

6-2021

How Did You Become a Police Officer? Entry-Related Motives and Concerns of Women and Men in Policing

Samantha S. Clinkinbeard

Starr J. Solomon

Rachael M. Rief

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/criminaljusticefacpub>

 Part of the [Criminology Commons](#)

Why did you become a police officer? Entry-related motives and concerns of women and men in policing.

SAMANTHA S. CLINKINBEARD, University of Nebraska at Omaha

STARR J. SOLOMON, Kent State University

RACHAEL M. RIEF, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Abstract

As police agencies in the United States suffer declining applications and struggle to recruit women, the National Institute of Justice has identified workforce development as a priority research area. To recruit more effectively, we must understand what attracts people to policing and what deters them. We surveyed officers in two Midwestern police departments ($n = 832$) about entry motivations and concerns and examined gender differences.

Serve/protect motivations were most important for men and women, though women rated the category significantly higher. Women and non-White officers rated legacy motives higher than did males and White officers. Women reported more concerns overall and scored higher on job demands and acceptance concerns; officers of color also reported more acceptance concerns than White officers. The largest gender differences were associated with gender-related obstacles and stereotypes (e.g., discrimination; being taken seriously; physical demands), indicating recruitment reform necessarily includes improving systemic issues.

Keywords: policing, gender, employment, gender differences, women

Current Version: October 2nd, 2020. Corresponding Author: Samantha Clinkinbeard
(sclinkinbeard@unomaha.edu).

Published at *Criminal Justice & Behavior* – Volume 48, Issue 6, pp. 715-733, June 2021:

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0093854821993508>

Police agencies across the United States have seen a recent drop in applications (PERF, 2019). Several forces are likely at work, ranging from declining public trust in response to viral negative officer-citizen encounters and well-publicized attacks on officers, to increased access to college education and a competitive job market, to disqualifier policies that have not kept pace with changing social norms around tattoos or marijuana use (Bolten, 2016; Cook, 2015; Jones, 2015; PERF, 2019; Rhodes & Tyler, 2019). Further, it is too early to tell how recent crises such as the Covid-19 pandemic and the worldwide protests surrounding the death of George Floyd and others will impact policing, and ultimately recruitment. Although the last decade or so has seen an increasing need for creativity in *overall* police recruitment, attracting women to the field has been an undeniable problem for decades (Cordner & Cordner, 2011; PERF, 2019), compounded by a culture of hegemonic masculinity, exclusionary testing procedures, absence of family-friendly policies, and lack of targeted recruiting, among others (Cordner & Cordner, 2011; Fielding, 1994; Martin & Jurik, 1996; Prokos & Padavic, 2002; Schuck, 2014; Schulze, 2010, 2012).

When women entered the field, they were relegated to policing-adjacent positions, assigned to 'deal with' women and children (Corsianos, 2009). With broader civil rights changes in the 1960s and 1970s, women fought their way into patrol; lawsuits and consent decrees facilitated sharp increases of women in the 1980s and 1990s (Archbold & Schulz, 2012; Lonsway et al., 2002). After consent decrees expired, efforts crumbled and the proportion of women entering policing dropped (Lonsway et al., 2002; Lonsway, Moore, Harrington, Smeal, & Spillar, 2003). Today, about 12.6% of sworn officers employed in U.S. agencies are women; the percentage of women is greater in large departments and typically less in rural and small departments (Hyland & Davis, 2019). Growth, however, has stalled since the start of the 21st century (Cordner & Cordner, 2011; Kringen, 2014).

We argue that a starting point for recruiting is to understand what motivated the current workforce to join. Further, given the continued underrepresentation of women, and the benefits they can bring to the force, it is important to explore the extent to which there may be gender differences in entry motivations. In this paper, we explore entry motivations, including gender differences, in a sample of current police officers. This approach provides insight into the perceptions of individuals that actively pursued the career. Although we are not the first to explore motivations (e.g., Lester, 1983; Raganella & White, 2004; M. D. White, Cooper, Saunders, & Raganella, 2010), persistent struggles with police recruitment demand continued work in this area. We expand the work on police entry with a systematic focus on concerns that surround career entry, a growing area of importance (e.g., Cambareri & Kuhns, 2018; Lord & Friday, 2003; Rossler, Rabe-Hemp, Peuterbaugh, & Scheer, 2020). We asked officers to identify what attracted them to policing at the start of their careers *and* what they remember being nervous about. A better understanding of the entry motives and concerns of current officers can inform general recruitment strategies and understanding gender variations can inform targeted approaches. Finally, a focus on entry-related *concerns* may highlight systemic issues that are keeping many women out of the field.

Literature Review

Policing Motives and Gender

A few researchers have explored motives for entering policing and variation by gender (Lester, 1983; Raganella & White, 2004; Tarng & Hsieh, 2001; M. D. White et al., 2010). Lester (1983) was among the first to explore motivations for joining the force utilizing two samples. The first sample consisted of males, who reported helping others, job security, companionship with co-workers, enforcing the laws, and fighting crime as top motivations. Factor analysis identified themes of pay/security, service, and power/status. In a replication sample that was approximately 20% female, men and women cited similar reasons for

joining, but small gender differences emerged. Women rated service higher, power/status lower, and pay/security similar to men (Lester, 1983).

Raganella and White (2004) surveyed New York police department recruits in 2001 using a modified version of Lester's (1983) measure. The top motives (helping people and job security) were the same as those reported by Lester. There were slight differences in rank-order by gender but the most important (helping people) and least important (salary) were the same for men and women. As with Lester's study, women reported helping people higher than did men, although it was still important to both; companionship and lack of alternatives were more important for males (Raganella & White, 2004). Six years after the first study, White and colleagues (2010) surveyed the same population (i.e., NYPD recruits from 2001) asking them to rate their motivations. Again, they found few gender differences.

Additional research has both reinforced initial findings (e.g., helping others as top motivation) and highlighted other motives as important, particularly for women (e.g., adventure/excitement, witnessing or interacting with female officers) (Ridgeway et al., 2008; Seklecki & Paynich, 2007; Todak, 2017). Yet, the policing motives and gender picture is not complete. We need information from all stages of the career lifecycle (i.e., pre-career women; those that left the academy; women that quit in the first couple years and others that remained for several). Research thus far has been limited by small, single-agency or single-gender samples, restricting comparisons. Finally, some of the motives that have been illuminated in qualitative work (e.g., Todak, 2017) have yet to be explored on a larger scale.

Potential Concerns and Gender

An emerging area regarding recruitment is concerns about career entry (Cambareri & Kuhns, 2018; Lord & Friday, 2003; Rossler et al., 2020; Todak, 2017). Literature on motivation, emphasizes that behavior is inspired by *two* sides of the motivational coin -- (1)

hopes and expectations, (2) fears or concerns¹ (Markus & Nurius, 1986). Concerns about future goals can balance expectations and help propel behavior towards them by informing strategies for achievement (Clinkinbeard & Zohra, 2011; Oyserman & Saltz, 1993). At the same time, strong fears can paralyze or motivate alternative actions (Lerner & Keltner, 2001).

The motivational literature not only recognizes the importance of concerns or fears for motivation but also recognizes that some gender differences exist. Most important to the current study is that women tend to report more fears than men and put more stock in those fears (Greene & DeBacker, 2004; Knox, Funk, Elliott, & Bush, 2000). Further, women are more sensitive to messages in the sociocultural context (e.g., stereotypes) (Greene & DeBacker, 2004; Kemmelmeier & Oyserman, 2001). This is of particular note in policing where decades of cultural socialization have sent the message that policing is a place only for the most masculine among us (Clinkinbeard, Solomon, & Rief, 2020).

Even if women are attracted to policing, experiences with, or concerns about, discrimination could discourage them from pursuing it. A few studies have found that young women have concerns about gender as a barrier to a career in policing (Cambareri & Kuhns, 2018; Lord & Friday, 2003; Rossler et al., 2020; Todak, 2017), and these concerns are not unfounded. There is plenty of evidence that issues of gender equity and fair treatment still exist in law enforcement. Women often encounter sexualized behavior from co-workers in the forms of sexual teasing and harassment and they are more likely than men to report experiences of workplace incivilities that negatively impact workgroup fit (Brown, Baldwin,

¹ The psychological literature on future-oriented thinking, specifically possible selves theory, typically refers to future-oriented concerns as “fears” (Markus & Nurius, 1986) which could be considered stronger than the way we operationalized concerns in our sample. Throughout the manuscript, we use a few different terms but reserve “fear” to when we are referring to past or previous research and the more conservative term, “concerns” when referring to our research and sample.

Dierenfeldt, & McCain, 2020; Lonsway, Paynich, & Hall, 2013; Rief & Clinkinbeard, 2020). A culture based in hegemonic masculinity means that women have to fight for acceptance by *managing* their own gender identities and expression (Kringen, 2014; Rabe-Hemp, 2009, 2018). Further, women are often subjected to policies that devalue their femininity (e.g., academy haircut policies, inconsistent pregnancy and maternity leave policies; Kringen & Novich, 2018; Schulze, 2010), pigeonholed into gendered work (e.g., victims' work, order maintenance), and left out of certain assignments (e.g., SWAT) (Garcia, 2003; Morash & Haarr, 2012; Rabe-Hemp, 2009). Thus, women's fears and concerns are reflections of reality, highlighting those areas that are most problematic and in need of change.

Current Study

To inform police recruitment, we must know what brings people to the field and what deters them, in addition to gender differences in motivations and concerns. Thus, we utilize a sample of approximately 830 officers across two agencies to explore the following: **(RQ1a)**

Are there gender differences in reported importance of policing career-entry motives?

Based on previous research (e.g., Lester, 1983; Raganella & White, 2004; M. D. White et al., 2010), we expected to find similarities between men and women on entry motivations.

(RQ1b) Are there gender differences in reported importance of policing career-entry

concerns? Although gender differences in career-entry concerns have not been explicitly explored, the broader motivational literature indicates that women are likely to have more

concerns and rate them as likely (Greene & DeBacker, 2004). **What are the primary**

categories of these motives (RQ2a) and concerns (RQ2b)? Are there gender differences

in the reported importance of motives (RQ3a) and concerns (RQ3b) categories?

Methods

Sample and Setting

The data comes from two Midwestern police departments. In June 2018, the time of data collection, the smaller department had 341 commissioned officers. Of these 341 officers,

83.6% (285) were male, and 16.4% (56) were female. Almost 10% (34) of both male and female officers were officers of color. The department had 1.2 officers per 1,000 residents, including center city and four geographical precincts. At the time of data collection in July 2018, the larger department consisted of about 790 commissioned officers. Of these officers, 82.5% (652) were male, and 17.5% (138) were female. Approximately 20% (158) were officers of color. This department had 2 officers per 1,000 residents in 2018, including headquarters and four geographical precincts.

Table 1

Sample Demographics

	Department 1 (n=506)			Department 2 (n=326)			Combined (n=832)		
<u>Demographic</u>	<u>M / %</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>M / %</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>M / %</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>R</u>
Female	18.09%	-	0-1	18.15%	-	0-1	18.12%	-	0-1
White	78.43%	-	0-1	91.02%	-	0-1	83.39%	-	0-1
Yrs Employed	14.03	8.23	1-37	14.16	9.85	1-47	14.08	8.90	1-47
Patrol	63.77%	-	0-1	63.93%	-	0-1	66.09%	-	0-1
Bachelors+	56.75%	-	0-1	77.78%	-	0-1	64.69%	-	0-1
Start Age	26.51	4.89	18-49	24.38	3.14	18-42	25.71	4.43	18-49
Military	50.32%	-	0-1	74.75%	-	0-1	59.53%	-	0-1

These two departments were chosen because they were large enough to provide a sufficient sample of women for comparison to men and still provide some variation in agency size and practice. Both departments employ slightly more women than the national average of 12-13% (Hyland & Davis, 2019). There are over 12,000 local police departments in the United States and about half of all the departments employ fewer than 10 full-time officers (Hyland & Davis, 2019). Women officers are mostly employed by larger departments serving larger populations (Hyland & Davis, 2019). Thus, given our purpose, larger departments were more likely to provide an acceptable sample, one with several female officers.

We attempted to survey all sworn officers who were employed at the departments

described above. Most of the sample represents mid-career officers with a little over a decade of experience. While a primarily mid-career sample has its limitations, it can provide valuable information not only about those that pursued policing but also those who have remained for some time. Understanding the motives of officers at different career points is also valuable for devising effective recruitment strategies, which is especially important for departments having a difficult time recruiting and retaining women.

We collected 832 surveys for an overall response rate of 79.7%, across both departments². Sample characteristics are presented in Table 1. Approximately 18% of our sample was female and 82% identified as white, non-Hispanic. Approximately 9% of participants identified as Hispanic or Latinx, 4% as Black or African American, and 2% as American Indian, Alaskan Native, Asian, or Pacific Islander. Officers were employed for an average of 14 years ($SD = 8.90$). Two-thirds of the sample were patrol officers³ and most (91%) had at least some college education. Approximately 4% had a high school diploma, 21% had some college, 8% had an associate's, 51% a bachelor's, and 8% graduate degree. Slightly more than half of our sample had a military background, 69% were married, and 57% had at least one child under the age of 18.

Survey Administration

The participating agencies requested different methods of survey delivery. The smaller department requested that all surveys be distributed online via their internal training

² The response rates varied by department though a majority responded for both departments (64% for the larger department; 96% for the smaller department). The larger response rate from the smaller department may, in part, be attributed to the fact that the survey was distributed via an online training system, which sent multiple reminders (see survey administration).

³ The remaining 33.91% were either Detectives, Sergeants, Lieutenants, Captains, Deputy Chiefs, Chiefs, school resource officers, or training officers.

system. The larger department requested in-person delivery at roll calls for patrol officers and online distribution via their employee listserv for the remainder. All data collection procedures were approved by the Human Subjects Review Board.

For online surveys, we provided agency contacts with a short message describing the nature of the survey, including an anonymous link to the survey. Agency contacts initiated the surveys through internal email/training networks. Both departments sent reminder messages though there was some variation in the number/nature of reminders. In addition to the email reminder, officers in the smaller department received several reminders via the training system which is set up to show unfinished tasks each time they log on.⁴

Surveys were distributed to patrol officers in the larger department at roll calls. Patrol has three crews assigned to each shift, with two crews per precinct on a shift. A member of our team visited each of the four precincts multiple times across two days, allowing us to sample officers from each of the three shifts and all three crews. We sampled at least two crews from each shift (e.g., morning, afternoon/swing, and night) from each precinct. To reach those that had the day off, we also attempted to go the following day. However, this did not work out for one precinct, and we missed the possibility to sample the crews that had the day off. Additional officers were likely missed due to vacation, medical leave, etc.

Measures

Motives.

Officers were asked to report on motivations for entering policing. They were prompted by the following: *People give lots of reasons for becoming a police officer. Listed below are common reasons given by police officers. How important were each of the*

⁴ Officers could delete the survey from their training task list by clicking, not completing, the external survey link.

following in YOUR decision to enter policing? A list of 21 motives, ranging from topics like job security, pay, and benefits, fighting crime and helping people, having autonomy, and being a role model, followed the prompt. Participants indicated importance on a 5-point scale (1 not at all important, 2 slightly important, 3 moderately important, 4 very important, 5 extremely important). The list of motives was developed from Lester's (1983) original list and other various motives noted in the literature, and supplemented by additional motives that arose during informal conversations between the investigators, law enforcement officers, and criminal justice students.

Entry Concerns.

Participants were also asked to report concerns before entering the field. They were prompted with the following: *Prior to entering policing, to what extent were you nervous about any of the following?* A list of 13 concerns, ranging from physical nature, danger, being accepted by others, being able to perform the job, to concerns about discrimination. This list was derived from quantitative and qualitative research on pre-career motives (Cambareri & Kuhns, 2018; Lord & Friday, 2003; Todak, 2017). Participants indicated importance on a 5-point scale (1 not at all important, 2 slightly important, 3 moderately important, 4 very important, 5 extremely important). Similar to motives, the list was supplemented with additional concerns from informal conversations with law enforcement officers and criminal justice students.

Demographics and occupational characteristics.

The primary predictor of interest was gender (1 = female, 0 = male). Although we utilize gender as a dichotomous predictor (male/female) in our study we do not assume resulting variable relationships or gender differences are biologically-based. We argue that the differences we are interested in are socially produced and thus use gender terminology in lieu of sex (Stewart & McDermott, 2004; Unger, 1979). We also controlled for several other

demographics and occupational variables in our analyses (see Table 1). These included race (White = 1), rank (patrol = 1, higher rank = 0), education (bachelors or higher = 1), military (military experience = 1), age at start of police career, and length of employment.

Analytic Strategy

To answer our first research questions, *are there gender differences in the reported importance of policing career-entry (RQ1a) motives and (RQ1b) concerns?* -- we present motives and concerns in rank order for the sample. We conducted t-tests by gender on each individual motive and concern. The next questions (**RQ2a** - *what are the primary categories of these motives? RQ2b and concerns?*) were addressed utilizing exploratory factor analysis. Finally, we utilized t-tests and a series of OLS regressions to investigate *gender differences in the reported importance of (RQ3a) motives and (RQ3b) concerns categories*. We had nearly full data (missing < 5 cases) for the analyses of RQ1a-RQ2b. Missing data on demographic variables limited the regression analyses to approximately 690 cases.⁵ After determining that our data met the assumption of missing at random (MAR), we produced 20 imputed data sets using the chained equations technique in Stata 15.1 (I. R. White, Royston, & Wood, 2011). The results from regression models using imputed and non-imputed data were substantively similar; we present the imputed regression models in the results section.⁶

⁵ Missing data on these variables ranged from <1% to 15%. Patrol had the largest amount of missing. This variable was created from an open-ended rank question. The patrol variable was coded as missing when it either was not completed or the answer was illegible/uninterpretable.

⁶ The non-imputed regression tables can be found in the online supplementary materials (Supplementary Tables 1-2).

Results

Entry Motives, Concerns, and Gender Differences (RQ1a and RQ1b)

Table 2 summarizes motives for the entire sample and differences by gender (RQ1a). Although the order varies slightly, the top three motives (*desire to stop those that would harm others, help people in the community, and fighting crime*) were the same for men and women. Gender differences were present for approximately half of the career entry motives with women rating the following significantly higher: *help people in the community, to have a challenging career, opportunity to solve problems, help others to live a better life, role model for others like me, show people like me make good officers, and use job as a stepping stone*. Men rated *ability to work on my own and companionship with co-workers* significantly higher than women. The effect size differences were relatively small (Cohen's d range = 0.21 - 0.37) with the largest differences in *companionship with co-workers* (males higher), *use job as a stepping stone* (females higher), and *opportunity to solve problems* (females higher).

Table 3 summarizes concerns for the entire sample and differences by gender (RQ1b). As with motives, top concerns were similar among women and men. Both males and females rated *being able to prove myself, being able to do the job effectively, danger of the job, and stressful nature of the job* in the top five. *Physical nature of the job* made the top five for women but not men, and men rated *job fit with relationships* in the top five but women did not. Women reported being significantly more nervous about 9 of 13 items on the questionnaire. Effect sizes ranged from small to moderate (Cohen's d range = 0.20 - 0.78). The largest differences were reported on *discrimination in the work environment, physical nature of the job, and being taken seriously*, indicating women were more likely than men to be nervous about these aspects.

Table 2

Entry Motivations by Gender

Variables	Total	Female	Male	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	Sample	(<i>n</i> = 150)	(<i>n</i> = 678)			
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)			
Help people in the community	4.15(0.91)	4.37(0.85)	4.10(0.91)	-3.47	.00	-0.30
Fighting crime	4.12(0.90)	4.15(0.86)	4.12(0.91)	-0.38	.71	-0.03
Excitement of the work	4.08(0.94)	4.09(0.91)	4.08(0.94)	-0.12	.90	-0.01
Desire to stop those that would harm	3.91(0.98)	4.09(0.99)	3.87(0.98)	-2.54	.01	-0.23
Help others improve their lives	3.84(0.99)	4.09(1.01)	3.78(0.98)	-3.43	.00	-0.32
Job that is different every day	3.82(1.08)	3.89(1.12)	3.80(1.07)	-0.91	.37	-0.08
Role models for others like me	3.79(1.19)	3.81(1.20)	3.78(1.19)	-0.27	.78	-0.02
Job security	3.79(1.12)	3.65(1.14)	3.82(1.11)	1.58	.11	0.15
Ability to work on my own	3.75(1.05)	3.50(1.14)	3.81(1.02)	2.99	.00	0.29
Enforcing laws of society	3.64(0.92)	3.77(0.89)	3.73(0.94)	-0.44	.66	-0.04
Show people like me make good officers	3.55(1.23)	3.81(1.19)	3.49(1.22)	-2.96	.00	-0.26
Salary	3.49(1.00)	3.54(1.08)	3.49(0.98)	-0.57	.57	-0.05
Career advancement	3.40(1.08)	3.49(1.12)	3.39(1.08)	-0.98	.33	-0.09
Show that officers are good people	3.36(1.32)	3.52(1.33)	3.34(1.31)	-1.53	.13	-0.14
Companionship with co-workers	3.32(1.10)	2.99(1.16)	3.40(1.07)	3.91	.00	0.37
Prestige	3.23(1.18)	3.11(1.19)	3.26(1.17)	1.37	.17	0.12
Lifelong dream	3.12(1.42)	3.03(1.53)	3.13(1.40)	0.72	.47	0.07
Educational experiences	2.99(1.32)	3.25(1.39)	2.93(1.29)	-2.58	.01	-0.24
Specific interactions with officers	2.94(1.29)	3.15(1.33)	2.89(1.27)	-2.13	.03	-0.20
Make others proud	2.69(1.28)	2.89(1.36)	2.65(1.26)	-1.94	.05	-0.18
Use job as stepping stone	2.05(1.13)	2.36(1.24)	1.98(1.09)	-3.44	.00	-0.34

Note: Significance indicated by boldface type. Shaded areas represent top five motives for women and men.

Table 3

Entry Concerns by Gender

Variables	Total	Female	Male	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	Sample	(<i>n</i> = 150)	(<i>n</i> = 678)			
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)			
Being able to do the job effectively	2.69(1.26)	2.79(1.25)	2.67(1.26)	-1.05	.29	-0.09
Being able to prove myself	2.61(1.25)	2.90(1.23)	2.55(1.25)	-3.14	.00	-0.28
Job fit with relationships	2.41(1.20)	2.40(1.18)	2.42(1.20)	0.17	.87	0.02
Stressful nature of the job	2.36(1.13)	2.63(1.10)	2.31(1.13)	-3.18	.00	-0.28
Danger of the job	2.34(1.11)	2.73(1.21)	2.26(1.06)	-4.38	.00	-0.43
Shift work/hours	2.25(1.16)	2.44(1.13)	2.21(1.16)	-2.29	.02	-0.20
Being accepted by co-workers	2.14(1.13)	2.46(1.23)	2.08(1.10)	-3.52	.00	-0.34
Being accepted by community	2.00(1.06)	2.17(1.07)	1.96(1.05)	-2.13	.03	-0.20
Dealing with the public	1.91(1.09)	1.93(0.91)	1.91(1.01)	-0.22	.82	-0.02
Physical nature of the job	1.90(0.99)	2.56(1.24)	1.76(1.00)	-7.40	.00	-0.77
Being taken seriously	1.86(1.05)	2.38(1.21)	1.74(0.98)	-5.95	.00	-0.62
Whether co-workers would be similar to me	1.85(0.96)	1.95(0.98)	1.83(0.96)	-1.44	.15	-0.13
Discrimination in the workplace	1.63(1.02)	2.26(1.23)	1.50(0.91)	-7.15	.00	-0.78

Note. Significance indicated by boldface type. Shaded areas represent top five concerns for women and men.

Categories of Entry Motives and Concerns (RQ2a and RQ2b)

We conducted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) using *Mplus 8* to investigate underlying motives and concerns related to policing. As this research is preliminary, EFA allowed us to explore underlying factor structures without making a priori assumptions about which items loaded on latent constructs. We utilized oblique rotations to allow the factors to correlate and to achieve the optimal simple structure where each factor explains as much variance as possible in non-overlapping indicators (Yong & Pearce, 2013). We relied on best practices in EFA (see Costello & Osborne, 2005; Yong & Pearce, 2013) to determine which EFA solution provided the best data-driven and theoretically consistent model. The literature suggests that factors loadings should be a minimum of .32 and should not have cross-loadings

exceeding .32 (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Yong & Pearce, 2013). We used more strict criteria and retained items from the EFA if loadings (λ) were $\geq .44$ and had no substantial cross-loading ($\lambda \geq .32$) on another factor. We also made determinations based on theory (i.e., sometimes items may empirically load on a factor but make little theoretical sense).

We started with motives (RQ3a) and decided on a 3-factor solution (Table 4). Though items had minimum acceptable loadings on more than one solution, the 3-factor solution had the fewest (20%) non-redundant residual values greater than .05 (Field, 2013) and was the most interpretable of the solutions. Four items (companionship with co-workers, lifelong dream, use job as stepping stone, job that is different every day) were dropped due to either not loading well on any factors or having high cross-loadings. The first factor identified was *Serve/Protect* ($\alpha = .88$) which included items associated with serving (e.g., help people in the community) and protecting (e.g., fighting crime, enforcing laws). The second factor was *Nature/Perks* ($\alpha = .74$) and included perks such as salary, prestige, job security, and ability to work on your own. The final factor, *Legacy* ($\alpha = .81$), was comprised of sources of future legacy (e.g., be a role model, show that people like me make good officers).

Table 4

3-Factor EFA Solution for Motives

Indicator	<i>Serve/Protect</i>	<i>Nature/Perks</i>	<i>Inspiration/Legacy</i>
	Loading (λ)		
Help people in the community	.51	-.06	.28
Excitement of the work	.79	.14	-.15
Fighting crime	.83	-.09	.08
Enforcing society's laws	.47	.02	.29
Desire to prevent harm to others	.61	.02	.28
Help others improve their lives	.60	.08	.28
Job security	-.04	.56	.08
Career Advancement	.28	.46	.07
Prestige	.24	.51	.07
Ability to work on my own	.30	.59	-.18
Salary	-.05	.58	.06
To make others proud	-.10	.53	.30
Show that officers are good people	-.01	.28	.58
Experiences with officers	-.06	.19	.68
Educational experiences	-.08	.30	.67
To be a role model for others like me	.21	-.14	.74
Show people like me make good officers	.18	-.12	.79
Companionship	.28	.38	.08
Lifelong dream	.14	.24	.26
Stepping-stone	-.17	.43	.19
The job is different everyday	.50	.35	-.10

Note. Model fit: χ^2 (150 df, N = 829) = 1404.50, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.88, RMSEA = 0.10, SRMR = .06

For concerns (RQ3b), we again explored multiple possible solutions using EFA. As with motives, EFA analysis suggested that the 3-factor solution (Table 5) was the best as it had only 21% of the non-redundant residuals over .05, the fewest problematic cross-loadings, and was the most interpretable. We dropped 1 item (i.e., shift work/hours) as it had problematic cross-loadings on multiple factors. The first identified factor was *Job Demands* ($\alpha = .79$) and was characterized by concerns such as stress and dangerous nature. The second factor, *Performance* ($\alpha = .87$), dealt with concerns about proving oneself and doing the job

effectively. The final factor, *Acceptance/Fit* ($\alpha = .82$), was characterized by concerns like discrimination, similarity to co-workers, and being taken seriously.

Table 5

3-Factor EFA Solution for Concerns

Item	Loading (λ)		
	<i>Job Demands</i>	<i>Acceptance/Fit</i>	<i>Performance</i>
Physical nature of the job	.63	.08	.21
Danger of the job	.92	-.11	.14
Stressful nature of the job	.72	.13	.02
How the job fits with relationships or family	.53	.30	-.28
Being able to prove myself on the job	.15	.23	.76
Being able to do the job effectively	.26	.13	.66
Being accepted by co-workers	-.02	.58	.30
Being accepted by the community	-.05	.70	.26
Discrimination in the work environment	.04	.67	-.18
Whether my co-workers are similar to me	.01	.76	.07
Dealing with the public	.30	.52	.03
Being taken seriously	.14	.63	.12
Shift work/hours	.48	.37	-.34

Note. Model fit: χ^2 (42 df, N = 831) = 687.73, $p < 0.01$; CFI = 0.94, RMSEA = 0.14, SRMR = .05

Thematic Gender Differences (RQ3a and RQ3b)

Table 6

Thematic Entry Motivations and Concerns by Gender

	Total Sample	Female (<i>n</i> = 150)	Male (<i>n</i> = 678)			
Subscales	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Motivation						
Serve/Protect	3.99(0.69)	4.11(0.67)	3.96(0.69)	-2.34	.02	-0.21
Nature/Perks	3.53(0.74)	3.46 (0.80)	3.55(0.73)	1.28	.20	0.12
Legacy	3.09(1.03)	3.32(1.03)	3.04(1.03)	-3.01	.00	-0.27
Concerns						
Job Demands	2.26(0.89)	2.58(0.95)	2.19(0.03)	-4.67	.00	-0.45
Performance	2.65(0.1.18)	2.84(1.16)	2.61(1.18)	-2.22	.03	-0.20
Acceptance/Fit	1.90(0.76)	2.19(0.79)	1.84(0.73)	-4.97	.00	-0.47

Note. Significance indicated by boldface type.

To explore thematic differences in motivation and concerns by gender we conducted *t*-tests on each subscale identified through factor analysis (see Table 6). For motivations, women scored significantly higher on *Serve/Protect* and *Legacy* but there was no evidence of gender difference in *Nature/Perks*. Effect size differences, indicated by Cohen's *d*, were relatively small. Females scored significantly higher on all 3 concerns subscales: *Job Demands*, *Performance*, and *Acceptance/Fit*. Effect size differences ranged from small to moderate with the largest difference in the *Acceptance/Fit* subscale.

Results from OLS regression models predicting entry motivations are presented in Table 7. In the first model, gender, patrol, and years employed were significant predictors of *Serve/Protect* motivations. Women and higher-ranking officers reported this motivation as more important than men and patrol officers. *Serve/Protect* was reported as less important with each year on the job. Gender was not a significant predictor of *Nature/Perks* motivation; years employed and race were the only significant predictors. *Nature/Perks* motivation was ranked less important with each year on the job and more important by officers of color.

Gender, race, and years employed significantly predicted the importance of *Legacy*. Women and officers of color rated *Legacy* higher than men and white officers. *Legacy* was ranked less important with each year on the job. Demographics accounted for only a modest proportion of the variance in entry motivations with the most variance accounted for in the *Legacy* model.

Table 7

OLS Regression Results for Entry Motivations and Concerns

	Motives						Concerns					
	Serve/Protect		Nature/Perks		Legacy		Job Demands		Performance		Acceptance/Fit	
	<i>b</i> (SE)	Avg β	<i>b</i> (SE)	Avg β	<i>b</i> (SE)	Avg β	<i>b</i> (SE)	Avg β	<i>b</i> (SE)	Avg β	<i>b</i> (SE)	Avg β
Female	.13(.06)*	.08	-.10(.07)	-.05	.30(.09)**	.11	.35(.08)**	.15	.15(.11)	.05	.34(.07)**	.17
White	-.00(.07)	.00	-.16(.07)*	-.08	-.26(.10)*	-.09	-.12(.09)	-.05	-.14(.11)	-.04	-.28(.08)**	-.14
Patrol	-.25(.06)**	-.17	-.09(.07)	-.06	-.07(.10)	-.03	.09(.08)	.05	-.11(.11)	-.04	.04(.07)	.02
Bachelors+	-.06(.06)	-.04	.08(.06)	.05	.01(.08)	-.00	.28(.07)**	.15	.28(.09)**	.11	.16(.06)**	.10
Yrs Employ	-.01(.00)**	-.16	-.02(.01)**	-.19	-.02(.00)**	-.17	-.02(.00)**	-.21	-.02(.01)**	-.17	-.01(.00)**	-.15
Start Age	0.00(.01)	.02	-.00(.01)	-.00	.00(.01)	-.01	-.00(.01)	-.01	-.01(.01)	-.03	-.01(.01)	-.04
Military	-0.04(.05)	-.03	-.07(.06)	-.05	-.14(.08)	-.07	.09(.06)	.05	.15(.09)	.06	.02(.05)	.01
Intercept	4.30		3.97		3.75		2.32		3.10		2.29	
F	4.29		5.40		7.11		13.83		5.93		9.72	
Avg R²	0.04		0.05		0.06		0.10		0.05		0.08	
Avg RVI	0.12		0.08		0.08		0.07		0.06		0.06	
Largest FMI	0.23		0.12		0.19		0.18		0.13		0.18	

Note. SE= Robust standard errors; Avg β = mean β across the 20 imputed models; Avg R² = mean R² across the 20 imputed models; Avg RVI = average relative increase in variance of estimates because of missing values (numbers closer to zero better)

* p < .05; ** p < .01

Results from OLS regression models predicting entry-related concerns are presented in Table 7. Gender, education, and years on the job significantly predicted concerns related to *Job Demands*. Women and officers with at least a bachelor's degree reported being more nervous about demands than males and those with less than a bachelors. Concerns about *Job Demands* decreased with each year on the job. Education and years on the job significantly predicted *Performance* but gender did not. Those with a bachelor's degree reported being more nervous about proving themselves and doing the job effectively while officers who had been on the job longer reported less initial concern in this area. Gender, race, education, and

years employed significantly predicted concerns related to *Acceptance/Fit*. Women, officers of color, and those with at least a bachelor's degree reported more concerns about *Acceptance/Fit*, or things like being taken seriously, discrimination, and similarity to co-workers. Each year on the job was associated with less reported concern at entry about *Acceptance/Fit*. Demographics accounted for a modest proportion of the variance in entry motivations with the most variance accounted for in the *Job Demands* model.

Discussion

The Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015) argued agencies should prioritize diversity (race, gender, language, etc.) in the workforce to facilitate understanding, trust, and effectiveness in serving communities. Indeed, some research indicates women are less likely to be involved in use-of-force incidents, agencies with more women experience fewer citizen complaints, and surges in women often initiates organizational change, such as increased focus on community policing, reductions in sexual harassment, and a more highly-educated police force (Brandl & Strohshine, 2013; Lonsway et al., 2003; Schuck, 2014, 2017; Schuck & Rabe-Hemp, 2016). Data from the United Kingdom indicates an association between an increase in officers of color and reductions in police misconduct and citizen complaints (Hong, 2017). Despite these benefits and repeated calls to diversify policing, relatively little has changed in the last couple of decades (Hyland & Davis, 2019; PERF, 2019). The same old recruitment strategies based on the same old images, assumptions, and stereotypes are not likely to bring about desired changes (Clinkinbeard & Rief, 2020). To improve strategies, we need to continue to develop our knowledge base on what attracts people, particularly women and people of color, to policing and what deters them. We focused on one piece of that puzzle – we asked male and female officers, many of whom had been on the force for several years, to identify motives and concerns that were most important to them at the time of career entry.

Motives

Our results on policing motivations align with previous research and add new areas of insight and importance. The most important motives for men and women were *desire to stop those that would harm others, helping people in the community and fighting crime*, similar to previous research (Lester, 1983; Raganella & White, 2004; M. D. White et al., 2010). These items were part of the *Serve/Protect* category which was rated as most influential by men and women. Though important for all, women rated helping people and the *Serve/Protect* category significantly higher than men. Aspects of police work like crime-fighting are highly salient in the public image and thus it is likely easier for all applicants to access those motivations. Although “helping or serving people” is also a well-known characteristic of police work, it may not garner as much attention and is an area agencies should emphasize. A meta-analysis of gender differences in job preferences found that one of the largest differences across studies was women’s preferences for “opportunities to help people” (Konrad, Ritchie, Lieb, & Corrigan, 2000). Still, young women are not likely to see policing as a career option (Clinkinbeard et al., 2020; Rossler et al., 2020) and so the challenge is getting those women who want to help others to see policing as fitting with that desire. This might mean concentrating on marketing that deemphasizes masculine “running and gunning” imagery and focuses more on meaningful interactions with community; or, it could mean engaging college students majoring in traditional helping career areas (e.g., psychology, social work) as part of recruitment.

By expanding earlier measures of policing motives, we made important discoveries about the motives of women and officers of color. Women and officers of color rated *Legacy* motives as more important than men and white officers. This category represents desires to impact future generations (e.g., be a role model, show people like me make good officers). Thus, recruitment strategies should appeal to those desires to influence the narrative around

policing, improve things for future generations, and prove that it is not a career restricted to white men. Even the best recruitment brochure or social media campaign will not work if dismissed as ‘not for me’. Direct interactions can plant a seed, leaving potential recruits open to possibilities when later presented through brochures, ads, and social media campaigns. This may also mean starting earlier in life to counteract stereotypes that steer women in other directions (e.g., women’s law enforcement groups partnering with girl scout troops).

Entry Concerns

As with motives, there were similarities in the top-reported concerns for men and women. *Being able to prove myself, being able to do the job effectively, danger of the job, and stressful nature of the job* made the top five for both men and women. Overall, though, women reported stronger concerns, scoring significantly higher than men on 9 of the 13 individual concerns. This finding is consistent with broader motivational literature which suggests that women tend to report more future-oriented fears, especially in male-dominated domains (Greene & DeBacker, 2004; Knox et al., 2000; Lips, 2004).

Concerns with the largest reported gender differences ($d = 0.62 - 0.78$) were *physical nature of the job, being taken seriously, and discrimination in the work environment*. These findings align with previous research on pre-career motives in which high school and college students have noted gender-related concerns associated with policing careers (Cambareri & Kuhns, 2018; Lord & Friday, 2003; Todak, 2017). In regression analyses, women rated *Acceptance/Fit* (i.e., being accepted by co-workers/community, being taken seriously, and discrimination) and *demands* (i.e., physical, dangerous, stressful nature, and fit with relationships) categories higher than men. Further, officers of color reported more concerns about *Acceptance/Fit* (compared to white officers). Some concerns (e.g., acceptance) among women and officers of color, could be partially explained by the visibility and isolation that comes from token status (Gustafson, 2008; Krimmel & Gormley, 2003; Strohline & Brandl,

2011). Further, people of color are sometimes seen as betraying their race by pursuing policing (Skolnick, 2008), potentially heightening concerns about acceptance from community members.

Concerns highlighted by women and officers of color must be considered by those trying to attract a diverse workforce. Agencies can work to reduce or eliminate real and perceived barriers. For example, research indicates that some physical requirements are responsible for eliminating women from the hiring pool, despite lack of direct correlation to performance (Martin & Jurik, 2007; Schuck, 2014; Schulze, 2012). Fitness requirements could be modified or eliminated to be more inclusive, or support (e.g., freely available training/workout programs) could be provided to help applicants succeed. Recruitment and marketing approaches need to move away from the white, hyper-masculine images if we're going to convince people that policing can be for them (Clinkinbeard et al., 2020; Todak, 2017). Combatting concerns requires multiple approaches, but the most important thing departments can do is to make discrimination, alienation, and other gender and race-based issues less of a *reality*. Strategies that lead to real, systemic change in climate and equity will be more effective than any recruitment strategy or marketing plan.

Recruiters do not need to portray everything as easy or rosy. Instead, they should address concerns about equity and discrimination and tap into potential recruits' desire to change images of policing for future generations. Police departments might benefit from harnessing desires (e.g., inspiration, anger) similar to those that have encouraged women to run for office since the 2016 presidential election (Entman, 2018; Kurtzleben, 2018). As Todak (2017) stated, "...it is up to departments to harness the inherent drive in women to defeat stereotypes and demonstrate their competence in areas thought to be exclusively masculine" (p. 265). That said, it is also important to provide access to networks that will inspire and support female applicants, like women's groups or mentoring programs.

Other Areas of Consideration

Years on the job was negatively associated with all categories of motives and concerns in the regression models. Because the finding was consistent across categories, we suggest that the perceived importance of all motives and concerns may have dissipated with time. The perceived strength of some of the motives and concerns likely weakens over time. Further, initial motives may be interpreted through the lens of experience, making them seem more or less important than they were previously. It is also possible that motives are slightly different for those that have been on the job several years versus those that are early in their career or those that choose to leave (i.e., we don't know if those that are in their first few years will stick around). Although it was outside the scope of our research, future work should explore the association between motives and concerns and long-term retention.

Race was not our primary focus but racial diversity is a critical component in building an effective police force. Although our sample was larger than many, it was not of sufficient size to breakdown the analysis by various race/gender combinations (e.g., black women⁷ compared to white women or white men). That said, it is important to note that race was a significant predictor of *Legacy* and *Nature/Perks* motives and *Acceptance/Fit* concerns. We believe these categories represent what is referred to as balance in the motivational literature (Clinkinbeard & Zohra, 2011; Oyserman & Markus, 1990). *Legacy* (e.g., desire to be role models, show that people like me make good officers) and *Nature/Perks* (job security, ability to work on my own) motives may have helped officers counteract or overcome concerns around *Acceptance/Fit* (e.g., discrimination, acceptance by community and co-workers). For example, officers of color likely expect they will face challenges related to their race (e.g., discrimination, accusations of betrayal) when they pursue policing, but they may be more

⁷ Although 16% of our sample was non-white, non-white females only made up 2.6% (n = 21) of the sample.

likely to endure them if they feel they have a secure job that allows them to contribute to an important purpose (e.g., a role model for future generations). Research should further explore the concept of balance and motives and fears within multiple race/gender combinations using large samples.

One final note is that paying special attention to how to attract more women will likely serve *everyone* better. It is noteworthy that *job fit with relationships* was a top-five fear for men, but not women. Family-friendly policies are often recommended to attract women to the field (Rabe-Hemp & Humiston, 2015; Schulze, 2010, 2011); however, such policies may also appeal to men. As gender roles continue to expand and more men take responsibility for childrearing, family-friendly policies tend to help everyone. When it comes to recruiting in a legitimacy crisis and changing workforce landscapes, departments not only need to rethink how they approach women but how they approach every potential applicant.

Limitations

One of our goals was to add to the conceptualization of policing motives. Although we are not the first to examine motives, the literature is relatively sparse, it is primarily atheoretical, and concepts are not well-defined. Aside from Lester's (1983) motives, there has been no consistent approach to conceptualization and measurement but rather a collection of varied motives and, less often, concerns. Thus, our work is largely exploratory although we have situated it within the broader social psychological framework on future-oriented thinking. More work is needed to improve upon and establish core measures of motives and barriers. We have provided initial evidence for latent factors surrounding career entry and now additional research is necessary to refine and validate measures and improve fit.

Although our investigation employs the largest known sample comparing motives of male and female officers, the sample has its limitations. The officers in our sample were already employed as officers, meaning that they made it through the application, hiring, and

training hoops to become officers. As half of our sample had been on the job at least 13 years, they also represent officers that had been retained through their first few years. Future research should compare people at various career stages (e.g., pre-career, application, early career, late-career) with those that considered but never pursued and those that left to get a complete picture of motivation and how it might best inform recruitment.

Conclusion

There may have been a time when it was easy to recruit police officers, but that is no longer the case (PERF, 2019). Understanding what draws people to the field and what turns them off can help agencies get creative with recruitment. We found popular notions of serving and protecting the community remain important motivations for men and women. We also identified less-obvious motives. The desire to leave a legacy and be a role model for others was particularly important for women and officers of color compared to men and white officers. Men and women both reported concerns around career entry but these were more pronounced for women. Many concerns were related to issues of gender or stereotypes (e.g., physical nature, being taken seriously, discrimination), which is not surprising given the long history of inequity, harassment, and hegemonic masculinity in policing. To attract more women, departments need to consider multiple approaches for addressing concerns, including: giving candidates opportunities to connect with officers, ask questions, and discuss concerns; providing opportunities for networking and support to help diverse candidates persist; thinking more broadly about recruitment imagery and target populations; and most important, making discrimination, alienation, and other gender and race-based issues less of a *reality* in policing. Strategies that lead to real, systemic change in climate and equity will be more effective than any single recruitment strategy or marketing plan.

References

- Archbold, C. A., & Schulz, D. M. (2012). Research on women in policing: A look at the past, present and future. *Sociology Compass*, 6(9), 694-706. doi:10.1111/j.17519020.2012.00501.x
- Bolten, K. A. (Nov. 2, 2016). Police 'heartbroken' after ambush leaves 2 des moines-area officers dead. *Des Moines Register*.
- Brandl, S. G., & Stroshine, M. S. (2013). The role of officer attributes, job characteristics, and arrest activity in explaining police use of force. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 24(5), 551-572. doi:10.1177/0887403412452424
- Brown, T. C., Baldwin, J. M., Dierenfeldt, R., & McCain, S. (2020). Playing the game: A qualitative exploration of the female experience in a hypermasculine policing environment. *Police Quarterly*, 23(2), 143-173. doi:10.1177/1098611119883423
- Cambareri, J. F., & Kuhns, J. B. (2018). Perceptions and perceived challenges associated with a hypothetical career in law enforcement: Differences among male and female college students. *Police Quarterly*, 21(3), 335-357. doi:10.1177/1098611118760862
- Clinkinbeard, S. S., & Rief, R. M. (2020). Four steps to bringing more women into policing. *Police Chief* (April).
- Clinkinbeard, S. S., Solomon, S. J., & Rief, R. M. (2020). Who dreams of badges? Gendered self-concept and policing career aspirations. *Feminist Criminology*. doi:10.1177/1557085120937799
- Clinkinbeard, S. S., & Zohra, T. (2011). Expectations, fears, and strategies: Juvenile offender thoughts on a future outside of incarceration. *Youth & Society*, 44(2), 236-257. doi:10.1177/0044118X11398365

- Cook, P. J. (2015). Will the current crisis in police legitimacy increase crime? Research offers a way forward. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(3), 71-74.
doi:10.1177/1529100615610575
- Cordner, G., & Cordner, A. (2011). Stuck on a plateau?: Obstacles to recruitment, selection, and retention of women police. *Police Quarterly*, 14(3), 207-226.
doi:10.1177/1098611111413990
- Corsianos, M. (2009). *Policing and gendered justice: Examining the possibilities*. Canada: Toronto Press.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(7).
- Entman, L. (Producer). (2018). Expert: Inspiration, anger motivate women to run for office. *Research News @ Vanderbilt*. Retrieved from <https://news.vanderbilt.edu/2018/08/02/expert-inspiration-anger-motivate-women-to-run-for-office/>
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using ibm spss statistics* (4th ed.): Sage Publications.
- Fielding, N. (1994). Cop canteen culture. In T. Newburn & E. A. Stanko (Eds.), *Just boys doing business: Men, masculinities, and crime* (pp. 46-63). New York: Routledge.
- Garcia, V. (2003). "Difference" in the police department: Women, policing, and "doing gender". *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 19(3), 330-344.
doi:10.1177/1043986203254530
- Greene, B. A., & DeBacker, T. K. (2004). Gender and orientations toward the future: Links to motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(2), 91-120.
- Gustafson, J. L. (2008). Tokenism in policing: An empirical test of Kanter's hypothesis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.12.001>

- Hong, S. (2017). Does increasing ethnic representativeness reduce police misconduct? *Public Administration Review*, 77(2), 195-205. doi:10.1111/puar.12629
- Hyland, S. S., & Davis, E. (2019). *Local police departments, 2016: Personnel*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/lpd16p.pdf>.
- Jones, J. M. (2015). In u.S., confidence in police lowest in 22 years. Retrieved from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/183704/confidence-police-lowest-years.aspx>
- Kimmelmeier, M., & Oyserman, D. (2001). Gendered influence of downward social comparisons on current and possible selves. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(1), 129-148.
- Knox, M., Funk, J., Elliott, R., & Bush, E. G. (2000). Gender differences in adolescents' possible selves. *Youth & Society*, 31(3), 287-309. doi:10.1177/0044118X00031003002
- Konrad, A. M., Ritchie, J. E., Lieb, P., & Corrigan, E. (2000). Sex differences and similarities in job attribute preferences: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(4), 593-641. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.4.593
- Krimmel, J. T., & Gormley, P. E. (2003). Tokenism and job satisfaction for policewomen. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(1), 73-88. doi:10.1007/BF02885753
- Kringen, A. L. (2014). Scholarship on women and policing: Trends and policy implications. *Feminist Criminology*, 9(4), 367-381. doi:10.1177/1557085114530772
- Kringen, A. L., & Novich, M. (2018). Is it 'just hair' or is it 'everything'? Embodiment and gender repression in policing. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 25(2), 195-213. doi:10.1111/gwao.12207
- Kurtzleben, D. (2018). More than twice as many women are running for congress in 2018 compared with 2016. *NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/2018/02/20/585542531/more-than-twice-as-many-women-are-running-for-congress-in-2018-compared-to-2016>
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2001). Fear, anger, and risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(1), 146-159. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.1.146

- Lester, D. (1983). Why do people become police officers: A study of reasons and their predictions of success. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*, 11(2), 170-174.
- Lips, H. M. (2004). The gender gap in possible selves: Divergence of academic self-views among high school and university students. *Sex Roles*, 50(5-6), 357-371.
doi:10.1023/B:SERS.0000018891.88889.c9
- Lonsway, K. A., Carrington, S., Aguirre, P., Wood, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., & Spillar, K. (2002). *Equality denied: The status of women in policing: 2001*. Retrieved from http://womenandpolicing.com/PDF/2002_Status_Report.pdf.
- Lonsway, K. A., Moore, M., Harrington, P., Smeal, E., & Spillar, K. (2003). *Hiring and retaining more women: The advantages to law enforcement agencies*. Retrieved from <http://womenandpolicing.com/pdf/newadvantagesreport.pdf>
- Lonsway, K. A., Paynich, R., & Hall, J. N. (2013). Sexual harassment in law enforcement: Incidence, impact, and perception. *Police Quarterly*, 16(2), 177-210.
doi:10.1177/1098611113475630
- Lord, V. B., & Friday, P. C. (2003). Choosing a career in police work: A comparative study between applicants for employment with a large police department and public high school students. *Police Practice & Research*, 4(1), 63.
doi:10.1080/1561426032000059196
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. *American Psychologist*, 41(9), 954-969.
- Martin, S. E., & Jurik, N. C. (1996). *Doing justice, doing gender: Women in law and criminal justice occupations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Morash, M., & Haarr, R. N. (2012). Doing, redoing, and undoing gender: Variation in gender identities of women working as police officers. *Feminist Criminology*, 7(1), 3-23.
doi:10.1177/1557085111413253

- Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. (1990). Possible selves in balance: Implications for delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*(2), 141-157. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1990.tb01927.x
- Oyserman, D., & Saltz, E. (1993). Competence, delinquency, and attempts to attain possible selves. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*(2), 360-374. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.2.360
- PERF. (2019). *The workforce crisis, and what police agencies are doing about it*. Retrieved from Washington, D.C.: <https://www.policeforum.org/assets/WorkforceCrisis.pdf>
- President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the president's task force on 21st century policing*. Retrieved from Washington, DC:
- Prokos, A., & Padavic, I. (2002). 'There oughtta be a law against bitches': Masculinity lessons in police academy training. *Gender, Work & Organization, 9*(4), 439-459. doi:10.1111/1468-0432.00168
- Rabe-Hemp, C. E. (2009). Policewomen or policemen? Doing gender and police work. *Feminist Criminology, 4*(2), 114-129. doi:10.1177/1557085108327659
- Rabe-Hemp, C. E. (2018). *Thriving in an all-boys club: Female police and their fight for equality*. United States: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Raganella, A. J., & White, M. D. (2004). Race, gender, and motivation for becoming a police officer: Implications for building a representative police department. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*(6), 501-513. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2004.08.009>
- Rhodes, T. N., & Tyler, D. H. (2019). Is it cool to be a cop? Exploring the differential impact of ferguson on police applicants. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*. doi:10.1093/police/paz013
- Ridgeway, G., Lim, N., Gifford, B., Koper, C., Matthies, C., Hajiamiri, S., & Huynh, A. (2008). *Strategies for improving officer recruitment in the san diego police department*.

- Rief, R. M., & Clinkinbeard, S. S. (2020). Exploring gendered environments in policing: Workplace incivilities and fit perceptions in men and women officers. *Police Quarterly*. doi:10.1177/1098611120917942
- Rossler, M. T., Rabe-Hemp, C. E., Peuterbaugh, M., & Scheer, C. (2020). Influence of gender on perceptions of barriers to a police patrol career. *Police Quarterly*, 23(3), 368-395. doi:10.1177/1098611120907870
- Schuck, A. M. (2014). Female representation in law enforcement: The influence of screening, unions, incentives, community policing, calea, and size. *Police Quarterly*, 17(1), 54-78. doi:10.1177/1098611114522467
- Schuck, A. M. (2017). Female officers and community policing: Examining the connection between gender diversity and organizational change. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 27(5), 341-362. doi:10.1080/08974454.2017.1303659
- Schuck, A. M., & Rabe-Hemp, C. (2016). Citizen complaints and gender diversity in police organisations. *Policing & Society*, 26(8), 859-874. doi:10.1080/10439463.2014.989161
- Schulze, C. (2010). Institutionalized masculinity in us police departments: How maternity leave policies (or lack thereof) affect women in policing. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 23(2), 177-193. doi:10.1080/1478601X.2010.485485
- Schulze, C. (2012). The masculine yardstick of physical competence: U.S. Police academy fitness tests. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 22(2), 89-107. doi:10.1080/08974454.2012.662117
- Seklecki, R., & Paynich, R. (2007). A national survey of female police officers: An overview of findings. *Police Practice and Research*, 8(1), 17-30. doi:10.1080/15614260701217941
- Skolnick, J. H. (2008). Enduring issues of police culture and demographics. *Policing and Society*, 18(1), 35-45. doi:10.1080/10439460701718542

- Stewart, A. J., & McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 519-544. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141537
- Stroshine, M. S., & Brandl, S. G. (2011). Race, gender, and tokenism in policing: An empirical elaboration. *Police Quarterly*, 14(4), 344-365.
doi:10.1177/1098611111423738
- Tarng, M.-Y., & Hsieh, C.-H. (2001). Personal background and reasons for choosing a career in policing an empirical study of police. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(1), 45.
doi:10.1016/S0047-2352(00)00075-1
- Todak, N. (2017). The decision to become a police officer in a legitimacy crisis. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 27(4), 250-270. doi:10.1080/08974454.2016.1256804
- Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. *American Psychologist*, 34(11), 1085-1094. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.34.11.1085
- White, I. R., Royston, P., & Wood, A. M. (2011). Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Statistics in Medicine*, 30(4), 377-399.
doi:10.1002/sim.4067
- White, M. D., Cooper, J. A., Saunders, J., & Raganella, A. J. (2010). Motivations for becoming a police officer: Re-assessing officer attitudes and job satisfaction after six years on the street. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 520-530.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.022
- Yong, A. G., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: Focusing on exploratory factor analysis. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology*, 9(2).