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Martin, W. (1988). *Motivation and productivity in public sector human service organizations*. New York: Quorum Books.

Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation*, Psychological Review,* 50(4), 370-396.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality.* New York: Harper & Row.

McCafferty, F. (2003). The challenge of selecting tomorrow's police officers from generation X and Y. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law,* 31(1), 78-88.

McDougall, W. (1908). *An introduction to social psychology.* London: Methuen and Co.

Mensik, J. (2007). A view on generational differences from a generation x leader. *Journal of*

Nursing Administration, 37 (11), 483-484.

Messer, M. (2001, January) Generation X: Ready to rock and roll. *Police,* 25(1), 14.

Mineard, T. (2003, July). Entry level openings: Recruiting and retraining gen-X officers. *Law & Order*, 51(7), 94.

Moynihan, D. & Pandey, S. K. (2007). The role of organizations in fostering public service motivation. *Public Administration Review,* Jan/Feb, 40-53.

Naber Technical Enterprises. Police Recruit Recruiting and Recruitment, Screening, Hiring, and Retention of Law Enforcement Staff, Retrieved August 20, 2010, from http://nteusa.org/RHR/policerecurit.html.

Naff, K. & Crum, J. (1999). Working for America: Does public service motivation make a difference? *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* Fall, 5-16.

Nislow, J. (2000). The year in review: Help Wanted. (2000, December). *Law Enforcement News*, 26, 545-546.

Nislow, J. (2001). The year in review: Back & forth go college requirements. (2001, December). *Law Enforcement News*, 27, 567-568.

North Central Texas Council of Government (n.d.)(web page). Retrieved December 2, 2007, from http://www.nctcog.org/about.asp.

Norusis, M. (2010). *PASW statistics 18.0 advanced statistical procedures companion.* Chapter 4, ordinal regression. Retrieved June 13, 2011, from http://www.norusis.com/pdf/ASPC_v13.pdf.

Paarlberg, L, Perry, J., & Hondeghem, A. (2008). From theory to practice: Strategies for applying public service motivation. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: A call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pandy, S.K. & Stazyk, E. (2008). Antecedents and correlates of public service motivation. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: A call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Perkins, J. (2011) Hiring 2.0: 23 creative ways to recruit and keep great staff. *Public Management,* 93(1), 1-4.

Perry, J. & Wise L. (1990). The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review,* 50, 367-373.

Perry, J. (1996). Measuring public service motivation: An assessment of construct reliability and validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 6(1), 5-22.

Perry, J. (1997). Antecedents of public service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 7(2), 181-198.

Perry, J. (2000). Bringing society in: Toward a theory of public-service motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* 10(2), 471-488.

Perry, J. & Hondeghem, A. (2008). Building theory and empirical evidence about public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal,* 11(1), 3-12.

Perry, J. & Hondeghem, A. (2008). Directions for future theory and research. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Perry, J. & Hondeghem, A. (Eds.)(2008). *Motivation in public management: The call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Perry, J. & Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Behavior dynamics: Institutions, identities, and self-regulation. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: The call of public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Perry, J., Brudney, J., Coursey, D. & Littlepage, L. (2008). What drives morally committed citizens? A study of the antecedents of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review,* 68(3), 445-458.

Perry, J. (2010). Introduction to the symposium on public service motivation research. *Public Administration Review,* 70(5), 679-690.

Robert Half International (2008). *What millennial workers want: How to attract and retain gen y*

employees. Retrieved September 20, 2011, from www.accoutingweb_cgi.com/.../generationy_robert_half.pdf.

Rook, S. (2003). Lack of applicants keeps police from filling jobs. *Wake Weekly*. October 16, 2003.

Salkind, N. (2011). *Statistic for people who (think they) hate statistics.* Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Steijn, B. (2004). Human resource management and job satisfaction in the Dutch public sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration,* 24(4), 291-303.

Steen, T. (2008). Not a government monopoly: The private, nonprofit, and voluntary sectors. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: A call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Steinberg, W. (2011). *Statistics alive* (2nd Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Stockton, D. (2007). Our police staffing crisis. *Law Officer,* 3(4), 10-12.

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards and Education (2011). Active peace officer licenses by DOB. Retrieved July 14, 2011, from www.tcleose.state.tx.us.

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards and Education (2011). Active peace officer licenses by education. Retrieved July 14, 2011, from www.tcleose.state.tx.us.

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officers Standards and Education (2011). Active peace officers licenses. Retrieved February 24, 2011, from www.tcleose.state.tx.us.

Thompson, A. & Bono, B. (1993). Work without wages: The motivation for volunteer firefighters. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* 52(3), 323-343.

Trahant, B. (2008). Recruiting the generations to federal service. *The Public Manager,* 37(2), 35-41.

Twenge, J. M. (2006). *Generation me: Why today's young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled – and more miserable than ever before.* New York: Free Press.

Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing, *Journal of Management,* 36(5), 1117-1142.

U. S. Department of Justice (personal communication, March 15, 2011). *A call to service: law enforcement recruiting toolkit (video).*

Vandenabeele, W. (2008). Government calling: Public service motivation as an element in selecting government as an employer of choice. *Public Administration,* 86(4), 1089-1105.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Motivation and work.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Wright, B. (2001). Public-sector work motivation: A review of the current literature and a revised conceptual model. *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory,* 11(4), 559-86.

Wright, B. (2008). Methodological challenges associated with public service motivation research. In J. L. Perry and A. Hondeghem (Eds.), *Motivation in public management: A call to public service.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Wright, B. & Grant, A. (2010). Unanswered questions about public service motivation: Designing research to address key issues of emergence and effects. *Public Administration Review,* 70(5), 691-700.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

G. M. Cox has over 30 years experience as a chief of police. Overall, he has 37 years of law enforcement experience, starting as a law enforcement specialist in the United States Air Force. Upon his honorable separation from the USAF after 6 years of service, he entered Sam Houston State University and earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Law Enforcement and Police Science. He graduated Summa Cum Laude and Alpha Chi.

Dr. Cox became a patrol deputy for the Montgomery County Sheriff's Department (Texas) and was assigned to serve in the city of Oak Ridge North, Texas. After 18 months in this role, he was hired as the first chief of police for Oak Ridge North, with only 30 days to create a fully functional and staffed law enforcement agency. Along with his education, his experience as an assistant shift supervisor, records manager, and crime prevention specialist with the Air Force, his patrol experience as a deputy made him uniquely qualified to head this city's first police department.

While performing duties as the chief of a small suburban police agency, Dr. Cox earned his Master of Science degree from Sam Houston State University in Criminal Justice Management. His graduate paper, "Career Path Development in Small Law Enforcement Agencies" was published in the *Texas Police Journal*. This would prove to be the first of many articles published not only in the *Texas Police Journal*, but also in the *Texas Police Chief.*

Dr. Cox served a short period as a city administrator and director of police services for Oak Ridge North before leaving for the Chief's position in Lamesa, Texas. While there, Dr. Cox attended the 165th Session (1991) of the FBI National Academy. He also started the long journey of achieving the coveted designation as a graduate of the Leadership Command College (LCC) of the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas. After leaving Lamesa, he found himself in the middle of a community in crisis as the Chief in Corsicana, Texas. While

in Corsicana, he was instrumental in the creation of the motorcycle, bike, Neighborhood Policing, Crime Interdiction, K9, and mounted units. He also was the founder of the 100 Club of Corsicana-Navarro County and the Corsicana Crime Commission.

Dr. Cox served as the President of the Texas Police Chiefs' Association (2005-06) and was the first Chairman of the TPCA's charity foundation. He is currently serving as a Texas Municipal League board member representing the TPCA. He was chosen as the Officer of the Year for 1996 and 1997 by the Navarro County Peace Officers' Association. He has also served as a board member of the YMCA in Corsicana and Chairman of both the Advisory Board for the Navarro College Regional Police Academy and Criminal Justice Curriculum committee. Dr. Cox is a court qualified mediator. He is a licensed law enforcement instructor and security inspector, with a Master Peace Officer certificate, issued by the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Standards and Education. Besides his law enforcement duties, he has been an adjunct faculty member of several colleges, including Navarro College and Texas A & M University – Commerce.

After over 15 years as the Chief of Corsicana, he retired from Corsicana on October 1, 2008. On October 13, 2008, he became the third full-time chief of police for the City of Murphy (Texas).

Dr. Cox's academic and research interests focus on labor issues in policing, comparative policing models, and futures studies associated with policing paradigms.