

Olivet Nazarene University

Digital Commons @ Olivet

Ed.D. Dissertations

School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

5-9-2020

Multigenerational Perceptions Of The Law Enforcement Work Environment

William K. Akin
akinwilliam@hotmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss



Part of the [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#), [Leadership Studies Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), [Organization Development Commons](#), [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), and the [Training and Development Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](#).

Recommended Citation

Akin, William K., "Multigenerational Perceptions Of The Law Enforcement Work Environment" (2020). *Ed.D. Dissertations*. 126.
https://digitalcommons.olivet.edu/edd_diss/126

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Graduate and Continuing Studies at Digital Commons @ Olivet. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ed.D. Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Olivet. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@olivet.edu.

MULTIGENERATIONAL PERCEPTIONS OF THE LAW
ENFORCEMENT WORK ENVIRONMENT

by

William K. Akin

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of

Olivet Nazarene University

School of Graduate and Continuing Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of

Doctor of Education

in

Ethical Leadership

May 2020

SIGNATURE PAGE

© 2020

William K. Akin

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A tremendous amount of support from friends and family accompanied this arduous experience of writing this dissertation. To Dr. Houston Thompson, thank you for your encouragement. From day one, your guidance empowered me to stay the course. Thank you, Sheriff Paul Vescovo, for *opening the door* and affording me the opportunities to succeed professionally. To my friends Melissa Evans and Jon Bazzano, I will never forget your support during this seemingly forever dissertation process.

To my sons Jerod, Keaton, and Jacob, I am forever grateful for your understanding and willingness to accept my diminished presence during this process. I look forward to making up for the lost time. Most importantly, I thank my amazing wife, Jennifer. I may never have the words to express my gratitude to you for your support, encouragement, and sacrifices, but I will eagerly spend a lifetime showing you.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this research to my brothers and sisters, who represent every facet of law enforcement. Our profession is not without sacrifice, and your willingness to accept the calling is admirable. Your commitment to serve is commendable. Be good stewards of the authority society entrusts upon you to protect. “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God” (Matthew 5:9, New International Version).

ABSTRACT

Leaders struggle to address shifting characteristics between generational cohorts in a multigenerational workforce. Research has shown that law enforcement culture supports an antiquated approach to leadership and that popular generational stereotypes are not consistent with behaviors in the workplace. This research was designed to help the law enforcement community understand generational values, beliefs, and work ethics, and to recommend ways to reduce generational stereotypes, address employee shortages, and improve the overall connection to their communities. The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II was used in an online survey to anonymously collect data from 441 law enforcement participants within the Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial cohorts. A quantitative analysis was conducted using Welch's ANOVA and Tukey's HSD post hoc analysis. Findings for Emotional Demands $F(2, 438) = 7.627, p = .001, \eta^2 = .034$, Influence $F(2, 438) = 9.985, p < .001, \eta^2 = .044$, and Predictability $F(2, 438) = 3.035, p = .049, \eta^2 = .013$ were statistically significant. Millennials seemingly interpret the law enforcement work environment differently from the other two cohorts, but it appears Baby Boomer and Generation X leadership require more understanding of generational characteristics and its applicability to Millennials in the workplace. As agencies struggle to recruit, hire, and retain employees, future research could emphasize the need for leaders to account for generational differences when modifying policy, procedures, and practices. The need for additional generational research in law enforcement still exists.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Background.....	4
Research Questions.....	6
Description of Terms	6
Significance of the Study.....	7
Process to Accomplish.....	8
Summary.....	12
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Introduction.....	13
Generations	15
The Greatest Generation	16
The Silent Generation	16
The Baby Boom Generation	17
Generation X.....	18
The Millennial Generation.....	20
Generation Z	21
Generational Considerations.....	22

Chapter	Page
Generational Characteristics	23
History of Policing.....	25
Law Enforcement Culture.....	34
Job Stress	37
Cynicism	38
Generational Leadership	39
Baby Boomers.....	40
Generation X.....	43
Millennials	46
Psychosocial Factors.....	49
Conclusion	53
Summary	56
III. METHODOLOGY	57
Introduction.....	57
Research Design.....	58
Participants.....	59
Data Collection	60
Analytical Methods.....	63
Limitations	64
Summary	66
IV. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	67
Introduction.....	67

Chapter	Page
Findings.....	67
Conclusions.....	80
Implications and Recommendations.....	85
REFERENCES	92
APPENDICES	
A. Permissions from Dr. Thomas Clausen	125
B. Demographic Questions.....	129
C. Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II.....	132
D. Regions and States of Participants.....	137

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Demographics: Gender, Birth Year, and Relationship Status.....	68
2. Demographics: Race/Ethnicity and Education	69
3. Demographics: Agency Tenure and Sworn Employees at Agency	70
4. Demographics: Salary and Agencies Worked	71
5. Demographics: Law Enforcement Tenure	72
6. Research Question One: Dimensions ANOVA	75
7. Research Question Two: Dimensions ANOVA	77
8. Research Question Three: Dimensions ANOVA	79

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Law enforcement agencies are viewed as paramilitary organizations where the chain of command and rank structure are adhered to regardless of age, experience, or educational background. Law enforcement agencies are known to be resistant to change and slow to adjust to new practices. This may be complicated as consideration is given to generational attitudes and behaviors. It is imperative for law enforcement agencies to recognize the different generational cohorts amongst their ranks. Law enforcement leaders must encompass each generational cohort in their leadership approach to maintain the highest degree of professionalism as officers continue to serve the public and perform their duties.

The law enforcement officers in the United States are represented by generational cohorts that span about 80 birth years from 1922 to 2000 (Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Eighty birth years includes four generational groups; however, departments are likely to have few members of the Veterans Generation. Nonetheless, how does leadership balance the remaining three cohorts and the characteristics that embody their generations?

In any profession or industry, managers who have not recognized the generational similarities and differences between cohort members face losing valuable employees at the risk of not knowing how to motivate them (Murphy, Gordon, & Anderson, 2004).

Generational characteristics are used to compare cohorts and further explore factors such as values, motivators, and beliefs. Stress caused by constant exposure to critical work-related incidents can alter workplace perceptions. Policing has long been considered as one of the most stressful occupations (Gershon, Lin, & Li, 2002; Marmar et al., 2006). Zhao, Thurman, & He (1999) recognized policing as an area which is understudied and separate from other workplace populations.

The relationship between communities and law enforcement are examined continuously and have led to the creation of various crime prevention programs throughout the years. Recent national events are highlighting the importance of law enforcement agencies to introspectively examine their organizations, adjust to community demands, and simultaneously remain focused on enforcing laws and maintaining public safety. The changes necessary to accommodate societal pressures are compounded when agencies struggle to find qualified candidates for police work while employee attrition rates continue to challenge departments. Law enforcement agencies across the United States are reporting critical manpower shortages due to recent national events, low salaries, and overall negative perceptions of police.

Dowler (2005) noted that the dangers and uncertainty associated with police officer's professional work environment fixed with the paramilitary structures of their organizations as sources of dissatisfaction as well as stress, burnout, and turnover. Multigenerational perceptions were explored to determine how generational characteristics affect the psychosocial work environment. Menard and Arter (2013) pointed out that critical incidents, avoidant coping, and social stressors played an essential role in police officer health. Working with employees from four generations can

overwhelm any organization but integrating generational characteristics into leadership approach can lead to continued mission success.

Statement of the Problem

Law enforcement leaders, described as officers with the responsibility of supervising subordinates, struggle to address shifting characteristics between the generational cohorts within their organizations. The issue is the result of law enforcement culture supporting an antiquated approach to leadership and maintaining the status quo that encourages a single process mentality (Schafer, 2009). The goal for improvement is to change law enforcement perception that popular generational stereotypes are not always consistent with workplace behaviors (Becton, Walker, & Jones-Farmer, 2014).

Previous researchers completed scientific research in reviewing multigenerational perceptions (Kleinhans, Chakradhar, Muller, & Waddill, 2015) and conducted studies regarding generational differences and cohort experiences linking cohesion, attitudes, and beliefs (Jobe, 2014). Generational studies have been done in an array of occupational settings including business, nursing, and construction (Dai & Goodrum, 2012; Havens, Warshawsky, & Vasey, 2013; Murphy, Gibson, & Greenwood, 2010). Research remains necessary in the field of law enforcement while examining how multigenerational perceptions impact employees in their workplace environment. The purpose of the current study is to examine how law enforcement officers perceive their psychosocial work environments in order to improve agency effectiveness when approaching their multigenerational workforce.

Background

Before the entry of Generation Z into the workforce, the standard for generations across Western economies was Veterans (1925-1942), Baby Boomers (1943-1960), Generation X (1961-1981), and Millennials whose cohort began in 1982 (Strauss & Howe, 1991). Zemke et al. (2000) identified the generational cohorts a little differently and labeled each generation as Veterans (1925-1946), Baby Boomers (1946-1960), Generation X (1960-1980), and Millennials (1980-2000). The disparity between the two groups of authors is illustrated to show that despite existing research, there are no precise dates of demarcation for the generations. Recommendations have even gone so far as creating sub-categories for leading and trailing years for each generation. Since year ranges vary in literature and for ease of understanding, Twenge, Campbell, Hoffman, & Lance (2010) used the following cohort years for Veterans (1925-1945), Baby Boomers (1946-1964), Generation X (1965-1981), and Millennials (1982-1999). With the anticipation of Generation Z (2000-2020) entering the law enforcement workforce as early as 2021, further research will be necessary to examine their generational perceptions of the workplace environment.

Continued research on generational perceptions is required as older generations retire or leave the workplace while newer generations enter the ranks (Murray, Toulson, & Legg, 2011). To date, research has focused on the study of generational characteristics when examining employees from different eras. Studies on job satisfaction for law enforcement officers is critical because issues regarding work-related environments can interfere with job performance impacting the overall effectiveness of police departments (Julseth, Ruiz, & Hummer, 2011). An additional factor is a challenge that human

resource departments face trying to recruit qualified candidates to replace retirees or other officers who choose to leave law enforcement. In policing today, retention has drawn much attention from administrators as have recruitment efforts (Julseth et al.). The recruitment process is multifaceted and requires organizations to spend money on replacing employees, advertise for vacant positions, and then to train new hires as they enter the workplace (Jones & Gates, 2007). Past recruitment efforts have focused on the selection of candidates that would represent the communities they would serve (Mastrofski & Willis, 2010) but human resources professionals now must consider generational characteristics and how to attract qualified candidates while following established hiring requirements for their agencies.

Previous research indicates generational characteristics exist based on the specific eras but scholars have noted that generational differences may, in fact, have more to do with an individual's stage in life rather than which generation they belong (Arnett, 2000; Carlson & Gjerde, 2009; Parry & Urwin, 2011). Studies that examined generational differences are valued because they have applied and theoretical implications (Trzesniewski & Donnellan, 2010) but stereotyping generations without empirical support can have adverse effects on research and practice (Becton et al., 2014).

Understanding generational differences can lead to creativeness and opportunity but misunderstanding them can lead to conflict and stress. The differences between the generations impact nearly every aspect of workplace expectations including communication methods, information technology requirements, forms of leadership, career development, reward and recognition, and pay and benefits. The current study

sought to offer insight into the multigenerational perceptions of employees in the law enforcement work environment.

Research Questions

The current study was guided by the following questions:

1. How do perceptions of the work environment differ between generational cohorts?
2. How do perceptions of organizational leadership differ between generational cohorts?
3. What is the relationship between the perceptions of organizational leadership and the work environment across all generational cohorts?

Description of Terms

Chain of command. The hierarchal structure between seniors and subordinates forming a chain with everyone linked to one another (Redmond et al., 2015).

Generation. An identifiable group of individuals who share birth years, age location, and significant life events at critical developmental stages that shaped their attitudes and values. (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Generational cohorts. Groups of people that share birth years, age location, and significant life events during critical developmental stages (Kupperschmidt, 2000).

Generational stereotypes. An overly simplified image of a specific generation fueled by popular press and media that accentuates the differences of each generation but lacks empirical research substantiating that image (Murray et al., 2011).

Policing. Enforcing activities such as patrol, traffic control, and investigations according to local, state, and federal laws (Frank, Lambert, & Qureshi, 2017).

Psychosocial work environment. Interactions between coworkers involving interpersonal and social factors that influence behaviors in the workplace (Martin, Karanika-Murray, Biron, & Sanderson, 2016).

Single process mentality. The process of learning one topic as a separate issue without considering its application to other factors (Schafer, 2009).

Status quo. The existing state of rules, norms, and established patterns in the workplace environment (Guneqlioglu, 2017).

Significance of the Study

Police departments across the nation are experiencing critical shortages in police officers. Recruiting new police officers is a more difficult task because of the national attention from incidents highlighting strained relationships between specific communities and their law enforcement agencies. Recruitment is an ongoing challenge and can be the topic of future discussions, however, the current study focused on the multigenerational perceptions of the workplace environment. By focusing on the workplace and the generations that make up the current workforce, leaders can build a better understanding of the dynamics surrounding their employees and their relationships. Understanding generational values, beliefs, and work ethics allow leaders to modify their leadership approach to encompass all generations without treating one generation differently than another.

Stereotyping younger generation employees can be detrimental to the workplace environment. Younger employees being referred to as kids from their older coworkers can create animosity between coworkers. Calling a younger officer, a *kid* rather than referring to them as an adult may be offensive especially when that officer is trying to

build their professional identity (Baker Rosa & Hastings, 2016). This mentality of viewing employees as kids must change if organizations wish to remain impactful in the services they provide their communities. The number of Baby Boomers in the workplace are reducing leaving the number of Millennials increasing. Generation X currently appears to remain constant. Changes are expected soon with the arrival of Generation Z entering the law enforcement workforce.

The current study was designed to deliver an understanding of generational perspectives of those working in law enforcement informing best practices for leading employees. The focus and mission for police officers is public safety and enforcing laws but approaching this mission will be different depending on employees' values, beliefs, attitudes, and the overall view of their profession. Law enforcement professionals of all levels could potentially benefit from the results of the current study directing them to change policies, hiring practices, and even leading organizations to improved community engagement.

Process to Accomplish

The researcher surveyed law enforcement officers from agencies across the United States who self-reported regarding their perceptions of their workplace environment. The study compared the findings of each generational cohort.

The population for the research study included law enforcement officers from agencies spanning from small to large and included local, county, state, and federal law enforcement organizations. State governing bodies for police officer standards and training established enforcement parameters for local, county, and state law enforcement

organizations. The Department of Justice set law enforcement parameters for federal law enforcement organizations.

The survey used for the current study was The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ) II. This questionnaire was developed as a tool for the examination of the psychosocial work environment and to be used by companies or workplaces without the support of professional consultants (Pejtersen, Kristensen, Borg, & Bjorner, 2010). The COPSOQ was created to serve as a universal tool appropriate for all labor markets and organizational levels that would contribute to improving the psychosocial work environment (Kristensen, Hannerz, Hogh, & Borg, 2005). The COPSOQII is a product of the National Research Center for the Working Environment. The questionnaire is based upon several theories of psychosocial factors at work and addresses the psychosocial impact on health (Kiss, De Meester, Kruse, Chavee, & Braeckman, 2013; Kristensen et al.; Pejtersen et al.). From this questionnaire, an electronic web-based survey was formatted by the researcher to collect the responses of participants regarding the perspectives of their workplace environment.

Employees assigned to positions that required them to perform the duties of a sworn law enforcement officer were selected as the sample regardless of employment status. Full-time, part-time, and reserve status employees were all considered for the study. The survey was electronically delivered to law enforcement professionals who are active members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy Association (FBINAA) and a midwestern region Metropolitan Chiefs and Sheriffs Association (MCSA). Members of the FBINAA are also graduates of the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy (FBINA). There was no requirement for MCSA

members to be graduates of the FBINA, however, a vast majority of the membership were graduates. An FBINAA liaison assisted in the distribution of the survey to all active members in the United States with a request to encourage the members to spread the study to their commissioned employees. An MCSA Administrative Assistant assisted in the distribution of the survey to all active members in their membership area with the same request. The method of chain sampling, or snowball sampling, aided with obtaining maximum participation.

The survey included a Likert scale that assessed perspectives of the workplace environment encompassing 16 dimensions. The online survey included an opening statement regarding the purpose of the study, confidentiality, and an added statement of informed consent. Additionally, information advising participants included that generational perspectives were studied and not the individual employee.

Before beginning the study, participants were asked to acknowledge their understanding of their rights to terminate their participation at any time during the survey process. After accepting their rights, participants were asked to answer demographic questions about gender, year of birth, level of education, ethnicity, relationship status, size of employer, employment status (full-time, part-time, reserve, or retired), employment length, current salary, the State in which they were employed, which law enforcement organization employed, how many law enforcement agencies they worked for, and how many total years they had in law enforcement.

Descriptive statistics were organized utilizing the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) statistical analysis software to describe the generational cohorts represented by the participants. Demographic information provided by the participants

allowed the researcher to analyze the data to determine which generation the participants would be categorized and further identify their stage of life. The demographic information was analyzed separately from the data analysis performed explicitly to the research questions.

The participants were asked to answer each question using the Likert scale which connected the work environment to the following five areas (a) demands at work, (b) work organization and job content, (c) interpersonal relations and leadership, (d) work-individual interface, (e) and values at the workplace. The three dimensions related to the area of demands at work are quantitative demands, work pace, and emotional demands. The four dimensions related to the area of work organization and job content are influence, possibilities for development, meaning of work, and commitment to the workplace. The five dimensions related to the area of interpersonal relations and leadership are predictability, rewards, role clarity, quality of leadership, and social support from supervisor. The two dimensions related to the area of work-individual interface are job satisfaction and work-family conflict. The two dimensions related to the area of values at the workplace are trust regarding management and justice and respect.

The survey consisted of 31 questions and collected data to measure 16 dimensions. The eight dimensions associated with research question number one were quantitative demands (Q1A, Q1B), work pace (Q2A, Q2B), emotional demands (Q3A, Q3B), possibilities for development (Q5A, Q5B), meaning of work (Q6A, Q6B), commitment to the workplace (Q7A, Q7B), role clarity (Q10A, Q10B), and job satisfaction (Q13). The two dimensions associated with research question number two were influence (Q4A, Q4B) and work-family conflict (Q14A, Q14B). The six dimensions associated with

research question number three were predictability (Q8A, Q8B), rewards (Q9A, Q9B), quality of leadership (Q11A, Q11B), social support from supervisor (Q12A, Q12B), trust regarding management (Q15A, Q15B), and justice and respect (Q16A, Q16B).

Questionnaire response options ranged from zero through four with each Likert scale number represented by an answer appropriate to the question. Job perceptions were analyzed with Welch's Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) using the 16 dimensions as predictors for the generational cohorts.

Summary

The current study contributed to the body of literature about generational perspectives in the law enforcement workplace. Generational cohorts have been examined across different occupations such as nursing, business, and education, but continued research is needed in law enforcement. As generations cycle through the law enforcement workforce, it is imperative for law enforcement professionals to recognize the changing characteristics, values, beliefs, and the varying stages of life between cohorts in the workplace.

Law enforcement agencies face issues from recruitment to leadership. National events showing law enforcement in the negative light coupled with societal demands are forcing law enforcement agencies to modify the way they engage their communities. Law enforcement agencies risk working with their communities successfully if they fail to lead their officers efficiently within their departments. Chapter II will delve deeper into existing literature on generational perspectives and how it applies to the law enforcement psychosocial work environment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The idea of generations and their effects have been discussed for many years by researchers in anthropology, sociology, and social psychology (Hung, Gu, & Yim, 2007). How often do family members, friends, and coworkers refer to other people in a manner that is associated with a perceived age group? Negative connotations are sometimes heard being made toward younger generations like Millennials and perhaps Generation Z, but that might be the result of the lack of understanding of generational differences (Meister & Willyerd, 2010). A generation, often called a cohort, consists of individuals who experience relatively the same social, historical, and life events during the same period of life and comparatively the same location (Kupperschmidt, 2000; Mannheim, 1953; McCrae et al., 2002; Noble & Schewe, 2003; Rogler, 2002; Ryder, 1965). These shared events differentiate from one generation to another (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998). Historical, social, and cultural effects have been theorized to impact people's attitudes, values, and personality characteristics (Caspi & Roberts, 2001; Dencker, Joshi, & Martocchio, 2008).

No facet of probable differences between the existing generations has received the amount of attention as that pertaining to work-related attitudes and values (Meriac, Woehr, & Banister, 2010). Lancaster and Stillman (2002) stated that generational

conflicts were among key management issues faced by leaders of today's organizations. Generational differences are presented in various manners in the media and popular press which generate preconceived notions in the minds of the observers. The notion of generational differences has drawn mixed reviews and there is a need for more studies to determine the extent that substantial differences do exist (Real, Mitnick, & Maloney, 2010).

It is argued that each generation experiences significant events and other contextual factors that form their values and beliefs. Examining these experiences along with other generational characteristics will provide a better understanding as to why differences, to some extent, exist between the generations. Understanding generational differences may lessen the challenges of managing the existing generations within the workforce. Understanding how the workplace environment can be affected by generational differences is also vital (Leiter, Price, & Spence Laschinger, 2010). Work ethic is important to reflect on when attempting to explain individual behavior.

Work ethic includes principles such as hard work, centrality of work, self-reliance, attitudes toward leisure, wasted time, morality, and delay of gratification (Miller, Woehr, & Hudspeth, 2002). The link between a person and their work is profound and goes well beyond valuing a job as just a place to earn an income. Work creates a part of our self-image, and job involvement is important for satisfying inherent needs and enables self-expression (Shragay & Tziner, 2011).

The current study reviews the research related to (a) generations, (b) generational characteristics, (c) history of policing, (d) law enforcement culture, (e) law enforcement leadership, and (f) psychosocial factors. To maintain perspective on these generational

topics, the focus will primarily be on the widely accepted generational cohorts of the twentieth century.

Generations

The examination of generations has been a topic of interest in many fields including economics, political science, psychology, and sociology for over 50 years (Alwin & McCammon, 2007). It is widely held that certain historical events become forming experiences for individuals of shared birth years which bond them together and influence their critical developmental years (Sullivan, Forret, Carraher, & Mainiero, 2009). There is a growing sense among consultants, trainers, and management professionals that generational differences do exist between individuals in the workplace (Costanza, Fraser, Badger, Severt, & Gade, 2012). Despite early exploration of intergenerational issues (Friedlander, 1975), there has been a heightened interest over the last two decades to conduct more research in generational differences in the workplace. Different studies identify different time periods, values, and characteristics of each generation and while differences do exist between the studies regarding lines that describe precise years of birth, it is generally accepted that there are six generations. According to the Pew Research Center (2015), the six commonly accepted generations are defined as the Greatest Generation (1901 to 1927), the Silent Generation (1928 to 1945), the Baby Boom Generation (1946 to 1964), Generation X (1965 to 1980), Millennial Generation (1981 to 1996), and Generation Z (1997 and later). Since the number of Greatest Generation members in today's workforce are believed to be so few, they are only mentioned in context. A more in-depth examination of the generations will be discussed individually beginning with the Silent Generation.

The Greatest Generation

The Greatest Generation (1901 to 1927) grew up with technological advancements including the radio, telephone, and aircraft. Only some members of this generation experienced World War I (WWI) but most saw the Roaring Twenties. This group also experienced profound social and economic turmoil after the stock market crashed in 1929 which led to the Great Depression.

This generation may also be referred to as the G. I. Generation or Government Issue Generation for their contributions in World War II (WWII). Popularity with the phrase Greatest Generation was established after Brokaw's (1998) book was published. They may also be called the Good Warriors or the WWII Generation. The Pew Research Center (2015) no longer reports updated data on the Greatest generation because they only represent roughly two percent of the adult population and standard public opinion surveys do not yield large enough sample sizes for reporting.

The Silent Generation

The Silent Generation (1928 to 1945) either grew up during or shortly after the Great Depression and in between both world wars. It is believed that most of this generation has already retired but those who are remaining represent the smallest number of employees in the workforce (Havens et al., 2013). Their legacy carries on as a generation that respected authority, followed rules, were well-disciplined, and found comfort in tradition (Stinchcomb & Leip, 2012). They are loyal, believe in paying one's dues for promotional purposes, and conforming to the norm (Hatfield, 2002).

The Silent label is not widely recognized by the public and is the least heard of than any of the other labels describing the existing generations (Pew Research Center,

2015). Uncertainty surrounds the source of why this generation has been called The Silent Generation but there is an assumption that they focused on their jobs rather than activism. This generation viewed having a job as a privilege and therefore focused on their work. The Great Depression and living during a time of hardship may have been the basis for their view on work. They were loyal to their employers and would work as necessary to ensure the work was completed. Likewise, took care of their employees as *family*.

The Silent Generation believed in traditional family values, appreciated simplicity, and understood what it meant to sacrifice. Having grown up during the depression, fought in WWII, or experienced the war as children, this generation prefer formality or a chain-of-command, their word is their bond, respect authority, and like social order (Niemic, 2000; Tolbize, 2008).

Other names you might see describing this generation are The Children of the Great Depression, Maturists, Depression Generation, The Lucky Few, Veterans, and Traditionalists (Carlson, 2008; Elder, 1974, 1998; Williams, Page, Petrosky, & Hernandez, 2010). Having lived through the Great Depression and WWII might be the reason for these generational descriptors.

The Baby Boom Generation

The Baby Boom Generation (1946 to 1964) is also known as Baby Boomers and is the largest of the six generations but is expected to soon be surpassed by the Millennial Generation. Many current political leaders, CEOs, and middle managers are Baby Boomers, but they are retiring at the rate of about 10,000 per day and are being replaced with members from Generation X (Carrier, Cheever, Rosen, Benitez, & Chang, 2009;

Cohn & Taylor, 2010). Like the Silent Generation gathering around the radio, the families of this generation would gather around the television. Events that shaped the Boomers generation include the Vietnam War and Woodstock (Adams, 2000), the man landing on the moon (Apostolidis & Polifroni, 2006), the equal and civil rights movements, the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr., and the Watergate scandal. Boomers were raised following WWII in an era of economic growth and prosperity (Carver & Candella, 2008). In the workplace, this group defined themselves through their work (Greene, 2005). They are hard workers, service-oriented, seek to please, driven by competition and rewards, value teamwork, willing to make sacrifices for their careers, and work overtime when needed (Lavoie-Tremblay et al., 2010). Also known to be loyal, competitive, and workaholics (Hall & Richter, 1990) Boomers seek respect and want coworkers and management to recognize their wisdom and experience (Westerman & Yamamura, 2007). They are results and relationship focused (Weston, 2001). This generation may also be referred to as the Me Generation, Love Generation, or Boomers (Williams et al., 2010).

Generation X

Generation X (1965 to 1980) is also known as XGen, GenX, or GenXers grew up as *latchkey kids* and entered the workforce at a time of corporate downsizing (Murray et al., 2011; Raines & Hunt, 2000). This generation is further defined by life experiences such as recessions, high unemployment, inflation, workforce downsizing, and high divorce rates among their parents (Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2005). The families of this generation were more than likely not as cohesive due to the increased number of single parents from high divorce rates or because of the increase in dual-income earning

parents. Formative experiences for the group include Music Television (MTV), home computers, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the Challenger Space Shuttle explosion. This group is also described as cynical or skeptical which may be a result of being exposed to the Persian Gulf War, increase in crime, the spread of AIDS, and pollution (Losyk, 1997).

This generation grew up during a time of rising divorce rates and working mothers, resulting in many becoming latchkey kids who were left to fend for themselves for long hours each day (Howe & Strauss, 1993). They became self-reliant *survivors* who view work more as a job than a career and are more mobile, flexible, and technologically-savvy than any of their predecessors (Stinchcomb & Leip, 2012). While considered not as loyal to a company as their parents were, members of this generation are committed to their work despite switching jobs often and are driven by feedback, work challenges, and developmental opportunities (Cohen, 2002). The workplace does not define this generation as it did the previous generation. Work is just one aspect of their identity (Jovic, Wallace, & Lemaire, 2006). They want meaningful work and want the trust from others that they will get the job done. Their drive is to develop the skills necessary for career advancement and move into managerial positions (Eisner, 2005) They desire independence and autonomy. This group was not coddled for every disappointment (David, Gelfeld, & Rangel, 2017). This generation may also be referred to as The Latchkey Generation, Latchkey Kids, Baby Busters, and Post Boomers (Anantatmula, & Shrivastav, 2012; Williams et al., 2010).

The Millennial Generation

The Millennial Generation (1981 to 1996) is also known as Millennials or Generation Y. They grew up with *helicopter* parents who micromanaged their lives while trying to shelter them from the evils of the world. The events that helped shape this generation are the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack, the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, AIDS, school shootings, and social media. Millennials have grown up with technology and is used to having technology as a large part of their life (Wong, Gardiner, Lang, & Coulon, 2008). Millennials are the first generation to be completely *wired* or having never known life without technology such as cell phones, personal computers, and ATMs (Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008; Wesner & Miller, 2008). Millennials are the first generation to grow up with the internet (Sherman, 2006). This generation has been dubbed as being technologically savvy (Carver & Candella, 2008; Stanley, 2010) and value instant access to information and being able to communicate through digital platforms.

Generational depictions in literature should not be ignored due to people potentially stereotyping this group based on the writings of popular press (Manolis, Levin, & Dahlstrom, 1997) When it comes to loyalty at the workplace, members of this group place themselves, family, friends, coworkers before their work, and demand work-life balance (Hira, 2007). While comfortable with authority they believe respect must be earned. Like Generation X, work is only an aspect of their lives (Bosco & Bianco, 2005; Giroux, 2001). They are always looking for feedback and want to know how their contributions fit in the big picture (Orrick, 2008; Wieck, Prydun, & Walsh, 2002). They work best under leaders who nurture and support them (Wieck, 2003). These reasons may

be why some researchers may feel this generation lacks focus and direction (Smola & Sutton, 2002). Generation Y believes job security does not exist and therefore places building and marketing their own skills as a priority (Bova & Kroth, 2001). Selecting and staying at a job may be contingent on how much training the company offers (Altimier, 2006). Entry-level jobs may not meet this generation's expectation. They have a reputation of expecting high pay, upward mobility, and enjoy their work while simultaneously being challenged and performing meaningful tasks (Schullery, 2013). They seek to learn, are social, and have very high self-esteem (Arsenault, 2004). They want minimal rules and bureaucracy, expect to be empowered (Morison, Erickson, & Dychtwald, 2006; Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008) and demand the flexibility and ability to move between projects, positions, departments, and locations (Martin, 2005). This generation may also be referred to as GenMe, Nexters, Net Generation, Echo Boomers, and even the Peter Pan Generation (Carroll et al., 2009; Twenge et al., 2010; Williams et al, 2010).

Generation Z

Generation Z (1997 and later) also known as the Post-Millennial Generation is the last of the generations that have been labeled. No date has been established yet as the end year for this group, but researchers, banking, and marketing focus groups are exploring the dates from 2010 to 2016 as potential years ("Alphabet Soup," 2018; Dimock, 2018; "Generations X, Y, Z," n.d.). The experiences that helped shape this generation are issues surrounding global warming, terrorism, war, and technology. Contemporary youth can be described as digital natives, because they have never experienced life without the internet (Prensky, 2001). No other generation has lived during a time where technology was so

easily accessible and with technological advances, Generation Z youth can interact and communicate in a world that is always connected (Turner, 2015). No other generation has approached technology with so much comfort as Generation Z.

Generation Z has been reared almost entirely in constant war. As a result, this generation may view the world as unsafe and have a greater awareness over global issues. Generation Z children whose parents served in the military in the Afghanistan and Iraq wars have experienced the consequences resulting in their parents either being injured or killed while serving their country.

Generation Z is considered the most diverse generation that has existed yet and only notices diversity when it is absent. This generation has many alternative names and is expected to become more formalized with a title other than Generation Z. Other names this generation has been referred to are Tweens, Baby Boomers, Generation 9/11, and Digital Natives, and Net-Gen (Turner, 2015; Williams et al., 2010).

Generational Considerations

It is worth noting that historical events that may shape a generation will vary depending on the country and how people experience specific events. Historical and cultural events that occurred in the United States would have impacted people differently than growing up during the same timeframe in countries like Russia, India, and Brazil. People experiencing historical events differently in other countries raises the question on whether the defined generations like Baby Boomers, Gen X, or Millennials can be generalized and used in the same fashion in other parts of the world.

A person must bear in mind that discrepancies exist in describing the different generations depending on varying literature identifying the beginning and ending years,

historical events, and ages for each generation. Considering such discrepancies, an incorrect assumption must not be made regarding an individual of a certain age within a specific generation would act the same as someone of the same age but from a different generation. Generational cohorts are different but not because of age differences but more so because they have experienced specific historical events (Mackay, 1997).

Each generation is influenced by factors such as parents, peers, media, critical economic and social events, and popular culture and create a common value system separating them from other generations (Twenge et al, 2010). These factors are strongest during an individual's childhood and adolescence (Lubinski, Schmidt, & Benbow, 1996; Meglino & Ravlin, 1998). This value system or "natural view stays with the individual throughout their lives and is the anchor against which later experiences are interpreted" (Scott, 2000, p. 356). Experienced life events have a much stronger and more enduring effect on the *coming-of-age* portion of a group than on the rest of the group who also experienced the same events (Becton et al., 2014).

Generational Characteristics

It is generally suggested that generational cohorts are formed when members experience the same historical events and reflect the underlying values during these periods of time (Egri & Ralston, 2004). Specific events may be the catalysts that helps shape a generation, but researchers continue to examine the characteristics of each group to determine how they differ from each other. It is believed by some researchers that the effects of events are more impactful during the formative years of a cohort member's life. This bond in perspectives and attitudes is thought to endure throughout a cohort's lifetime despite their progression in age (Meredith & Schewe, 1994). Notwithstanding

changes in a person's life stage, their attitudes and behaviors that were formed in one's most influential years will persist throughout their life (Inglehart, 1997). "Life stage is not everything" (Walker Smith & Clurman, 1997, p. 7).

Generational differences may change over the period of a person's life.

Developmental psychologist Erik Erikson suggested that human development occurring in stages influenced behavior (Erikson, 1963). The notion is that aging adults pass through distinct phases or cycles. As people progress through adulthood, they are faced with new challenges and seemingly adopt different social roles (Cogin, 2012). Other critics explain that generational differences occur in life stages. They suggest a universal development order during the human lifecycle which progresses through childhood, teenage years, early adulthood, middle adulthood, and in old age (Appelbaum, Serena, & Shapiro, 2005). As people progress through life and get older, they tend to become more collectivistic, conservative, and self-transcendent, and less individualistic, open to change, and self-enhancing (Schwartz et al., 2001). O'Rand and Kreckler (1990) claimed that a person's individual needs change over time.

Generational characteristics in the workplace are discussed and examined by researchers to address topics such as recruitment, hiring, and retention, Baby Boomers are believed to be the most engaged employees of all the generations in the workplace (Schullery, 2013). The challenge will be how employers will engage newer generations. The necessity to learn new strategies is high due to Veterans and Baby Boomers retiring from the workforce. Human resource departments are constantly seeking new methods to entice newer generations to replace their depleting workforce. Ways employers have engaged new recruits is by luring them with opportunities to have fun in the workplace

(Bakke, 2010; Gavin & Mason, 2004). Millennials' appetite for meaningful work but their lack of completely giving themselves to an employer has gained that generation the unofficial reputation as entitled rather than being known for a willingness to work their way up (Farrell & Hurt, 2014). To reduce attrition and turn-over rates it is important that employers engage Millennials because they are known to hop from job to job when they are not engaged (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011).

Each generation approaches the work environment with their own distinct characteristics. Historical events that occurred during their formative years further illustrates how generational cohorts view the work environment differently. Understanding generational perceptions could aid organizational leadership when approaching their multigenerational workforce by understanding how each cohort views their work environment.

History of Policing

Policing in America has roots that date as far back as 1215. The Magna Carta is a document that placed limitations on the English constables that would have protected the barons from unlawful imprisonment and grant access to swift justice. Fast forward to 1829 when Sir Robert Peel, home secretary in the British Cabinet, worked with parliament to pass the Metropolitan Police Act which was the legislation needed to create the London police force. Sir Robert Peel's principles of policing are still regarded as relevant today as they were in his day. There are abbreviated versions of Peel's nine principles, but the following are the most descriptive (Loader, 2016):

- To prevent crime and disorder, as an alternative to their repression by military force and severity of legal punishment.

- To recognize always that the power of the police to fulfil their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions and behavior, and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
- To recognize always that to secure and maintain the respect and approval of the public means also the securing of the willing cooperation of the public in the task of securing observance of the law.
- To recognize always that the extent to which the cooperation of the public can be secured diminishes, proportionately, the necessity of the use of physical force and compulsion for achieving police objectives.
- To seek and preserve public favor, not by pandering to public opinion, but by constantly demonstrating absolutely impartial service to law, in complete independence of policy, and without regard to the justice or injustice of the substance of individual laws, by ready offering of individual service and friendship to all members of the public without regard to their wealth or social standing by ready exercise of courtesy and good humor; and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life.
- To use physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public cooperation to an extent necessary to secure observance of law or restore order; and to use only the minimum degree of physical force which is necessary on any occasion for achieving a police objective.
- To maintain always a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and that the public are the police; the police

being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.

- To recognize always the need for strict adherence to police-executive functions, and to refrain from even seeming to usurp the power of the judiciary of avenging individuals or the state, and authoritatively judging guilt and punishing the guilty.
- To recognize always that the test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder and not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them. (pp. 429-430)

Law enforcement in America can be categorized into three eras of policing: the political era (1840-1920), the professional model era (1920-1970), and the community policing era (1970-present) (Kelling & Moore, 1989). Most major cities including New York, Boston, and Chicago had police departments by the 1880s however, this did not apply to the rural areas of the South and the West at this time. The rural areas were covered by Sheriffs in their counties and the U.S. Marshals covered the territories in the West. Jurisdictionally speaking, the main difference between the two positions were Sheriffs were elected by the people of their county and U.S. Marshals were appointed through the federal government.

Police officers of the political era (1840-1920) acted more like agents for local political figures. Strong ties existed between the two entities. Police officers were paid to look the other way when it came to illegal activity and to achieve rank in the police department you either had to be politically connected or buy the rank which was typically sold to the highest bidder (Walker & Katz, 2012). Organizational structure of police

departments in cities were decentralized and managed by precinct commanders and the elected officials who represented that precinct area. Sheriffs were also elected officials, but they depended on the people as well. Poses were formed to help maintain order. U. S. Marshals on the other hand had to take matters into their own hands by forming vigilante groups since the West was settled before order was established (Calhoun, 1990).

The professional model era (1920-1970) experienced a reformation of policing techniques and strategies. Policing during this era was heavily influenced by the progressive era and extensive efforts were made to remove politics from law enforcement. August Vollmer, a former police chief (1909-1932) of Berkeley, California, is another noteworthy name in the history of policing. Chief Vollmer was a leading advocate for police reformation. Vollmer (1933) wrote that under the old system, police officers were appointed through political affiliation but were unintelligent and untrained. He encouraged a highly selective process for determining who would be the future leaders of an organization. Vollmer along with other advocates for police reformation urged that the police be made into a professional force, absent of partisanship, and committed to serving the public through six elements (Cole, Smith, & DeJong, 2018):

- The force should stay out of politics.
- Members should be well trained, well disciplined, and tightly organized.
- Laws should be enforced equally.
- The force should use new technology.
- Personnel promotions should be based on merit.
- The main task of the police should be fighting crime. (p.112)

With the focus on the sixth element, police transitioned to fighting crime as opposed to maintaining order. This focus was later challenged during the 1960s when America saw the civil rights movement, anti-war sentiment, urban riots, and rising crime rates. In their attempts to maintain order, enforcing laws tended to effect minorities and the poor and as crime rates continued to rise the people viewed the police as ineffective (Cole et al., 2018). “Police professionalism and the military model of policing became synonymous with police repression” (Potter, 2013, p. 11).

The professional model era led to two inadvertent consequences. The development of a police subculture and strained relations between the community and the police. In terms of the subculture, officers felt alienated from administrators and resented police hierarchy, viewed the media as adversaries because they criticized police for their inability to curtail the rise in crime, frustrated with citizens for lack of support, and only felt comfortable in their working environment when they stood together (Uchida, 1997). The second inadvertent consequence was the strained relationship between the community and police. Police relations with the community had become impersonal which was epitomized in the 1950s television show *Dragnet* where the main character, Detective Sergeant Joe Friday, only wanted the facts of the case. The focus was strictly on the crime fighting aspect of the incident and leaving very little regard to the actual crisis the victim was experiencing. The implementation of new methods and technology such as police vehicle patrols and radio communications also had an impact since it drew police officers away from personal interactions with the public unless they were responding to a call for service (Kelling & Moore, 1989). Community relations may have been strained but the public still needed police presence in their neighborhoods. For

police officers to be effective performing their duties throughout their communities, they needed support from the people of those communities. This support led to the transition from professional model era to the community policing era.

The community policing era (1970-present) represented a new era of policing. Police departments started asking the public to take a more active role in reducing crime in their communities and address crime-related issues by working alongside the police (Thurman & Reisig, 1996). While there may be some question of what defines a community, the one central theme of community policing is that both the police and the community must work together to find solutions to crime related issues (Grinc, 1994). Community-oriented policing is defined as “a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime” (International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2018). To deal more effectively with disorder, crime, and the fear of crime, police began focusing on the underlying causes that contributed to crime by provided services beyond the crime control methods of the professional model era (Oliver, 2006). One such method was the reimplementation of foot patrols. Foot patrols allowed police officers to interact with the residents of their beat or neighborhood area and become more familiarized with localized issues. Personal interactions reduced hostility and built trust between residents and police officers (Sparrow, Moore, & Kennedy, 1990).

In a car, an officer is more likely to deal with street people by rolling down the window and looking at them. The door and the window exclude the approaching

citizen; they are a barrier. Some officers take advantage of this barrier, perhaps unconsciously, by acting differently if in the car than they would on foot. We have seen this countless times. The police car pulls up to a corner where teenagers are gathered. The window is rolled down. The officer stares at the youths. They stare back. The officer says to one, "C'mere." He saunters over, conveying to his friends by his elaborately casual style the idea that he is not intimidated by authority. What's your name?" "Chuck." "Chuck who?" "Chuck Jones." "What'ya doing, Chuck?" "Nothin'." "Got a P.O. [parole officer]?" "Nah." "Sure?" "Yeah." "Stay out of trouble, Chuckie." Meanwhile, the other boys laugh and exchange comments among themselves, probably at the officer's expense. The officer stares harder. He cannot be certain what is being said, nor can he join in and, by displaying his own skill at street banter, prove that he cannot be "put down." In the process, the officer has learned almost nothing, and the boys have decided the officer is an alien force who can safely be disregarded, even mocked (Wilson & Kelling, 1982, p. 9).

The scenario above from *Broken Windows* highlighted a barrier between police and the community. Other efforts from a community-oriented policing perspective that may have been implemented were bicycle patrols, visiting schools, and meeting with neighborhood associations. It was imperative for police officers to engage and interact with the public (Wilson & Kelling, 1982).

Some critics argued that community-oriented policing had very little effect on reducing crime because it was more of a philosophy rather than a tactic providing a framework for employing strategies (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett, 2014).

Exacerbating the argument was the lack of specific guidelines for community-oriented policing since each police department relied on working with their community's issues which would differ from other communities (Morabito, 2010). Some police departments felt that community-oriented policing had lost momentum because it failed to meet expectations that it would reduce crime (Stone & Travis, 2011). Some police departments may not have completely abandoned community-oriented policing but supporting the philosophy became more of a budgetary constraint and resources became less committed to the effort (Weisburd & Eck, 2004).

Despite arguments against community-oriented policing, some will argue that the non-crime control outcomes were worth the effort. Community-oriented policing promoted collaboration with police on addressing crime-related issues, improved trust between citizens and police officers, and enhanced relations between communities and the police (Gill et al., 2014). A positive outcome of this improved relationship is citizens are more likely to obey the law when they trust and accept the authority of the police (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

The Department of Justice (DOJ) created the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) in 1994 to further the efforts of community-oriented policing. COPS is responsible for advancing the practice of community policing throughout the United States. COPS has invested more than \$14 billion since 1994 to assist police departments advance their community policing efforts (U. S. Department of Justice, 2018). Since the creation of COPS and the availability of grant money, some people have questioned whether police departments employed community policing methods or if they just claimed they did to receive grant money to hire more officers (Cole et al., 2018).

That question may never be answered but notwithstanding the massive decreases in grant money since the inception of COPS, many police departments continue to emphasize community policing in their daily operations (Stein & Griffith, 2015).

The events that occurred on September 11, 2001, forced law enforcement into a new era of policing coined the homeland security era (Oliver, 2007). The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) employs around 35,000 employees and are expected to protect the American people (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2018). The FBI's 35,000 employees are made up of special agents and support professionals who are charged with keeping the United States safe from terrorism events such as the infamous attack that occurred on September 11, 2001. There are approximately 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States that employ approximately 750,000 sworn law enforcement officers (Banks, Hendrix, Hickman, & Kyckelhahn, 2016). By the FBI incorporating law enforcement agencies throughout the United States into their plans of keeping America safe, they identified their inclusion in the overall strategy of homeland security (Thacher, 2005). Policing at the local level changed to incorporate bordering jurisdictions in planning, response, and recovery efforts; information gathering and sharing, coordinating with state and federal agencies, focusing on infrastructure protection, enhancing relationships between police agencies, local businesses, and the community to aid in the facilitation of prevention and response to potential terrorist attacks (Caruson, MacManus, Kohen, & Watson, 2005; Thacher). The plan to incorporate local law enforcement agencies was initially met with skepticism as many police agencies lacked funding, appropriate training, personal protection equipment, and technology to be included in such counter-terrorism activities (Morreale & Lambert, 2009). The Department of

Homeland Security (DHS) has worked with law enforcement agencies over the years through various grants. A recent example of the federal government partnering with local jurisdictions can be realized in the fiscal year 2016 program where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) awarded 29 recipients nearly \$36 million to improve their ability to prepare for, prevent, and respond to a complex coordinated terrorist attack in collaboration while keeping the whole community in mind (Federal Emergency Management Agency, 2017). The primary focus of the homeland security era has been citizen safety and anti-terrorism, but many local police departments continued to stress community policing (Oliver, 2006; Stein & Griffith, 2015).

As each era progresses, there are still elements of the previous eras that persist. Elements of community policing have remained in the homeland security era and will more than likely continue to remain through future eras as that is a perceived public expectation. Law enforcement will continue to adjust to society's expectations, but it is less certain how the law enforcement culture will be impacted as law enforcement adjusts.

Law Enforcement Culture

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), police officers are considered at higher risk than other occupations for sustaining work-related injuries. The inherent risk involved with being a police officer is known by every law enforcement professional and is the underlying reason why most in law enforcement depart from each other by saying *stay safe!* According to the Officer Down Memorial Page (2018), 137 line of duty deaths (LODD) occurred in 2017. The top three contributors to the 2017 LODD are gunfire (45), automobile crash (28), and heart attack (16) totaling 89 of the 137 which

equates to 64% of total LODD deaths. The remaining 36% of LODD include 9/11 related illness (7), vehicular assault (6), assault (6), vehicle pursuit (5), drowned (5), motorcycle crash (4), struck by vehicle (4), duty-related illness (3), aircraft accident (2), boating accident (2), animal-related (1), exposure to toxins (1), stabbed (1), and unidentified (1). Most in law enforcement say they worry about the dangers they may face and their safety but also feel that the public does not understand the risks or challenges they face performing their duties (Morin, Parker, Stepler, & Mercer, 2017). Law enforcement culture may stem from the perception that only those in law enforcement, not the public, can understand the challenges they face. Schein (2004) wrote,

The culture of a group can be defined as a pattern of shared assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 17)

Law enforcement culture is consistent regardless of the size or location of the agency. There may be a few variations, but attitudes, values, and norms are for the most part, shared between all officers.

There are certain realities that are expected to be adhered to within a law enforcement culture. They are always there for each other and providing backup goes without question. They never leave a brother or sister behind and never give up when facing life-threatening situations. They will fight until the end if necessary, for themselves, their fellow officer, and for members of the public. There is a level of loyalty

and reliance upon each other that is experienced in few occupations but mirrors that of being a service member in the military (Miller, 2004).

An officer is exposed to this culture from day one in the academy and even more so after they begin the Field Training Officer (FTO) phase of their training (Miller, 2004). The influence that an FTO has over a new officer is critical in this early phase of integration into law enforcement. There is a tight bond within law enforcement which holds each of them together and encourages them to look after one another. This process of learning the informalities of law enforcement is called socialization (Cole et al., 2018). Similar values, beliefs, and truths exist among officers but there is also a subculture that exist within departments made up of specialized units including K9 units, tactical teams, investigations, dispatchers, and management. These units or sections can create resistance within their agency leading up to the department acting fractured and not working together as a whole. Being a police officer in an agency is very much like being a member of an extended family. Siblings may not like each other but they must love one another.

The *Thin Blue Line* embodies the shared values of those in law enforcement and the symbol depicts the straightforwardness of how and why they do what they do. The symbol is a black flag with a horizontal blue line that spans from edge to edge. The top black area represents society, order, and peace while the bottom black area represents crime, disorder, and chaos (Kelling & Moore, 1989). The blue line in the middle represents law enforcement and their duty to separate the two black areas. The history of the thin blue line pertaining to police is believed to date back to the 1960s. It may have had a different meaning then, but the symbolic significance of its meaning today is one of

support and an understanding of the duties they are expected to perform regularly (Murphy, 2008). Being a member of the thin blue line does not grant special privileges. It is a visual depiction that represents them standing together in service of others while maintaining the highest of ethical standards.

Job Stress

Working in law enforcement is often rated within the top ten most stressful occupations in the United States. Law enforcement work environment and culture contribute to the stress experienced by officers (Dabney, Copes, Tewksbury, & Hawk-Tourtlot, 2013; Noblet, Rodwell, & Allisey, 2009; Schaible & Gecas, 2010). It was not until the community policing era where law enforcement officials became aware of the stress-related problems officers experienced on the job (Lumb & Breazeale, 2002). Psychologists have identified external, organizational, personal, and operational stresses as the four types of stress officers face on the job (Cole et al., 2018; Cullen, Lemming, Link, & Wozniak, 1985; Shane, 2010). The factors that attribute to external stress are dealing with threats and dangers associated with responding to the unknown. The factors that attribute to organizational stress are paramilitary structure, policy adherence, and irregular hours. The factors that attribute to personal stress are racial status, bias, social isolation, and adjusting to group-held values. The factors that attribute to operational stress are dealing with suspects, mental health crises, and hostile subjects. Scholars have learned that the most significant predictors of stress for officers are work-family conflict, work environment, and individual coping mechanisms (Zhao, He, Lovrich, & Cancino, 2003). The stress officers experience as they progress in their careers is compounded with sleep deprivation and working under conditions of severe

fatigue (Vila, 1996). The added stress combined with unmet expectations of entering law enforcement may be a contributor that leads to officer burnout. Safeguards have been implemented in many law enforcement agencies across the country that approach on-the-job stress with special training, counseling, and peer-support groups but continued efforts to mitigate the effects of on-the-job stress remain a focus of officer health and well-being.

Cynicism

One of the most common answers in interviews to become an officer is the desire to help people. After a person completes the hiring process and is indoctrinated through the process of the academy, they begin their training in the FTO program. The FTO program is an intensive on-the-job training experience led by an experienced and trained Field Training Officer and typically lasts between 16 to 20 weeks depending on the agency (Sun, 2003). The officer in training is evaluated daily and is required to meet specific performance standards before they are released from the program as a solo capable officer.

The FTO program is where new officers are introduced to “real” police work as well as police culture. This is perhaps where new officers realize the tedious nature of their new occupation. As new officers continue to learn their job, more experienced and tenured officers can negatively affect them. Senior officers who have adopted a cynical mindset can act as contagions to junior officers (Thurman & Zhao, 2004). Over time, intolerance of faults and mistakes made by others escalates and could lead to the loss of purpose (Richardson, Burke, & Martinussen, 2006). Cynicism could be a coping mechanism toward a work environment that is perceived to be hostile and unstable and may be related to health deterioration (Mirvis & Kanter, 1991). Cynicism increases over

time and if left unchecked may have serious consequences for the agency. One of those unchecked consequences may lead to an *us versus them* mentality. Assimilating into law enforcement culture without submitting to the negative mindset of experienced officers poses a difficult challenge for new officers. Job satisfaction is likely to suffer because of increased cynicism (Regoli, Crank, & Culbertson, 1989).

On the other hand, providing for a positive work environment may combat the negative effects of cynicism or the *us versus them* mentality. Engagement with work can be a positive, fulfilling, work-related mental state that can be characterized as energetic, dedicated, and captivated (Schaufeli, Salanova, Gonzalez-Roma, & Bakker, 2002). The conflict though rests between going against the norms and being a social outcast.

Understanding the fundamentals of police history provides leadership the necessary background knowledge and insight into law enforcement culture. Both internal and external stressors, can add to the complex nature of leading and managing such a diverse work force. Job stress and cynicism experienced during different stages of a career in law enforcement may dictate how members of a generation will view the leadership within their organization. With all these factors considered, the perceptions of organizational leadership may differ depending on the organization's culture, an officer's time in service, and whether the leadership is stagnant or innovative.

Generational Leadership

This section will explore each of the generation's approach to leadership accounting for their morals, values, ethics, and beliefs. Since differences exist between the generations, conflicts can occur between them (multigenerational) and among them (intergenerational). As each generation creates a social distinctiveness from the others,

they are uniquely grouped. Regardless of generational differences, they will stand side by side when facing an adversary or other threat (Crank, 1998). Understanding the similarities and differences between the generations may provide ideas on how they can most effectively work together.

Members of The Silent Generation may still be among the ranks in law enforcement but because of this generation's age, the assumption was made that they have handed the proverbial reins to the Baby Boomers. Generation Z being on the other side of the spectrum may still be too new to hold critical positions in leadership. This is not to say that neither generation is incapable of holding leadership positions. These are merely assumptions based on organizational policies on retirement and promotions for law enforcement. The three generations highlighted for their roles in law enforcement are Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials.

Baby Boomers

Leadership styles started to change by the end of the 1960s. Social changes began to challenge the traditional command-and-control style of law enforcement leadership of the previous generation (Bishop, 2008). Baby Boomer officers were beginning to question authority within their agencies. Officers rebelled against the expectation that loyalty was blindly given to a specific title by actively questioning management (Haight, 2007; Kappeler, Sluder, & Alpert, 1998; Reuss-Ianni, 1993). Change was inevitable, but the paramilitary model persisted and continues in agencies even today.

Some officers may believe applying the military model in policing is effective and maintains control, but others believe that policing adopted only negative characteristics of the model as it relates to hierarchy, tradition, and structure. Cowper (2000) wrote,

America's military officers are not trained to be the arrogant martinets that generations of police supervisors have aspired to emulate, and their doctrine does not demand blind obedience on mindless brutes commonly attributed to military culture by its many detractors. (p. 231)

Management styles based on quasi-military hierarchy does not meet the standards for policing in the modern world (Thurman & Zhao, 2004). Baby Boomers knew that traditional leadership was not working, and they found themselves in unique positions to change how agencies would be led (Erickson, 2008; Massey, 1979).

Baby Boomers also saw the transition of women making their way into the workforce as well as more pursuing employment in law enforcement. Social influences of gender equality extended educational and job-related opportunities for women (Lyons, Duxbury, & Higgins, 2005). Many emotional events from the 1960s and 1970s helped Baby Boomers establish a new leadership style in law enforcement that vastly differed from the preceding generation.

Some leadership traits associated with Baby Boomers are mentoring, team building, loyal, committed, dependable, and strong work ethic, (Kupperschmidt, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Zemke et al., 2000). Baby Boomers are also driven, motivated, and dedicated (Weston, 2001). Leadership to them was about walking the walk, not just talking the talk (Murphy, 2008). Baby Boomers believed they had to pay their dues and earn their promotions which were considered symbols of status (Kupperschmidt). Working long hours was not foreign to Baby Boomers ultimately leading them to be known as workaholics (Hall & Richter, 1990).

Many Baby Boomers still subscribe to a hierarchy system with the organizational structure that starts with the chief at the top and works its way down to frontline employees (Erickson, 2008). Much of the power and decision-making authority rests at the top levels of this structure. One factor that challenged this hierarchy system was the era thought brought about community policing (Bouza, 1990). The implementation of community policing allowed frontline officers to interact with the public and make on-the-spot decisions impacting the community without having to first obtain permission or include the chain-of-command. Given that Baby Boomers are very competitive, removing their power from this aspect reduced their level of control was probably met with some resistance (Erickson; Hall & Richter, 1990; Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008). There may have been resistance to community policing since its inception, but it remains today and as an expectation from communities. Community policing may be one of those practices that has allowed Baby Boomer leadership to slowly become more inclusive and have a more participatory leadership style.

As leaders whose generational cohort is retiring at a rate of 10,000 per day, they look back to assess whether they have left a lasting footprint in their professional careers (Cohn & Taylor, 2010; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002). Were they able to leave a legacy? Did they leave the profession better than when they found it? Were they able to mentor officers with the necessary support to become competent leaders for tomorrow? Baby Boomers realized their sacrifices for their organization were at the expense of work-life balance and failed relationships drive them to advise newer officers to not sacrifice the way they did in their careers (Jorgensen, 2003; Tolbize, 2008).

People are valuable resources in an organization (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 2002). Employees work their best when they know their supervisors care and their work adds to the bigger picture (Thurman & Zhao, 2004). Leaders have life expectancies whereas the positions do not. Change is inevitable and something that Baby Boomer leaders must understand. As leaders, they must take the initial step to demonstrate to newer officers they are not as rigid as they may seem, can compromise by allowing the future to meld with the past, and can work together moving forward and hope to leave a positive legacy behind (Espinoza & Ukleja, 2016).

Generation X

Lancaster and Stillman (2002) characterized Generation X as the one generation in the workforce that is probably the most misunderstood generation of them all. Business mergers and buyouts, corporate downsizing, and watching their parents experience layoffs after committing themselves to their companies changed this generation's perspective of how they viewed their workplace (Bishop, 2008). Unlike their parents, members of Generation X preferred to question authority and at times seem cynical, extreme, and solitary (Berkup, 2014; Twenge et al, 2010; Zemke, Raines, & Filipczak, 2013). A result of being in a position worse than their parents, Generation X is an extremely cautious and self-reliant cohort that takes a work-to-live approach as opposed to their parents live-to-work approach (Berkup).

Tulgan (2000) identified Generation X as a new kind of workers who have their own agenda. As latchkey kids, they have created sort of an attitude that makes it seem like they are only looking out for themselves. They seek autonomy in their positions but do not necessarily look for supervisory roles (Costanza et al., 2012). Not all officers seek

leadership positions in their agencies and are happy amongst the ranks that fill general and specialty units. Generation X makes up most of the officers employed in law enforcement agencies in the United States (Henchey, 2005). As Baby Boomers continue to retire at 10,000 per day, this makes room in the middle-management levels in law enforcement organizations and makes way for Generation X to move up to the Chief positions of those organizations. If they are not in those positions, they will find themselves in those positions soon whether they are ready for them or not.

Generation X does not show loyalty to their organizations like the generation before them but to learn from their mistakes, they draw from the experiences and wisdom from more senior officers they respect within the organization (Bova & Kroth, 2001). Generation X has different priorities than their predecessors (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011). They have no interest in paying dues or spending time at the bottom rung like parents before them (Murray et al., 2011). This lack of interest may be a source of additional intergenerational conflict but then again Generation X is also known for challenging rules, hierarchies, as well as the traditional organization structure that revolves around the chain-or-command when they do not see it as useful (Bishop, 2008; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Martin, 2005; Tulgan, 2000). Despite intergenerational conflicts, Generation X still looks to their Baby Boomer leaders for lessons as they continue to move closer to taking over their agencies.

Generation X want to work in environments where they can exercise their abilities and expertise which include working independent, flexible, and are comfortable working with technology (Keepnews, Brewer, Kovner, & Shin, 2010). In addition to being technologically literate, Generation X are focused learners, ambitious, and are

comfortable with diversity as well (Bova & Kroth, 2001; Smola & Sutton, 2002). This generation was also raised to question any organization that was resistant to change and will push to make the changes they think are necessary (Delattre, 2002). Baby Boomers may be retiring at a rate of 10,000 per day but there seems to be a lack of upward mobility within the agencies which have forced Generation X officers to wait at the lower levels of the organization (Erickson, 2008). This does not necessarily sit well for Generation X and they are now more willing to take calculated risks to move into the upper levels of their organizations (Martin & Tulgan, 2006). Generation X is ready to step up into leadership positions and want to gain recognition.

Once Generation X officers ascend to the upper ranks of their agencies they will lead with a style of leadership consistent with their values, morals, and beliefs which include concern, encouragement, integrity, efficiency, creativity, balance, and innovation (Bishop, 2008; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002; Lester, Standifer, Schultz, & Windsor, 2012; Smola & Sutton, 2002). Generation X officers are not micromanagers and like to work with flexibility. Once given a task, they will complete it but want to do so with autonomy. Immediate feedback after the task is complete with perhaps recognition to follow is what motivates officers (Smola & Sutton).

What are law enforcement leaders doing about training, teaching, or mentoring the leaders of tomorrow? To break the cycle from perpetuating Generation X needs to ensure they cultivate the younger members of their agencies to be future leaders. There is a desire to overcome the cynical label Generation X is known for and get past the years of stifled leadership they have endured (Thurman & Zhao, 2004). Respect is earned

through leadership and not by merely occupying a position. Generation X will lead the next set of leaders by example.

Generation X will adapt their leadership skills to accommodate the next generations and their needs. “Remember that each generation has the same proportion of intelligence, ambition, and desire, and it is a mistake to think that it is always the subordinate who need to change behavior” (Schumacher, 2003, p. 2). Every officer has the potential to be a leader, but they must be given the opportunity and that opportunity comes from their leaders. Future leaders can thrive in positive working environments and constructive leader-follower relationships will foster younger officer’s growth. It is up to Generation X to break the cycle and change the way they lead the next generation of leaders.

Millennials

The Millennial Generation is a technological generation. They were born into technology and have lived with it in ways unlike other generations before them (Berkup, 2014). They use technology for everything, can adapt to its use very easily, and can maintain pace as it changes. This generation has never known a time without technology and are known as the most technologically savvy generation (Cahill & Sedrak, 2012). Millennials are not known for their patience and therefore prefer quick communication like text messaging or other instant forms of communications. They may be considered technologically sophisticated, but their oral, written, and interpersonal skills are lacking and is therefore critical to understand this generation (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011).

Millennials have been fashioned by constant positive feedback, reassurances, and helicopter parents (Thompson & Gregory, 2012). Millennials have grown up with parents

who were overprotective and hovered over their children managing nearly every aspect of their education and their social activities including some later in life decisions (Glass, 2007). This generation is sometimes referred as the *Trophy Generation* given the trend that began with this group for rewarding everyone for merely participating in competitive activity and not necessarily winning (Tolbize, 2008). This oversight may be why this generation requires coaching, constant feedback, and a manager that believes in them and their abilities as well as supports them.

Millennials are known to challenge authority, do not like taking orders without explanation, do not believe in the hierarchy system, and are not impressed by positions or titles (Berkup, 2014). They want to be motivated with meaningful work and have jobs that offer tasks that are productive and different. They seek every opportunity for training, view their job as a place to learn, and believe in the importance of lifelong learning. They measure their success by the significance and relevance of their own work (Eisner, 2005). Millennials may judge their relevance on their work, but they still value leisure more than any other generation before them (Meriac et al., 2010).

Baby Boomers may have placed a lot of emphasis on their careers, but Millennials are more interested in their jobs accommodating their familial obligations and their personal lives (Twenge et al., 2010). They wish to balance their work lives with their family lives. Family means a tremendous amount to this generation as it is a primary means of emotional support and sometimes financial support or assistance. They desire jobs that offer flexibility, they seek part-time work opportunities, want to telecommute, and temporarily leave the workforce to have children and raise a family (Bell & Narz, 2007). Millennials just want to control where, how, and when they work.

Diversity is a fact of life for Millennials. Large scale immigration and the rise of multicultural marriages has made America both racially and ethnically more diverse than ever before (Fry, Igielnik, & Patten, 2018). Most Millennials believe diversity strengthens the workplace and agree diverse groups produce better solutions to problems and ideas for innovation (Bannon, Ford, & Meltzer, 2011). Gender equality has also improved with this generation and has provided women more opportunities in law enforcement and for leadership roles. Lifestyle choices are not an issue for this generation and the openness toward others with different beliefs and traditions has made this generation more accepting than the previous generations (Fields, Wilder, Bunch, & Newbold, 2008; Zemke et al., 2000).

Millennials prefer to work in teams and on team-based projects where they can work collaboratively but need constant feedback about how they are performing (Miller, Hodge, Brandt, & Schneider, 2013). This generation likes to be challenged, want creativity in their work, and thrive on managers with empowering management styles. They relate better to supervisors who take the time to understand as them as individuals (Dwyer, 2009). Millennials want more than just a job where they collect a check. They want to work in an environment that is fun and allows them to socially interact with colleagues. Factors that motivate these employees are social, self-esteem, and self-actualization (Poornima, 2009). They want to connect with their supervisors on an emotional level and be friends with them (Fields et al., 2008). Millennials' openness and willingness to connect with others is not always reciprocated by other officers from older generations. Issues over personal space may even surface between the two older generations and Millennials because they may feel they should change who they are or

change the workplace environment to accommodate the characteristics of the younger generation. Human resources and managers both can respond to these challenges by creating training sessions to address concerns and explain the differences in generational characteristics.

Members from each generation can be a part of their organization's leadership at some point in their career depending on their level of pursuit of promotion opportunities in their agency. Generational perceptions may differ on work environment and organizational leadership. The relationship between work environment and organizational leadership may depend on how each generation views their leaders and how they lead. The impact of psychosocial factors may influence this relationship.

Psychosocial Factors

Researchers suggest that police work is extremely stressful and working in law enforcement is one of the most stressful occupations in the world (Anderson, Litzenberger, & Plecas, 2002; Anshel, 2000). Stress if left unaddressed may lead to chronic conditions or exacerbate existing medical conditions whether known or unknown. Stress can also be one of the most contributing factors for police officer absenteeism, sick leave abuse, burnout, poor work performance, attrition, a weakened immune system which may lead to illness, and potentially, premature death (Alkus & Padesky, 1983; Anshel; Brown & Campbell, 1990; Burke, 1994; Kirkcaldy, Cooper, & Ruffalo, 1995; Vena, Violanti, Marshall, & Fiedler, 1986; Violanti, Vena, & Marshall, 1986). Police officers are often exposed to stressors that the average person does not experience in normal daily life (Anderson et al., 2002). They work varying shifts, forced overtime, deal with unruly people, handle situations that may threaten their life or the life

of others, and sometimes must work unforgettable crime scenes. These situations may happen unexpectedly, and the perceived stress experienced by the officer can be overwhelming and further push the officer beyond their own coping mechanisms (Evans, Coman, Stanley, & Burrows, 1993).

Aside from the everyday physical stress officers experience such as standing, walking, running, climbing stairs, pushing, pulling, squatting, and kneeling to name a few, officers also experience psychosocial stress or at least perceive they have experienced psychosocial stress (Anshel, 2000; Anshel, Robertson, & Caputi, 1997; Brown & Grover, 1998; Burke, 1994; Violanti & Aron, 1995). An officer's belief may stem from attempting to determine a situation prior to arriving on scene. This process invokes a pre-conceived impression of the scene which may be worse than the actual situation. Psychosocial stress is an individual's response to a self-perceived imbalance between a presented situation and the resources available to that person to respond successfully (Eden, 1990). The amount of stress experienced by the person will depend on the perceived severity of the situation and if that person believes they are equipped to handle it accordingly.

Acute stress happens when incidents are experienced so quickly that it temporarily overwhelms the officer's coping abilities and immediately stresses the officer (Evans et al., 1993). Chronic stress builds over time and although it may not immediately lead to distress, the onset would depend on the officer's ability to cope (Anshel, 2000; Burke, 1994; Evans et al.; Haarr & Morash, 1999). Chronic stress is believed to be connected to issues that are experienced within an organization (Burke; Storch & Panzarella, 1996; Violanti & Aron, 1995). Distress can originate from internal politics,

lack of training, lack of administrative support, excessive paperwork, shift work, critical incident response, fear for personal safety, time-management, and conflicts between work and home (Burke; Kirkcaldy et al., 1995; Martelli, Waters, & Martelli, 1989; Violanti & Aron). Not every officer will experience the same stress under the same conditions. Mindset, physical health, and a support system may reduce stress levels and aid in managing induced stress.

Positive coping strategies are critical in dealing with stress. Officers who are not able to cope with stress are at a higher risk to resorting to excessive alcohol use, drug use, high divorce rates, and suicide (Evans et al., 1993; McCafferty, McCafferty, & McCafferty, 1992; Richmond, Wodak, Kehoe, & Heather, 1998). Suicide is the ultimate reaction to stress and is considered the most devastating response to stress (Loo, 1999). Practices typically used by officers to cope is alcohol consumption, tobacco use, and self-imposed isolation from others (Burke, 1994). The most common response for coping with stress amongst police officers is the consumption of alcohol (Davey, Obst, & Sheehan, 2000; Lindsay, Banks Taylor, & Shelley, 2008; Richmond et al.; Violanti, 1999). Training exists for educating officers how to employ coping techniques for stress and has been implemented in agencies across the country. Researchers have emphasized that little has been accomplished to reform organizations to address the lack of social support and how leadership, trust, and open communication could further reduce stress (Alkus & Padesky, 1983; Anshel, 2000; Biggam, Power, & MacDonald, 1997; Burke, 1994; Haarr & Morash, 1999; Hart, Wearing, & Headey, 1995; Kirkcaldy et al., 1995; Martelli et al., 1989; Storch & Panzarella, 1996; Violanti & Aron, 1995).

Officers perception of the way the public views them adds to the stress experienced in the vocation. Items donned before beginning their shift such as the badge, duty belt, sidearm, and handcuffs are symbolic of the power and control police has over the general public. Police are viewed as authoritarians who can exercise legal jurisdiction over the public during the performance of their duties (Skolnick, 2010). Niederhoffer (1967) highlighted a spectrum of public feelings toward police as a result of their perception of police as authority figures:

The policeman is a 'Rorschach' in uniform as he patrols his beat. His occupational accouterments – shield, nightstick, gun, and summons book – clothe him in a mantle of symbolism that stimulates fantasy and projection. Children identify with him in the perennial game of 'cops and robbers.' Teen-agers in autos stiffen with compulsive rage or anxiety at the sight of the patrol car. To people in trouble the police officer is a savior. In another metamorphosis the patrolman becomes a fierce ogre that mothers conjure up to frighten their disobedient youngsters. At one moment the policeman is hero, the next, monster. (p. 1)

Law enforcement will continue to adjust their public service methods to meet the needs of their communities, but some may question whether the changes will be enough to change the lasting perception of police authority.

Paramilitary environments endorse routine, structure, and conformity which can prompt inadvertent stress on police officers (Skolnick, 2010; Violanti, 2003). There are rigid expectations in paramilitary organizations that restrict creativity and opportunities to operate outside of normal procedures which diminish perceptions that opportunities for change will ever arise (Violanti). Organizational support, or more specifically, supervisor

support is integral in officer's psychological well-being (Violanti). Factors involved in officer well-being can span from understanding leadership expectations to recovering from critical incidents. Kirkcaldy et al., (1995) identified resentment toward an organization's administration as the leading stressor above all other issues within the organization. Organizational leaders may consider opportunities to reduce the resentment toward administration as an option to improve the law enforcement working environment. Millennials are a dynamic force in the workplace and may be the best positioned generation in making the necessary organizational changes as they continue to move into positions of leadership (Kaifi, Nafei, Khanfar, & Kaifi, 2012). Millennials have a high adaptability toward change, are aware of the speed of change, can keep pace with change, like change, and more impressively, they want change (Berkup, 2014; Thompson & Gregory, 2012).

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed literature on the different generations and how they influenced their work environments with an emphasis on the law enforcement work environment. The literature discussed matters of generational considerations, generational characteristics, the history of policing, law enforcement culture, generational leadership, and psychosocial factors. There are currently five generations in law enforcement, but literature identified Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials as the generations that make up most of the work force in law enforcement.

There is an increasing interest in occupational exposures and influences experienced in the psychosocial work environment (Kiss et al., 2013). The challenge remains for law enforcement to determine which course of action is required to bridge the

generational gaps to improve the work environment while meeting society's expectations. Generational differences exist among the ranks of law enforcement organizations, but a better understanding may provide ideas for improved navigation of those differences and reduce the rifts created by the generational gaps in today's workforce (Kleinhans et al., 2015).

Baby Boomers define themselves through their work, work hard, are motivated by rewards, and will make sacrifices for their careers. They are known as workaholics. Their perception of the work environment is one that is all business, tasks must be completed, and will work overtime if needed to complete those tasks.

Members of Generation X are more cynical or skeptical regarding their perceptions of the work environment. They are not as loyal to their companies as were the Baby Boomers and they view work more as a job than a career unlike their predecessors. The workplace does not define this generation. Baby Boomers preferred working in groups or teams whereas the Generation X cohort prefers autonomy, flexibility, and independence. Generation X views their work environment as one that must have meaning. They desire to understand the purpose of their job and tasks. Their drive is to seek advancement in their organizations as they develop their skills and knowledge.

Millennials on the other hand place themselves, friends, and family, and even coworkers before their work. Their perception of the work environment is one that is secondary to relationships with family, friends, and peers. They also prefer meaningful work but lose interest in entry-level positions quickly. They view their work environment

as one that must be social, has minimal rules, and allows flexibility. They tend to change jobs when other opportunities appear, that they view as being better.

Technology also plays a role in each generation's work environment. Baby Boomers are not as technologically savvy as Millennials and work environments that require the use of technology may be more challenging for them. Generation X has adapted well to technology but not quite like Millennials. The Millennial Generation is the first generation that has never known life without technology. Their perception of the work environment involving technology is one that comes with ease.

The law enforcement organization consists of personnel who have goals and want to be contributing members in their organization. The challenge for law enforcement is to incorporate fresh thoughts and new ways of thinking to allow the organization to grow. Leaders are responsible for creating innovative ways to keep all members engaged in the organization to prevent issues like burnout, attrition, substance abuse, or even worse, suicide (Frank et al., 2017; Miller, 2004; Schaible & Gecas, 2010). Law enforcement leaders must be aware of their agency's vitality and remain vigilant to their organizations need for change.

Change is an unavoidable aspect of growth. Growth is needed for an organization to maximize their effectiveness in their industry. Growth in this context does not necessarily mean an organization must become bigger. It simply suggests that if an organization remains stagnant then it will become ineffective, obsolete, or become the source of contention within a community. Utterback (1994) wrote, "Firms must accept the inevitability of change by valuing innovation even above past success; one of management's most essential roles is to find a balance between supporting new and

established innovations” (para.1). People are naturally resistant to change but an organization that encourages change makes it more palatable to accept. How it is accepted by the individual relies on many factors such as demands at work, work organization, interpersonal relations, and leadership. Change may not be the easiest to deal with but successful change in any amount rests on the synergistic relationship between both the person and the organization.

Summary

By understanding each generation’s perception of their work environment, agencies can improve their effectiveness in their approach toward a multigenerational workforce. Each generation views their work environment differently and it is up to organizational leadership to learn those differences, identify them in their workforce, and apply a more effective method to lead their personnel to perform their duties according to the agency’s mission and vision. Categorizing the different generations into silos poses continued challenges in workplace and when serving the public. Learning how each generation perceives their work environment, their organizational leadership, and discovering the relationship between the two are important factors to improving agency effectiveness when approaching their multigenerational workforce. In chapter II, the researcher examined various aspects of the generations including generational characteristics, history of policing, and psychosocial factors. Methodology for the current study is discussed in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The previous chapter provided a review of professional literature offering background information on six different generations, the history of policing, law enforcement culture, and psychosocial factors in the law enforcement work environment. The current study examined the relationships between three of the six generational cohorts: Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials currently working in law enforcement and their perceptions of the work environment, further expanding the body of knowledge to existing research. Understanding generational differences can lead to creativeness and opportunity but misunderstanding them can lead to conflict and stress.

With generational and workplace research abundantly available there was a lack of research on generational perceptions of the law enforcement work environment further adding to the need for additional research. Agencies are obligated to explore motivating factors to retain officers and evaluate and implement new strategies for reducing attrition. Officers retiring from law enforcement, increased costs associated with hiring and training new officers, and intergenerational conflicts within the workplace pose additional challenges for agencies (Lynch & Tuckey, 2008; Wilson, Dalton, Scheer, & Grammich, 2010). Understanding each generation and what influenced their value system

may reduce confusion between members of the different generations and may have a positive impact on an agency's collective efforts (Kapoor & Solomon, 2011).

The purpose of the current study was to examine how law enforcement officers perceive their psychosocial work environments in order to improve agency effectiveness when approaching their multigenerational workforce. The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do perceptions of the work environment differ between generational cohorts?
2. How do perceptions of organizational leadership differ between generational cohorts?
3. What is the relationship between the perceptions of organizational leadership and the work environment across all generational cohorts?

This chapter covered the research design, participants, data collection, analytical methods, and limitations.

Research Design

The current study explored the relationships between generational cohorts in law enforcement and their perceptions of the work environment. Scores collected from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (COPSOQII) measured the relationships between cohorts and the 16 dimensions relevant to the law enforcement work environment. Cohorts were determined by commonly accepted date ranges for each group and variables were not manipulated within the study.

The current study used quantitative methodology with a non-experimental comparative design. Data were analyzed using an ANOVA. This analysis was conducted

using the statistical software program SPSS. Robson & McCartan (2016) suggested that descriptive survey research provided information about the distribution of characteristics of the participants and the relationships of those characteristics with other variables. In the current study, descriptive data were collected to highlight the relationships between generational cohorts and the psychosocial factors that make up the law enforcement work environment.

Participants

The population for the research study included law enforcement officers from agencies spanning from small to large and included local, county, state, and federal organizations. The selection of participants was completed by using non-probability sampling. The sample included ($N = 7092$) active members of the FBI National Academy Association (FBINAA) who were also graduates of the FBI National Academy (FBINA).

Participants were also recruited by electronically delivering the survey to a sample of ($N = 107$) members of a midwestern region Metropolitan Chiefs and Sheriffs Association (MCSA). There was no requirement for MCSA members to be graduates of the FBINA, but most of the membership were graduates. The same request for members of the MCSA to distribute the survey to officers within their agencies was made to ensure maximum participation. For both groups, officer participation was voluntary.

Total sample size included ($N = 7199$) potential participants. Total survey responses included ($N = 522$) from a demographic of $n = 60$ female (11.49%) and $n = 462$ male (88.51%). The ethnic makeup of the participants included White/Caucasian, $n = 488$ (93.49%); Multiple Ethnicity/Other, $n = 11$ (2.11%); Black or African American, $n = 8$

(1.53%); Hispanic, $n = 6$ (1.15%); Asian/Pacific Islander $n = 5$ (.96%); and American Indian or Alaskan Native, $n = 4$ (.77%).

Since the current research is based on the perceptions of participants currently active in the law enforcement work environment from the Baby Boomer Generation, Generation X, and Millennials, some participants were not included in the analysis. Of the 522 participants, 55 reported their status as retired, four reported as part-time, and two reported as reserve. Of the remaining 461 surveys, 19 were removed as they were not completed in their entirety. Of the remaining 442 surveys, one was removed as it was the only survey from the Silent Generation. A total of 81 surveys were removed resulting in $N = 441$ surveys used for analysis.

The demographics of the $N = 441$ participants included $n = 50$ female (11.34%) and $n = 391$ male (88.66%). The ethnicity of the modified group of participants included White/Caucasian, $n = 412$ (93.42%); Multiple Ethnicity/Other, $n = 9$ (2.04%); Black or African American, $n = 7$ (1.59%); Hispanic, $n = 6$ (1.36%); Asian/Pacific Islander $n = 5$ (1.13%); and American Indian or Alaskan Native, $n = 2$ (.45%). A final count of cohort members resulted in one from the Silent Generation, 79 Baby Boomers, 251 Generation X, and 111 Millennials.

Data Collection

The COPSOQII survey provided a platform for the collection of responses regarding participant's perceptions of their law enforcement work environment.

The development of COPSOQ II took place in five main steps: (1) We considered practical experience from the use of COPSOQ I, in particular feedback from workplace studies where the questionnaire had been used; (2) All scales

concerning workplace factors in COPSOQ I were analyzed for differential item functioning (DIF) with regard to gender, age, and occupational status; (3) A test version of COPSOQ II including new scales and items was developed and tested in a representative sample of working Danes between 20 and 59 years of age. In all, 3,517 Danish employees participated in the study. The overall response rate was 60.4%; (4) Based on psychometric analyses, the final questionnaire was developed; and (5) Criteria-related validity of the new scales was tested.

(Pejtersen et al., 2010)

The COPSOQII is a widely used instrument for self-reporting of psychosocial factors identified by leading occupational stress theories (Dicke et al., 2018). The researcher selected the COPSOQII as the instrument to identify the differences in generational perceptions of the law enforcement work environment and organizational leadership. Three research questions guided the process of exploring the 16 dimensions relevant to the law enforcement work environment.

After receiving Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval, the researcher disseminated the electronic survey via the FBINAA bi-weekly newsletter over six weeks and delivered to the MCSA after presenting the research information to the membership at a monthly meeting. The survey included informed consent, the nature of and purpose of the study, and an explanation of procedures. Each participant indicated his/her approval to participate in the study by proceeding to the survey. After advancing to the survey questions, participants were asked to answer demographic questions. Questions included gender, year of birth, level of education, ethnicity, relationship status, size of employer, employment status (full-time, part-time, reserve, or retired), employment

length, current salary, the State where employed, which law enforcement organization they were employed, total law enforcement agencies worked, and total years worked in law enforcement.

Participants completed 31 questions using a Likert type scale to provide a range of responses to their perceptions of the work environment. Response options for questions 1A through 4B, 12A, and 12B ranged from zero through four, with 4 representing Always, 3 Often, 2 Sometimes, 1 Seldom, and 0 Never/hardly ever. One exception existed with question 1B where 0 represents Always, 1 Often, 2 Sometimes, 3 Seldom, and 4 Never/hardly ever. Response options for questions 5A through 11B and 15A through 16B ranged from zero to four, with 4 representing To a very large extent, 3 To a large extent, 2 Somewhat, 1 To a small extent, and 0 To a very small extent. Response options for questions 14A and 14B ranged from zero to three, with 3 representing Yes, certainly, 2 Yes, to a certain degree, 1 Yes, but only very little, and 0 No, not at all. Response options for question 13 ranged from zero through three, with 3 representing Very satisfied, 2 Satisfied, 1 Unsatisfied, and 0 Very unsatisfied.

The COPSOQII survey connected the work environment to the following five areas (a) demands at work, (b) work organization and job content, (c) interpersonal relations and leadership, (d) work-individual interface, (e) and values at the workplace. The researcher identified a total of 16 dimensions relevant to the work environment as being 1. quantitative demands, 2. work pace, 3. emotional demands, 4. influence, 5. possibilities for development, 6. meaning of work, 7. commitment to the workplace, 8. predictability, 9. rewards, 10. role clarity, 11. quality of leadership, 12. social support from supervisor, 13. job satisfaction, 14. work-family conflict, 15. trust regarding

management, and 16. justice and respect. The dimensions are listed in numerical order according to how they are presented in the survey.

The electronic survey remained accessible on SurveyMonkey for 138 days. Aside from the participant's circumstances, the discomfort and risks associated with the instrument used to collect data were expected to be minimal. The potential of risks were addressed in the informed consent. All information collected through the survey was done so with complete anonymity, and no identifying factors such as internet protocol addresses or names were collected during the process. No incentives were used or offered during the collection of data during this period. The decision to close the survey came after 24 days of inactivity. Surveys were reviewed for completeness, and any incomplete surveys were excluded from the analysis. Statistical analysis of the results began after the survey was closed and surveys were reviewed for completeness.

Analytical Methods

The completion of the electronic survey provided quantitative data which was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software for Windows version 24.0. Data collected during the current study were analyzed using Welch's ANOVA. The Welch's ANOVA is conducted much like a classic ANOVA where the analysis examines the means of the differences among three or more groups within and between them (Leedy & Ormrod, 2016). Welch's ANOVA is the method used when data violates the assumption of equal variances.

Generational cohorts were coded as 1 for Baby Boomers, 2 for Generation X, and 3 for Millennials. Welch's ANOVA provided a between groups analysis of the differences between the perceptions of each cohort and the variables. A post hoc test for

any results that showed statistical significance was conducted using the Tukey's HSD to determine which groups exhibited differences.

Limitations

Price and Murnan (2004) wrote that a limitation is a systematic bias that a researcher could not control and where the results inappropriately affected the study. The current study identified limitations which should be considered for future research. The limitations acknowledged are discussed in the areas of geographical response, participant selection, and the participant's setting during survey completion.

Participants returned at least one survey from every state across the country except for six states including Alabama, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island which produced no participants. The District of Columbia and 29 states that produced from one to five surveys included Alaska, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Seven states that produced from six to 10 surveys included Arizona, Colorado, Illinois, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Washington. Four states that produced from 11 to 20 surveys included California, New Jersey, New York, and Ohio. The State of Minnesota produced 28 surveys, the State of Kansas produced 68 surveys, and the State of Missouri produced 243.

Removing the 81 surveys not included in the analysis resulted in zero surveys used from Alabama, Delaware, Georgia, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Wyoming. The remaining states produced one to nine

surveys except for New York (10), California (11), Minnesota (25), Kansas (63), and Missouri (227). The top three survey producing states, as indicated, are Midwestern states. Perceptions of the law enforcement work environment may vary depending on the geographical location of the participants. Statistical analysis may favor perceptions from three states in the Midwest as opposed to the rest of the country.

Participant selection was another limitation identified during the current study. The selection of participants was difficult since chain sampling, or snowball sampling was relied upon as a method to distribute the survey to obtain participation. The idea of chain sampling producing maximum results is not realistic, and researchers must actively and deliberately be engaged in the selection process from start to finish to ensure maximum participation (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). Specific characteristics also challenged the collection efforts since participants had to be active members in law enforcement and could be categorized in one of the three identified generational cohorts determined by age.

The quality of the answers to the survey questions may also diminish depending on the origination of the chain mainly if it originated from a supervisor or manager. Officers may be compelled to answer survey questions based on how they feel their supervisor expects them to answer. Supervisor influence could undoubtedly sway answers positively or negatively depending upon the relationship between the subordinate and supervisor. A negative relationship between supervisor and subordinate may also deter an officer from participating out of fear of retaliation.

The setting where a participant decides to participate in the survey also poses a limitation to the current study. The survey was distributed by way of professional

associations where members likely received notification of the survey through departmental email. The request for forwarding the survey (chain sampling) and requesting coworkers to participate could be assumed would take place in the workplace. Participants may have been disinclined to fully and truthfully answer the questions regarding their work environment while at their place of employment. Although the informed consent displayed for review before proceeding to the electronic survey stated the survey would be taken with the strictest confidentiality, participants may have assumed their answers would be tracked or traced back to them. The belief of not remaining anonymous would add to the possibility of participants altering their responses disguising their real perceptions of their work environment or to not participate at all. Another factor of the setting limitation could be participants potentially participated in the survey as a group rather than as individuals. Work areas where multiple officers perform their duties would further perpetuate the reality of participants not taking the survey independently or worse, seriously.

Summary

This chapter explained the methodology of how the current study was conducted and how Welch's ANOVA was the statistical test used to analyze the data. The participants, instrument, and variables have been discussed. Limitations of the study were identified and addressed. Chapter IV details the findings of the research along with conclusions based on those findings and how they correspond to the research questions. Implications and recommendations will also be made based on research findings.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

In this final chapter, the researcher summarized the information from the preceding three chapters and then delivered the results from the data collection, the analysis of the research questions, and discussed interpretations of the findings. The researcher also included in this chapter conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research resulting from the current study. The purpose of the current study was to examine how law enforcement officers perceive their psychosocial work environments in order to improve agency effectiveness when approaching their multigenerational workforce. The following research questions guided the current study:

1. How do perceptions of the work environment differ between generational cohorts?
2. How do perceptions of organizational leadership differ between generational cohorts?
3. What is the relationship between the perceptions of organizational leadership and the work environment across all generational cohorts?

Findings

To provide a representation of those who participated in the current study, the following tables are provided to illustrate the demographic information of the

participants. Tables 1 through 5 represent participant’s gender, birth year, relationship status, race/ethnicity, education, agency tenure, sworn employees at agency, salary, agencies worked, and law enforcement tenure. Appendix E lists the participant’s state from where they were employed.

Table 1

Demographics: Gender, Birth Year, and Relationship Status

Demographic	Occurrence	Percentage
Gender		
Female	50	11.3
Male	391	88.7
Birth Year Cohort		
Baby Boomer	79	17.9
Generation X	251	56.9
Millennial	111	25.2
Relationship Status		
Married	348	78.9
Widowed	2	0.5
Divorced	33	7.5
Separated	3	0.7
Domestic Partnership	3	0.7
Single but Cohabiting	28	6.3
Single, Never Married	24	5.4

Note. N = 441

Table 2

Demographics: Race/Ethnicity and Education

Demographic	Occurrence	Percentage
Race/Ethnicity		
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	0.5
Asian / Pacific Islander	5	1.1
Black or African American	7	1.6
Hispanic	6	1.4
White / Caucasian	412	93.4
Multiple Ethnicity / Other	9	2.0
Education		
High School Diploma or GED	5	1.1
Some College, but No Degree	76	17.2
Trade/Technical/Vocational Training	8	1.8
Associate's Degree	58	13.2
Bachelor's Degree	197	44.7
Graduate Degree	92	20.9
Professional Degree	3	0.7
Doctoral Degree	2	0.5

Note. $N = 441$

Table 3

Demographics: Agency Tenure and Sworn Employees at Agency

Demographic	Occurrence	Percentage
Agency Tenure (Years)		
Fewer Than 1	11	2.5
2 – 5	59	13.4
6 – 10	56	12.7
11 – 15	54	12.2
16 – 20	72	16.3
21 – 25	96	21.8
26 – 30	50	11.3
31 – 35	34	7.7
36 – 40	9	2.0
Sworn Employees at Agency		
Fewer Than 50	66	15.0
50 – 100	124	28.1
101 – 250	87	19.7
251 – 500	11	2.5
501 – 1000	12	2.7
1001 – 2000	94	21.3
2001 – 5000	37	8.4
More Than 5000	10	2.3

Note. N = 441

Table 4

Demographics: Salary and Agencies Worked

Demographic	Occurrence	Percentage
Salary		
\$25,000 - \$49,999	64	14.5
\$50,000 - \$74,999	111	25.1
\$75,000 - \$99,999	130	29.5
\$100,000 - \$124,999	68	15.4
\$125,000 - \$149,999	27	6.1
\$150,000 - \$174,999	19	4.3
\$175,000 - \$199,999	12	2.7
\$200,000 or more	8	1.8
Prefer Not To Answer	2	0.5
Agencies Worked		
1	239	54.2
2	131	29.7
3	46	10.4
4	19	4.3
5 or More	6	1.4

Note. $N = 441$

Table 5

Demographics: Law Enforcement Tenure

Demographic	Occurrence	Percentage
Law Enforcement Tenure (Years)		
Fewer Than 1	7	1.6
2 – 5	36	8.2
6 – 10	44	9.8
11 – 15	45	10.2
16 – 20	67	15.2
21 – 25	99	22.4
26 – 30	67	15.2
31 – 35	46	10.4
36 – 40	22	5.0
More Than 40	8	1.8

Note. $N = 441$

Tables 1 through 5 depict the percentages of the participants from each demographic question. Most of the participants in the current study were married Caucasian males from Generation X who held bachelor's degrees and had between 21 to 25 years of experience in law enforcement. Many of the participants worked in agencies that employed between 21 and 50 sworn employees. Although the Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial generations were the basis of the current study, the other demographic questions were presented as additional factors to consider in the participant's perception of their work environments.

The COPSOQ-II used for the current research consisted of 31 questions to collect data to measure 16 dimensions. The reliability and validity of the COPSOQ-II has been tested and can also be found in over 25 different languages. The questionnaire was tested after internal consistency was discovered not to apply to all questionnaire scales (Thorsen & Bjorner, 2010). Results of the Spanish COPSOQ-II supported validity and reliability when the questionnaire was used as a tool to assess the psychosocial work environment (Moncada et al., 2014). The Portuguese long version of the questionnaire also showed to be a reliable and valid instrument to assess psychosocial factors in the workplace (Rosario et al., 2017). The results for retest reliability showed strong evidence which coincides with other studies pertaining to convergent and discriminant validity related to stability over time (Rosario, Fonseca, & da Costa, 2014).

Welch's ANOVA was the statistical test used to conduct the analysis. Welch's ANOVA was selected because it is used when different groups violate the assumption of homogeneity of variances. The Welch test provided a more robust equality of means when determining statistical significance. Tukey's HSD post hoc test was conducted on the variables that reached statistical significance to determine where the significance existed between the different groups. Microsoft Excel 2016 was used to tabulate and sum the Likert-type scores obtained from the COPSOQ-II. The program used to conduct the analysis was the SPSS.

Research Question 1

How do perceptions of the work environment differ between generational cohorts?

Research question one addressed the differences between how generational cohorts perceived their work environment. Research question one was answered when the

researcher analyzed the scores of the Likert-type scale for quantitative demands (Q1A, Q1B), work pace (Q2A, Q2B), emotional demands (Q3A, Q3B), possibilities for development (Q5A, Q5B), meaning of work (Q6A, Q6B), commitment to the workplace (Q7A, Q7B), role clarity (Q10A, Q10B), and job satisfaction (Q13). All dimensions except for Emotional Demands resulted in no statistically significant difference between the three generations. For the Emotional Demands dimension, the analysis resulted significant difference $F(2, 438) = 7.627, p = .001, \eta^2 = .034$. Tukey's HSD post hoc analysis indicated that Millennials ($M = 5.19, SD = 1.39$) perceived their work environment as more demanding when placed in emotionally disturbing situations and having to relate to people's personal problems than both Baby Boomers ($M = 4.41, SD = 1.35$) and Generation X ($M = 4.77, SD = 1.39$). There was also a statistically significant difference between Generation X and Baby Boomers which indicated that Generation X perceived their work environment more demanding when placed in emotionally disturbing situations and having to relate to people's personal problems than both Baby Boomers. Millennials seem to be more effected from the emotional demands of their work environment than do Baby Boomers and Generation X but the effect size of .034 is small. Table 6 represents the dimensions and results from research question one.

Table 6

Research Question One: Dimensions ANOVA

Dimension	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Quantitative Demands</i>					
Between groups	2	16.770	8.385	2.981	.052
Within groups	438	1232.146	2.813		
Total	440	1248.916			
<i>Work Pace</i>					
Between groups	2	1.284	.642	.325	.723
Within groups	438	865.754	1.977		
Total	440	867.039			
<i>Emotional Demands</i>					
Between groups	2	29.258	14.629	7.627	.001
Within groups	438	840.121	1.918		
Total	440	869.379			
<i>Development Possibility</i>					
Between groups	2	1.618	.809	.484	.617
Within groups	438	732.522	1.672		
Total	440	734.141			
<i>Work Meaning</i>					
Between groups	2	13.741	6.870	2.838	.060
Within groups	438	1060.259	2.421		
Total	440	1074.000			

Table 6 (continued).

Dimension	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Workplace Commitment</i>					
Between groups	2	8.757	4.378	1.319	.269
Within groups	438	1454.159	3.320		
Total	440	1462.916			
<i>Role Clarity</i>					
Between groups	2	4.336	2.168	1.020	.362
Within groups	438	931.274	2.126		
Total	440	935.610			
<i>Job Satisfaction</i>					
Between groups	2	1.291	.646	1.495	.225
Within groups	438	189.117	.432		
Total	440	190.408			

Research Question 2

How do perceptions of organizational leadership differ between generational cohorts?

Research question two addressed the differences between how generational cohorts perceived their organizational leadership. Research question two was answered when the researcher analyzed the scores of the Likert-type scale for influence (Q4A, Q4B) and work-family conflict (Q14A, Q14B). Although work family conflict resulted in no statistically significant difference between the three generations, an analysis of the dimension for influence resulted in significant difference $F(2, 438) = 9.985, p < .001, \eta^2 = .044$. Tukey's HSD post hoc analysis indicated that Millennials ($M = 3.71, SD = 1.65$)

perceived their degree of influence concerning their work and amount of work assigned to them to be lower than both Baby Boomers ($M = 4.72, SD = 1.62$) and Generation X ($M = 4.29, SD = 1.53$). The results also indicated that Generation X perceived their degree of influence concerning their work and amount of work assigned to them to be lower than Baby Boomers. Millennials seem to believe they have less influence regarding their work and amount of work assigned to them than Baby Boomers and Generation X. The effect size was .044. Generation X also seems to believe they have less influence in their work and amount of work assigned to them than Baby Boomers. Table 7 represents the dimensions and results from research question two.

Table 7

Research Question Two: Dimensions ANOVA

Dimension	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Influence</i>					
Between groups	2	49.805	24.903	9.985	.000
Within groups	438	1092.417	2.494		
Total	440	1142.222			
<i>Work Family Conflict</i>					
Between groups	2	2.001	1.000	.400	.670
Within groups	438	1094.521	2.499		
Total	440	1096.522			

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between the perceptions of organizational leadership and the work environment across all generational cohorts?

Research question three addressed the relationship between how generational cohorts perceived organizational leadership and their work environment. Research question three was answered when the researcher analyzed the scores of the Likert-type scale for predictability (Q8A, Q8B), rewards (Q9A, Q9B), quality of leadership (Q11A, Q11B), social support from supervisor (Q12A, Q12B), trust regarding management (Q15A, Q15B), and justice and respect (Q16A, Q16B). All dimensions except for Predictability, resulted in no statistically significant difference between the three generations. For the Predictability dimension, the analysis resulted in a statistically significant difference $F(2, 438) = 3.035, p = .049, \eta^2 = .013$. Tukey 's HSD post hoc analysis indicated that Millennials ($M = 4.18, SD = 1.74$) perceived they were not as well-informed on important decisions, changes, or plans for the future and they did not receive all the information they need to do their work well as Baby Boomers ($M = 4.78, SD = 1.71$) and Generation X ($M = 4.51, SD = 1.67$). There was no statistically significant difference between Baby Boomers and Generation X. Millennials believed they were less informed on decisions that impact the future than Baby Boomers and Generation X, but the effect size of .013 is small. Table 8 represents the dimensions and results from research question three.

Table 8

Research Question Three: Dimensions ANOVA

Dimension	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Predictability</i>					
Between groups	2	17.471	8.735	3.035	.049
Within groups	438	1260.479	2.878		
Total	440	1277.950			
<i>Rewards</i>					
Between groups	2	11.116	5.558	1.730	.179
Within groups	438	1407.446	3.213		
Total	440	1418.562			
<i>Leadership Quality</i>					
Between groups	2	5.436	2.718	.756	.470
Within groups	438	1574.745	3.595		
Total	440	1580.181			
<i>Social Support from Supervisor</i>					
Between groups	2	22.094	11.047	2.993	.051
Within groups	438	1616.682	3.691		
Total	440	1638.776			
<i>Trust Regarding Management</i>					
Between groups	2	2.524	1.262	.435	.647
Within groups	438	1269.720	2.899		
Total	440	1272.245			
<i>Justice and Respect</i>					
Between groups	2	.870	.435	.148	.862
Within groups	438	1286.477	2.937		
Total	440	1287.347			

Of the eight dimensions in research question one, Emotional Demands was the only dimension that reached a statistically significant difference, but the effect size was small. The perceived differences in the work environment between the generational cohorts were minimal. The only dimension from research question two that had a statistically significant difference was Influence. Generational cohorts may perceive their organizational leadership differently based on the amount of influence they have in concerning their work and how they influence the amount of work assigned to them. The only dimension from research question three that had a statistically significant difference was Predictability, but the effect size was small. It appeared that generational cohorts may perceive a difference in the relationship between organizational leadership and the work environment depending on how well informed they are regarding the organization but still appeared to be minimal since only one dimension was statistically significantly different.

Conclusions

The purpose of the current study was to examine how law enforcement officers perceived their psychosocial work environment in order to improve agency effectiveness when approaching their multigenerational workforce. Generational studies have been conducted throughout an array of occupations and industries, but research remains necessary in the field of law enforcement to examine how multigenerational perceptions impact employees in their workplace environment. The current study's results could have been skewed by the concentration of returned surveys from the Midwest region of the United States. Appendix E shows the regions and states from where participants responded. The results should not be used to generalize officer's perceptions of their

work environments in all regions of the country. An additional factor to consider as an effect to the current study is the request for participants to forward the survey to sworn law enforcement officers of their organizations using the snowball effect to achieve maximum law enforcement participation.

The results from the current study add to the body of knowledge for the law enforcement community and how generational characteristics influence the law enforcement work environment. Past research regarding the generational impact in law enforcement is minimal and warrants further investigation. Law enforcement is no different than any other field or industry in terms of facing personnel challenges. Agencies should examine how generational differences impact their organizations while searching for solutions related to recruiting, hiring, training, and retention. As employees progress in years, it only makes sense to prepare future generations for future generations.

Research Question 1

How do perceptions of the work environment differ between generational cohorts? As discussed in the findings section of this chapter for research question one, the only statistically significant difference was found in the dimension related to Emotional Demands $F(2, 438) = 7.627, p = .001, \eta^2 = .034$. The statistically significant difference suggests that Millennial participants perceive their work environment more emotionally disturbing and having to relate to people's personal problems has a more negative effect on them than reported by Baby Boomers and Generation X participants. A possible connection could be the fact that the events that helped shape this generation are terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, school shootings, and

social media. Perhaps living with *helicopter* parents who micromanaged their lives while trying to shelter them from the evils of the world served them no justice in preparing them for the emotional demands of the law enforcement work environment.

Glass (2007) wrote that Millennials grew up with parents who were overprotective and hovered over their children, managing nearly every aspect of their education and their social activities, including some later in life decisions. Tolbize (2008) referenced Millennials being referred to as the *Trophy Generation* for the generation that began the trend of receiving rewards for merely participating in activities and not winning. Overprotective parents involved in nearly every aspect of this generation's lives could quite possibly clarify why this generation is known to require constant feedback, coaching, and consistent support from their leaders.

Baby Boomers appear to be better able to handle the emotional demands of the experienced in the work environment. It is possible that factors such as time on the job, rank, and proximity to retirement could reduce the emotional demand of this generation. Generation X perceived their work environment more emotionally demanding than Baby Boomers but less than Millennials. This difference could be the result of time on the job and rank or position as well. One could assume that members of Generation X would be stepping up to fill positions of leadership as Baby Boomers retire further separating them from situations experienced by field personnel and therefore lessening the emotional demands of the job. As indicated by the results, Millennials perceived their work environment as more emotionally disturbing than Generation X and Baby Boomers. Perhaps as Millennials progress in their careers and promote within their organizations, their perceptions will change and perceive their work environments less demanding.

Research Question 2

How do perceptions of organizational leadership differ between generational cohorts? As discussed in the findings section of this chapter for research question two, the only statistically significant difference was found in the dimension related to Influence $F(2, 438) = 9.985, p < .001, \eta^2 = .044$. The statistically significant difference suggests that Millennial participants perceive themselves to have less of an influence on the amount of work assigned to them as well as a lesser degree of influence concerning their work than their Baby Boomer and Generation X coworkers. The feeling of lacking influence in the work environment could be the result of technology (Hart, 2006; Smola & Sutton, 2002; Tulgan & Martin, 2001; Wong et al., 2008). Millennials are the first generation to never have known life without technology, has been dubbed technologically savvy, and values instant access to information and being able to communicate through digital platforms (Bennett et al., 2008; Carver & Candella, 2008; Sherman, 2006; Stanley, 2010; Wesner & Miller, 2008).

Lacking a certain degree of influence within their work environment could also be the reason why Millennials are known to hop from job to job when they are not engaged (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Millennials desire meaningful work, but their lack of commitment to an employer has gained them an unofficial reputation as entitled and not willing to work their way up (Farrell & Hurt, 2014). Millennials are motivated by work that has meaning and seeks jobs that offer tasks that are productive and different. They pursue opportunities for training, view their job as a place to learn, and believe in lifelong learning. They measure their success by the significance and relevance of their own work (Eisner, 2005). Millennials want more than just a job from where they get paid. They

desire a work environment that is fun and promotes social interaction. Poornima (2009) wrote that Millennial employees are motivated by factors surrounding social factors, environments that help build self-esteem, and self-actualization.

Research Question 3

What is the relationship between the perceptions of organizational leadership and the work environment across all generational cohorts? As discussed in the findings section of this chapter for research question three, the only statistically significant difference was found in the dimension related to Predictability $F(2, 438) = 3.035, p = .049, \eta^2 = .013$. The statistically significant difference suggests that Millennial participants perceived themselves to be less informed than Baby Boomers and Generation X on important decisions, changes, or plans for the future and they did not receive all the information they needed to do their work well. There was no significant difference between Baby Boomers and Generation X.

The relationship between perceptions of leadership and work environment across the three generational cohorts could very well be where members are in their cycle of life. A person could experience an array of changes as they progress through their life. Developmental psychologist, Erikson (1963) suggested that human development occurred in stages and influenced behavior. As people progress through adulthood, they are faced with new challenges and seemingly adopt different social roles (Cogin, 2012). Appelbaum et al. (2005) suggested a universal development order during the human lifecycle, which progresses through childhood, teenage years, early adulthood, middle adulthood, and in old age. As people get older, they tend to become more collectivistic, conservative, and self-transcendent, and less individualistic, open to change, and self-

enhancing (Schwartz et al., 2001). A person's individual needs change over time (O'Rand & Krecker, 1990).

Many current political leaders, CEOs, and middle managers are Baby Boomers, but they are retiring at the rate of about 10,000 per day and are being replaced with members from Generation X (Carrier et al., 2009; Cohn & Taylor, 2010). Baby Boomers are the generation that holds positions that can influence change in the organization but are perceived quite the opposite due to the proximity of their retirement. As Baby Boomers continue to retire at 10,000 per day, this makes room in the middle-management levels in law enforcement organizations and makes way for Generation X to move up to the Chief positions of those organizations. Generation X is now more than ever willing to take calculated risks to move into the upper levels of their organizations (Martin & Tulgan, 2006). They are ready to step into leadership positions.

Implications and Recommendations

The implications of the current study include the knowledge that there are some differences between the generational cohorts in law enforcement. Law enforcement agencies could use the information presented in the current study when considering future changes in policy, procedures, or human resource practices, including recruitment, hiring, training, and retention. Although there is a tremendous amount of scholarly literature on the topic of generations and generational characteristics, there appears to be the need for additional studies regarding generational research in law enforcement.

The current study expanded research, literature, and knowledge of generational differences in law enforcement. Implications and recommendations are presented for law enforcement leaders to consider as a result of the current study. There exists an inherent

resistance for people not to accept change. Organizations that embrace and encourage change make it more palatable for employees to accept when changes occur. With Baby Boomers retiring at a rate of approximately 10,000 per day, members of Generation X are quickly moving into positions of leadership. Delattre (2002) identified Generation X as a generation that questioned organizations that were resistant to change and would push to make the necessary changes as they saw fit. Now more than ever is the time for members of Generation X to begin to implement changes if they have not already done so. The results from the current study could assist the law enforcement leaders with implementing policy and procedural changes that could improve agency effectiveness when approaching their multigenerational workforce.

Law enforcement officers who are trailing edge Millennials through Generation Z will benefit the most from the more acceptable attitudes toward change since they still have longevity in their careers. Future generations will also reap the benefits as agencies progress and embrace change. Change is necessary for law enforcement agencies to remain competitive while striving to recruit qualified candidates and retain exceptional employees. Stereotyping members from any generation serves merely as an excuse and not as a viable means for working toward a solution for any problem. Becton et al. (2014) pointed out that the goal for improvement is to change law enforcement perception that popular generational stereotypes are not always consistent with workplace behaviors. Blaming problems on one specific generation is unproductive.

Many law enforcement agencies are exploring the possibilities of relaxing longstanding policies and standards, including tattoos and facial hair to attract more people to the field of law enforcement. Organizations must address generational

differences now especially with Baby Boomers leaving the field, Generation X nearing retirement age, Millennials moving up the ranks, and as department personnel numbers dwindle. Understanding generational characteristics and the shift in cohorts may prove successful for agencies as they move to make appropriate changes to their policies and procedures. Making necessary adjustments to everyday law enforcement practices is an important step toward improving agency effectiveness.

Geographical Response

Banks et al. (2016) identified that there are over 18,000 law enforcement agencies in the United States that employ over 750,000 sworn law enforcement officers. Of the 522 returned surveys, only 441 were usable for the current study. Of the 441 surveys returned, 343 or 77.8% were returned from the Midwest region of the United States. There is a belief that the culture of policing is different depending on the geographical location of the agency. Along with the belief that the culture of policing may be different on the East Coast compared to the West Coast or the culture of policing in the Southern states differs from the Northern states, is the difference in perceptions from law enforcement professionals from each region. The statistical analysis of the current study may favor Midwestern perceptions and not represent the law enforcement perceptions equally throughout the rest of the country.

A recommendation for future research is to address the specificity of the geographical location by incorporating a mechanism or establishing parameters to capture regional data without diluting that information with data collected from the other regions. Perceptions of the work environment may be different in some regions compared to others. Relationships between agencies and their communities in some regions may be

more positive compared to agencies in other regions who regularly face national issues resulting in a more negative relationship within their communities. Examining the law enforcement officer's generational perceptions in their work environment is important. Exploring those perceptions and how they differ in various regions may explain how other community factors such as jurisdictional population, socioeconomic status, demographic breakdown, and community relations impact police culture and further influence officer's perceptions.

Participant Selection

The researcher relied on one professional law enforcement organizations to distribute the survey used for the current study, which limited the selection process of participants. Chain sampling, or snowball sampling was applied to maximize participation but still only yielded 522 (7.3% of $N = 7092$) of surveys returned of which only 441 (6.2% of $N = 7092$) were usable in the current study. Biernacki and Waldorf (1981) wrote that using chain sampling to maximize result is not realistic, and researchers must be actively engaged in the entire selection process to ensure maximum participation.

Coordinating with multiple professional law enforcement organizations like the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), National Sheriff's Association (NSA), and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association (FLEOA), along with the FBINAA could result in additional completed surveys from across the country. Consideration should also be given to the fact that younger officers may not be members of these organizations, which could further limit responses to more senior officers. A deliberate effort should be made to include officers from every generation currently in law enforcement. The current study only analyzed responses from sworn employees.

Many agencies employ part-time, sworn employees. Further consideration should be given to incorporating part-time sworn employees to identify if perceptions change depending on their employment status.

Participant's Setting

The answers reported in the surveys have the potential for being skewed depending on the origination of the survey delivered to an officer, mainly if the survey originated from a supervisor or a manager. Officers could have felt as if they had no choice but to complete the survey and had the potential of being influenced to answer based on how they thought their supervisor wanted them to answer the questions. A negative relationship between the officer and their supervisor could have further diminished the quality of their answers for fear of retaliation.

The place where a participant chose to complete the survey may have reduced their willingness to fully and truthfully complete the survey while at their workplace. The cynical nature of police culture may have led participants to believe their answers could be traced back to them despite the informed consent clearly stating the survey would be taken with the strictest confidentiality. Distrust and the belief that participants would not remain anonymous could have led participants to alter their responses, disguise their true perceptions, or not participate at all. Given that surveys were likely completed at the workplace, participants could have participated in the survey collectively as a group rather than as individuals. Roll call rooms or other areas where multiple officers would congregate, have the potential of influencing participants not to take the survey, take the survey independently, or even worse, seriously. Case in point, one participant, intentionally answered that they identified as a robot regarding their ethnicity. A robot is

a term sometimes used in law enforcement by an officer to express negative feelings toward their work environment where an officer is only there to comply with the orders of their superiors. A robot performs the same meaningless tasks and lacks individuality.

A recommendation for future research is to accompany the survey with a brief description permitting the participant to complete the survey at a location of their choosing and not necessarily at the workplace to minimize external influences. Explain to participants the need for truthful and accurate information which could improve the field of law enforcement and benefit them as well as their fellow law enforcement brothers and sisters. Reiterate the fact that participation is voluntary and completely anonymous. Consideration should also be given to the removal of the demographic question for which law enforcement organization is your employer. It was brought to the researcher's attention that answering both the organization question as well as the salary question could lead a person to speculate which position, they held. The salary question should remain optional, however, as it could depict where a participant lies in the organizational structure.

The research questions in the current study were answered, but not without acknowledging the limitations. Although the geographical location, participant selection, and participant's setting during survey completion limited the researcher's methodology, future research should include the replication of the methodology to support or contest the conclusions of the findings from the current study. Replication should occur within different regions of the country and consideration given to the comparison of the generational perceptions from officers within those regions.

Future researchers should consider conducting a longitudinal study and track officer's entry into law enforcement through various periods of their career to retirement to possibly identify factors that influence cohort member's perceptions of their work environment. Future researchers should conduct a longitudinal study of the newest generation to enter law enforcement in urban, suburban, and rural areas where local, county, state, and federal agencies perform their duties. A longitudinal study may identify internal and external factors that may explain why officers perceive their work environment the way they do at specific periods of their life and career.

The current study resulted in data that supports the idea that differences exist between Baby Boomers, Generation X, and Millennials in law enforcement. Caution should be used in generalizing the results of the current study since only three variables of 16 were found to be statistically significant. Other variables neared significance but may have been the result of the limitations of the current study. The findings of the current study could assist law enforcement leaders in tackling the challenges they face when approaching a multigenerational workforce. The challenges of recruiting, hiring, training, and retention could be mitigated by examining the findings of the current study and applying them to law enforcement organizations that employ a multigenerational workforce.

REFERENCES

- Adams, S. J. (2000). Generation X: How understanding this generation leads to better safety programs. *Professional Safety*, 45(1), 26-29.
- Alkus, S., & Padesky, C. (1983). Special problems of police officers: Stress-related issues and interventions. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 11(2), 55-64.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0011000083112010>
- Alphabet soup: Boomers, Gen X, Gen Y, and Gen Z explained. (2018, May 16).
Retrieved from <https://communityrising.kasasa.com/gen-x-gen-y-gen-z/>
- Altimier, L. (2006). Leading a new generation. *Newborn and Infant Nursing Reviews*, 6(1), 7-9. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.nainr.2005.12.008>
- Alwin, D. F., & McCammon, R. J. (2007). Rethinking generations. *Research in Human Development*, 4(3), 219-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15427600701663072>
- Anantatmula, V. S., & Shrivastav, B. (2012). Evolution of project teams for Generation Y workforce. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 5(1), 9-26.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17538371211192874>
- Anderson, G. S., Litzenberger, R., & Plecas, D. (2002). Physical evidence of police officer stress. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 25(2), 399-420. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510210429437>

- Anshel, M. H. (2000). A conceptual model and implications for coping with stressful events in police work. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27(3), 375-400.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0093854800027003006>
- Anshel, M. H., Robertson, M., & Caputi, P. (1997). Sources of acute stress and their appraisals and reappraisals among Australian police as a function of previous experience. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70(4), 337-356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1997.tb00653.x>
- Apostolidis, B. M., & Polifroni, E. C. (2006). Nurse work satisfaction and generational differences. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 36(11), 506-509. Retrieved from https://journals.lww.com/jonajournal/Citation/2006/11000/Nurse_Work_Satisfaction_and_Generational.3.aspx
- Appelbaum, S. H., Serena, M., & Shapiro, B. T. (2005). Generation “X” and the boomers: An analysis of realities and myths. *Management Research News*, 28(1), 1-33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409170510784751>
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). High hopes in a grim world. *Youth & Society*, 31(3), 267-286.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0044118X00031003001>
- Arsenault, P. M. (2004). Validating generational differences: A legitimate diversity and leadership issue. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(2), 124-141. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730410521813>
- Baker Rosa, N. M., & Hastings, S. O. (2016). Managers making sense of millennials: Perceptions of a generational cohort. *Qualitative Research Reports in Communication*, 17(1), 52-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17459435.2015.1088895>

- Bakke, D. W. (2010). *Joy at work: A revolutionary approach to fun on the job*. Seattle, WA: PVG.
- Banks, D., Hendrix, J., Hickman, M., & Kyckelhahn, T. (2016). National sources of law enforcement employment data. *United States Bureau of Justice Statistics*, 1-16.
Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5600>
- Bannon, S., Ford, K., & Meltzer, L. (2011). Understanding millennials in the workplace. *The CPA Journal*, 81(11), 61-65.
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (2002). Building competitive advantage through people. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 43(2), 34-41.
- Becton, J. B., Walker, H. J., & Jones-Farmer, A. (2014). Generational differences in workplace behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44(3), 175-189.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12208>
- Bell, N. S., & Narz, M. (2007). Meeting the challenges of age diversity in the workplace. *The CPA Journal*, 77(2), 56.
- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The digital natives' debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 39(5), 775-786.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x>
- Berkup, S. B. (2014). Working with generations X and Y in generation Z period: Management of different generations in business life. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(19), 218-229. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2014.v5n19p218>
- Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 10(2), 141-163.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/004912418101000205>

- Biggam, F. H., Power, K. G., & MacDonald, R. R. (1997). Coping with the occupational stressors of police work: A study of Scottish officers. *Stress Medicine, 13*(2), 109-115. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1700\(199704\)13:2%3C109::AID-SMI724%3E3.0.CO;2-H](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1700(199704)13:2%3C109::AID-SMI724%3E3.0.CO;2-H)
- Bishop, C. F. (2008). *We're in this boat together: Leadership succession between the generations*. Colorado Springs, CO: Authentic.
- Bosco, S. M., & Bianco, C. A. (2005). Influence of maternal work patterns and socioeconomic status on Gen Y lifestyle choice. *Journal of Career Development, 32*(2), 165-182. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0894845305279169>
- Bouza, A. V. (1990). *The police mystique: An insider's look at cops, crime, and the criminal justice system*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Bova, B., & Kroth, M. (2001). Workplace learning and Generation X. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 13*(2), 57-65. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13665620110383645>
- Brokaw, T. (1998). *The greatest generation*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Brown, J., & Grover, J. (1998). The role of moderating variables between stressor exposure and being distressed in a sample of serving police officers. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*(2), 181-185. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(97\)00156-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(97)00156-6)
- Brown, J. M., & Campbell, E. A. (1990). Sources of occupational stress in the police. *Work & Stress, 4*(4), 305-318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678379008256993>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2016, August). Injuries, illnesses, and fatalities. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/police-officers-2014.htm>

- Burke, R. J. (1994). Stressful events, work-family conflict, coping, psychological burnout, and well-being among police officers. *Psychological Reports, 75*(2), 787-800. <https://doi.org/10.2466%2Fpr0.1994.75.2.787>
- Cahill, T. F., & Sedrak, M. (2012). Leading a multigenerational workforce: Strategies for attracting and retaining millennials. *Frontiers of Health Services Management, 29*(1), 3-15.
- Calhoun, F. (1990). *The Lawmen, U.S. Marshals and their deputies, 1789-1989*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institute Press.
- Carlson, E. (2008). *The luck few: Between the greatest generation and the baby boom*. New York, NY: Springer
- Carlson, K. S., & Gjerde, P. F. (2009). Preschool personality antecedents of narcissism in adolescence and emerging adulthood: A 20-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(4), 570-578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.03.003>
- Carrier, L. M., Cheever, N. A., Rosen, L. D., Benitez, S., & Chang, J. (2009). Multitasking across generations: Multitasking choices and difficulty ratings in three generations of Americans. *Computers in Human Behavior, 25*(2), 483-489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.10.012>
- Carroll, J. S., Badger, S., Willoughby, B. J., Nelson, L. J., Madsen, S. D., & McNamara Barry, C. (2009). Ready or not? Criteria for marriage readiness among emerging adults. *Journal of adolescent research, 24*(3), 349-375. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0743558409334253>

- Caruson, K., MacManus, S. A., Kohen, M., & Watson, T. A. (2005). Homeland security preparedness: The rebirth of regionalism. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 35(1), 143-168. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pji003>
- Carver, L., & Candella, L. (2008). Attaining organizational commitment across different generations of nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16(8), 984-991. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00911.x>
- Caspi, A., & Roberts, B. W. (2001). Personality development across the life course: The argument for change and continuity. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12(2), 49-66. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1202_01
- Cogin, J. (2012). Are generational differences in work values fact or fiction? Multi-country evidence and implications. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(11), 2268-2294. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.610967>
- Cohen, J. (2002). I/Os in the know offer insights on Generation X workers. *Monitor on Psychology*, 33(2), 66-67. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/monitor/feb02/genxwork.aspx>
- Cohn, D., & Taylor, P. (2010, December 10). *Baby boomers approach 65-glumly*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/12/20/baby-boomers-approach-65-glumly/>
- Cole, G. F., Smith, C. E., & DeJong, C. (2018). *Criminal justice in America*. (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

- Costanza, D. P., Fraser, R. L., Badger, J. M., Severt, J. B., & Gade, P. A. (2012). Generational differences in work-related variables: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Psychology, 27*(4), 375-394. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-012-9259-4>
- Cowper, T. J. (2000). The myth of the “military model” of leadership in law enforcement. *Police Quarterly, 3*(3), 228–246. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611100003003001>
- Crank, J. P. (1998). *Understanding police culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Cullen, F. T., Lemming, T., Link, B. G., & Wozniak, J. F. (1985). The impact of social supports on police stress. *Criminology, 23*(3), 503-522. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1985.tb00351.x>
- Dabney, D. A., Copes, H., Tewksbury, R., & Hawk-Tourtlot, S. R. (2013). A qualitative assessment of stress perceptions among members of a homicide unit. *Justice Quarterly, 30*(5), 811-836. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2011.633542>
- Dai, J., & Goodrum, P. M. (2012). Generational differences on craft workers’ perceptions of the factors affecting labour productivity. *Canadian Journal of Civil Engineering, 39*(9), 1018-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1139/12012-053>
- Davey, J. D., Obst, P. L., & Sheehan, M. C. (2000). Developing a profile of alcohol consumption patterns of police officers in a large scale sample of an Australian police service. *European Addiction Research, 6*(4), 205-212. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000052047>
- David, P., Gelfeld, V., & Rangel, A. (2017). Generation X and its evolving experience with the American dream. *Generations, 4*(3), 77-83.

- Delattre, E. J. (2002). *Character and cops: Ethics in policing*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.
- Dencker, J. C., Joshi, A., & Martocchio, J. J. (2008). Towards a theoretical framework linking generational memories to workplace attitudes and behaviors. *Human Resource Management Review, 18*(3), 180-187.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2008.07.007>
- Dicke, T., Marsh, H. W., Riley, P., Parker, P. D., Guo, J., & Horwood, M. (2018). Validating the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ-II) Using Set-ESEM: Identifying psychosocial risk factors in a sample of school principals. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 584. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00584>
- Dimock, M. (2018, March 1). *Defining generations: Where Millennials end and post-Millennials begin*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/01/defining-generations-where-millennials-end-and-post-millennials-begin/>
- Dowler, K. (2005). Job satisfaction, burnout, and perceptions of unfair treatment: The relationship between race and police work. *Police Quarterly, 8*(4), 476-479.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1098611104269787>
- Dwyer, R. J. (2009). Prepare for the impact of the multi-generational workforce! *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, 3*(2), 101-110.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/17506160910960513>
- Eden, D. (1990). Acute and chronic job stress, strain, and vacation relief. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 45*(2), 175-193.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(90\)90010-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(90)90010-7)

- Egri, C. P., & Ralston, D. A. (2004). Generation cohorts and personal values: A comparison of China and the United States. *Organization Science, 15*(2), 210-220. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1030.0048>
- Eisner, S. P. (2005). Managing generation Y. *SAM Advanced Management Journal, 70*(4), 4-15.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1974). *Children of the great depression: Social change in life experience*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child development, 69*(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1998.tb06128.x>
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Erickson, T. (2008). *Plugged in: The Generation Y guide to thriving at work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Espinoza, C., & Ukleja, M. (2016). *Managing the Millennials: Discover the core competencies for managing today's workforce*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Evans, B. J., Coman, G. J., Stanley, R. O., & Burrows, G. D. (1993). Police officers' coping strategies: An Australian police survey. *Stress Medicine, 9*(4), 237-246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2460090406>
- Farrell, L., & Hurt, A. C. (2014). Training the Millennial Generation: Implications for organizational climate. *E Journal of Organizational Learning & Leadership, 12*(1), 47-60. Retrieved from https://www.leadingtoday.org/weleadinlearning/Spring2014/Spring_2014_Farrell.pdf

- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2018, September 24). About. Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/about>
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. (2017, July 13). *FEMA announces funding awards to prepare communities for complex coordinated terrorist attacks* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.fema.gov/news-release/2017/07/13/fema-announces-funding-awards-prepare-communities-complex-coordinated>
- Fields, B., Wilder, S., Bunch, J., & Newbold, R. (2008). *Millennial leaders*. Buffalo Grove, IL. Writers of the Round Table.
- Frank, J., Lambert, E. G., & Qureshi, H. (2017). Examining police officer work stress using the job demands-resources model. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 33(4), 348-367. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043986217724248>
- Friedlander, F. (1975). Emergent and contemporary life styles: An inter-generational issue. *Human Relations*, 28(4), 329-347. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F001872677502800402>
- Fry, R., Igielnik, R., & Patten, E. (2018, March 16). *How Millennials today compare with their grandparents 50 years ago*. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/03/16/how-millennials-compare-with-their-grandparents/>
- Gavin, J. H., & Mason, R. O. (2004). The virtuous organization: The value of happiness in the workplace. *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 379-392. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.005>
- Generations X, Y, Z and the others. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://socialmarketing.org/archives/generations-xy-z-and-the-others/>

- Gershon, R. R. M., Lin, S., & Li, X. (2002). Work stress in aging police officers, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 44(2), 160-167. Retrieved from https://journals.lww.com/joem/Abstract/2002/02000/Work_Stress_in_Aging_Police_Officers.11.aspx
- Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 10(4), 399-428. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9210-y>
- Giroux, J. (2001). Eating our young. *Urologic Nursing*, 21(6), 381-382.
- Glass, A. (2007). Understanding generational differences for competitive success. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 39(2), 98-103. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850710732424>
- Greene, J. (2005). What nurses want. Different generations. Different expectations. *Hospitals & Health Networks*, 79(3), 34-38.
- Grinc, R. M. (1994). "Angels in marble": Problems in stimulating community involvement in community policing. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(3), 437-468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128794040003008>
- Guneylioglu, M. (2017). War, status quo, and peace in the South Caucasus: A power transition perspective. *Public Integrity*, 19(4), 316-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2017.1302868>
- Haarr, R. N., & Morash, M. (1999). Gender, race, and strategies of coping with occupational stress in policing. *Justice quarterly*, 16(2), 303-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829900094151>

- Haight, M. (2007). *Kissing the corporate frog: An enlightening story about leadership traits 21st century employees admire and respect*. Peoria, IL: Worded Write.
- Hall, D. T., & Richter, J. (1990). Career gridlock: Baby boomers hit the wall. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 4(3), 7-22. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.1990.4274650>
- Hart, K. A. (2006). Generations in the workplace: finding common ground. *MLO: Medical Laboratory Observer*, 38(10), 26-27.
- Hart, P. M., Wearing, A. J., & Headey, B. (1995). Police stress and well-being: Integrating personality, coping and daily work experiences. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 68(2), 133-156. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1995.tb00578.x>
- Hartman, J. L., & McCambridge, J. (2011). Optimizing millennials' communication styles. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 74(1), 22-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1080569910395564>
- Hatfield, S. L. (2002). Understanding the four generations to enhance workplace management. *Afp Exchange*, 22(4), 72-72.
- Havens, D. S., Warshawsky, N. E., & Vasey, J. (2013). RN work engagement in generational cohorts: The view from rural US hospitals. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(7), 927-940. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12171>
- Henchey, J. P. (2005). Ready or not, here they come: The millennial generation enters the workforce. *The Police Chief*, 72(9), 108-118. Retrieved from <https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/ready-or-not-here-they-come/>

- Hira, N. A. (2007). You raised them, now manage them (twentysomethings in the workplace). *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 15(7), 38-46.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/hrmid.2007.04415gad.007>
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (1993). *13th Gen: Abort, retry, ignore, fail?* New York, NY: Vintage.
- Hung, K. H., Gu, F. F., & Yim, C. K. B. (2007). A social institutional approach to identifying generation cohorts in China with a comparison with American consumers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(5), 836-853.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400288>
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- International Association of Chiefs of Police. (2018, September 23). *What is community policing?* Retrieved from <https://www.iacpcommunitypolicing.org/>
- Jobe, L. L. (2014). Generational differences in work ethic among 3 generations of registered nurses. *The Journal of Nursing Administration*, 44(5), 303-308.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/NNA.0000000000000071>
- Jones, C. B., & Gates, M. (2007). The costs and benefits of nurse turnover: A business case for nurse retention. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 12(3), 1-3.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/00002800-199200630-00012>
- Jorgensen, B. (2003). Baby boomers, generation X and generation Y? Policy implications for defence forces in the modern era. *Foresight*, 5(4), 41-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14636680310494753>

- Jovic, E., Wallace, J. E., & Lemaire, J. (2006). The generation and gender shifts in medicine: An exploratory survey of internal medicine physicians. *BMC Health Services Research*, 6(55), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-6-55>
- Julseth, J., Ruiz, J., & Hummer, D. (2011). Municipal police officer job satisfaction in Pennsylvania: A study of organisational development in small police departments. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 13(3), 243-254. <https://doi.org/10.1350/ijps.2011.13.3.228>
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Brown, R. G. (1998). Generational comparisons of public employee motivation. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 18(4), 18-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0734371X9801800403>
- Kaifi, B. A., Nafei, W. A., Khanfar, N. M., & Kaifi, M. M. (2012). A multi-generational workforce: Managing and understanding millennials. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(24), 88-93. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v7n24p88>
- Kapoor, C., & Solomon, N. (2011). Understanding and managing generational differences in the workplace. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 3(4), 308-318. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17554211111162435>
- Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R. D., & Alpert, G. P. (1998). *Forces of deviance: Understanding the dark side of policing*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Keepnews, D. M., Brewer, C. S., Kovner, C. T., & Shin, J. H. (2010). Generational differences among newly licensed registered nurses. *Nursing Outlook*, 58(3), 155-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2009.11.001>

- Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1989). *The evolving strategy of policing*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.innovations.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/114213.pdf>
- Kirkcaldy, B., Cooper, C. L., & Ruffalo, P. (1995). Work stress and health in a sample of US police. *Psychological Reports*, 76(2), 700-702. <https://doi.org/10.2466%2Fpr0.1995.76.2.700>
- Kiss, P., De Meester, M., Kruse, A., Chavee, B., & Braeckman, L. (2013). Comparison between the first and second versions of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire: Psychosocial risk factors for a high need for recovery after work. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 86(1), 17-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-012-0741-0>
- Kleinhans, K., Chakradhar, K., Muller, S., & Waddill, P. (2015). Multigenerational perceptions of the academic work environment in higher education in the United States. *Higher Education*, 70(1), 89-103. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9825-y>
- Kristensen, T., Hannerz, H., Høgh, A., & Borg, V. (2005). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ): A tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 31(6), 438-449. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40967527>
- Kupperschmidt, B. (2000). Multigeneration employees: Strategies for effective management. *Health Care Manager*, 19(1), 65-76. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00126450-200019010-00011>

- Lancaster, L. C., & Stillman, D. (2002). *When generations collide: Who they are. Why they clash. How to solve the generational puzzle at work*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Lavoie-Tremblay, M., Paquet, M., Duchesne, M., Santo, A., Gavrancic, A., Courcy, F., & Gagnon, S. (2010). Retaining nurses and other hospital workers: An intergenerational perspective of the work climate. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 42*(4), 414-422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2010.01370.x>
- Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2016). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Leiter, M. P., Price, S. L., & Spence Laschinger, H. K., (2010). Generational differences in distress, attitudes and incivility among nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management, 18*(8), 970-980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01168.x>
- Lester, S. W., Standifer, R. L., Schultz, N. J., & Windsor, J. M. (2012). Actual versus perceived generational differences at work: An empirical examination. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 19*(3), 341-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1548051812442747>
- Lindsay, V., Banks Taylor, W., & Shelley, K. (2008). Alcohol and the police: An empirical examination of a widely-held assumption. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 31*(4), 596-609. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510810910580>
- Loader, I. (2016). In search of civic policing: Recasting the ‘Peelian’ principles. *Criminal Law and Philosophy, 10*(3), 427-440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11572-014-9318-1>

- Loo, R. (1999). Police suicide: The ultimate stress reaction. In J. M. Violanti & D. Paton (Eds.), *Police trauma: Psychological aftermath of civilian combat* (pp. 241-254). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Losyk, B. (1997). Generation X: What they think and what they plan to do. *The Futurist*, 31(2), 39-42.
- Lubinski, D., Schmidt, D. B., & Benbow, C. P. (1996). A 20-year stability analysis of the study of values for intellectually gifted individuals from adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 443-451.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.4.443>
- Lumb, R. C., & Breazeale, R. (2002). Police officer attitudes and community policing implementation: Developing strategies for durable organizational change. *Policing & Society*, 13(1), 91-106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460290032340>
- Lynch, J. E., & Tuckey, M. (2008). The police turnover problem: Fact or fiction? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31(1), 6-18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510810852549>
- Lyons, S., Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2005). Are gender differences in basic human values a generational phenomenon? *Sex roles*, 53(9-10), 763-778.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-7740-4>
- Lyons, S. T., Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (2007). An empirical assessment of generational differences in basic human values. *Psychological Reports*, 101(2), 339-352. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PR0.101.2.339-352>
- Mackay, H. (1997). *Generations: Baby boomers, their parents and their children*. Sydney, Australia: Pan Macmillan.

- Mannheim, K. (1953). *Essays on sociology and social psychology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Manolis, C., Levin, A., & Dahlstrom, R. (1997). A generation X scale: Creation and validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 57*(4), 666-684.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013164497057004011>
- Marmar, C. R., McCaslin, S. E., Metzler, T. J., Best, S., Weiss, D. S., Fagan, J., ... Neylan, T. (2006). Predictors of posttraumatic stress in police and other first responders. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1071*(1), 1-18.
<https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1364.001>
- Martelli, T. A., Waters, L. K., & Martelli, J. (1989). The police stress survey: Reliability and relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Psychological Reports, 64*(1), 267-273. <https://doi.org/10.2466%2Fpr0.1989.64.1.267>
- Martin, A., Karanika-Murray, M., Biron, C., & Sanderson, K. (2016). The psychosocial work environment, employee mental health, and organizational interventions: Improving research and practice by taking a multilevel approach. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress, 32*(3), 201-215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2593>
- Martin, C. A. (2005). From high maintenance to high productivity: What managers need to know about generation Y. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 37*(1), 39-44.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00197850510699965>
- Martin, C. A., & Tulgan, B. (2006). *Managing the generation mix: From urgency to opportunity*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

- Massey, M. (1979). *The people puzzle: Understanding yourself & others*. Reston, VA: Reston.
- Mastrofski, S. D., & Willis, J. J. (2010). Police organization continuity and change: Into the twenty-first century. *Crime and Justice*, 39(1), 55-144.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/653046>
- McCafferty, F. L., McCafferty, E., & McCafferty, M. A. (1992). Stress and suicide in police officers: Paradigm of occupational stress. *Southern Medical Journal*, 85(3), 233-243. Retrieved from <https://europepmc.org/abstract/med/1546346>
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., Terracciano, A., Parker, W. D., Mills, C. J., De Fruyt, F., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Personality trait development from age 12 to age 18: Longitudinal, cross-sectional and cross-cultural analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1456-1468.<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.83.6.1456>
- Meglino, B. M., & Ravlin, E. C. (1998). Individual values in organizations: Concepts, controversies, and research. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 351-389.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F014920639802400304>
- Meister, J. C., & Willyerd, K. (2010). Mentoring millennials. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(5), 68-72.
- Menard, K. S., & Arter, M. L. (2013). Police officer alcohol use and trauma symptoms: Associations with critical incidents, coping, and social stressors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 20(1), 37-56. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031434>

- Meredith, G., & Schewe, C. (1994). The power of cohorts. *American Demographics*, 16(12), 22-28.
- Meriac, J. P., Woehr, D. J., & Banister, C. (2010). Generational differences in work ethic: An examination of measurement equivalence across three cohorts. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 315-324.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9164-7>
- Miller, L. (2004). Good cop-bad cop: Problem officers, law enforcement culture, and strategies for success. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 19(2), 30-48.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02813871>
- Miller, M. B., Hodge, K. H., Brandt, A., & Schneider, E. A. (2013). The young and the restless: Gen Y'ers in the workplace! Are you prepared? *FDCC Quarterly*, 63(3), 226-250.
- Miller, M. J., Woehr, D. J., & Hudspeth, N. (2002). The meaning and measurement of work ethic: Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 60(3), 451-489.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1838>
- Mirvis, P. H., & Kanter, D. L. (1991). Beyond demography: A psychographic profile of the workforce. *Human Resource Management*, 30(1), 45-68.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.3930300104>
- Moncada, S., Utzet, M., Molinero, E., Llorens, C., Moreno, N., Galtés, A., & Navarro, A. (2014). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (COPSOQ II) in Spain – A tool for psychosocial risk assessment at the workplace. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 57(1), 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.22238>

- Morabito, M. (2010). Understanding community policing as an innovation: Patterns of adoption. *Crime & Delinquency*, 56(4), 564-587.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0011128707311643>
- Morin, R., Parker, K., Stepler, R., & Mercer, A. (2017). Behind the badge. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2017/01/11/police-culture/>
- Morison, R., Erickson, T., & Dychtwald, K. (2006). Managing middlecence. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(3), 78-86. <https://doi.org/10.1108/dlo.2006.08120dad.001>
- Morreale, S. A., & Lambert, D. E. (2009). Homeland security and the police mission. *Journal of Homeland Security and Emergency Management*, 6(1), 1-19.
<https://doi.org/10.2202/1547-7355.1618>
- Murphy, E. F., Jr., Gibson, J. W., & Greenwood, R. A. (2010). Analyzing generational values among managers and non-managers for sustainable organizational effectiveness. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, 75(1), 33-43.
- Murphy, E. F., Jr., Gordon, J. D., & Anderson, T. L. (2004). Cross-cultural, cross-cultural age and cross-cultural generational differences between the United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 21-48.
- Murphy, S. A. (2008). The role of emotions and transformational leadership on police culture: An autoethnographic account. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 10(2), 165-178. <https://doi.org/10.1350/ijps.2008.10.2.72>
- Murray, K., Toulson, P., & Legg, S. (2011). Generational cohorts' expectations in the workplace: A study of New Zealanders. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 49(4), 476-493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10384111111423188>

- Niederhoffer, A. (1967). *Behind the shield: The police in urban society*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Niemiec, S. (2000). Finding common ground for all ages. *Security Distributing & Marketing*, 30(3), 81-84.
- Noble, S. M., & Schewe, C. D. (2003). Cohort segmentation: An exploration of its validity. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(12), 979-987.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(02\)00268-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(02)00268-0)
- Noblet, A., Rodwell, J., & Allisey, A. (2009). Job stress in the law enforcement sector: comparing the linear, non-linear and interaction effects of working conditions. *Stress and Health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of stress*, 25(1), 111-120. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1227>
- Officer Down Memorial Page. (2018). Honoring officers killed in 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.odmp.org/search/year?year=2017>
- Oliver, W. M. (2006). The fourth era of policing: Homeland security. *International Review of Law Computers & Technology*, 20(1-2), 49-62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13600860600579696>
- Oliver, W. M. (2007). *Homeland security for policing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- O'Rand, A. M., & Krecker, M. L. (1990). Concepts of the life cycle: Their history, meanings, and uses in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16(1), 241-262. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.16.080190.001325>
- Orrick, D. W. (2008). *Recruitment, retention, and turnover of police personnel: Reliable, practical, and effective solutions*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

- Parry, E., & Urwin, P. (2011). Generational differences in work values: A review of theory and evidence. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(1), 79-96.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00285.x>
- Pejtersen, J. H., Kristensen, T. S., Borg, V., & Bjorner, J. B. (2010). The second version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 38(3), 8-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1403494809349858>
- Pew Research Center. (2015, September 3). *The whys and hows of generations research*. Retrieved from <http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2015/09/09-3-2015-Generations-explainer-release.pdf>
- Poornima, S. C. (2009). Motivating through satisfaction: An ongoing effort of HR in organizations. *IUP Journal of Management Research*, 8(5), 26-37.
- Potter, G. (2013). *The history of policing in the United States*. Retrieved from <https://plsonline.eku.edu/sites/plsonline.eku.edu/files/the-history-of-policing-in-us.pdf>
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants' part 1. *On the Horizon*, 9(5), 1-6.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/10748120110424816>
- Price, J. H., & Murnan, J. (2004). Research limitations and the necessity of reporting them. *American Journal of Health Education*, 35(2), 66-67.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19325037.2004.10603611>
- Raines, C., & Hunt, J. (2000). *The X'ers and the boomers: From adversaries to allies-A diplomat's guide*. Berkeley, CA: Crisp.

- Real, K., Mitnick, A. D., & Maloney, W. F. (2010). More similar than different: Millennials in the U.S. building trades. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 303-313. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-010-9163-8>
- Redmond, S., Wilcox, S., Campbell, S., Kim, A., Finney, K., Barr, K., & Hassan, A. (2015). A brief introduction to the military workplace culture. *Work*, 50(1), 9-20. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-141987>
- Regoli, R. M., Crank, J. P., & Culbertson, R. G. (1989). Police cynicism, job satisfaction, and work relations of police chiefs: An assessment of the influence of department size. *Sociological Focus*, 22(3), 161-171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.1989.10570540>
- Reuss-Ianni, E. (1993). *Two cultures of policing*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Richardsen, A. M., Burke, R. J., & Martinussen, M. (2006). Work and health outcomes among police officers: The mediating role of police cynicism and engagement. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(4), 555. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.13.4.555>
- Richmond, R. L., Wodak, A., Kehoe, L., & Heather, N. (1998). How healthy are the police? A survey of life-style factors. *Addiction*, 93(11), 1729-1737. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1360-0443.1998.9311172910.x>
- Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research* (4th ed.). West Sussex, United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons.
- Rogler, L. H. (2002). Historical generations and psychology: The case of the Great Depression and World War II. *American Psychologist*, 57(12), 1013-1023. <http://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.57.12.1013>

- Rosario, S., Azevedo, L. F., Fonseca, J. A., Nienhaus, A., Nübling, M., & da Costa, J. T. (2017). The Portuguese long version of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (COPSOQ II) – a validation study. *Journal of Occupational Medicine and Toxicology*, 12(1), 24-41. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12995-017-0170-9>
- Rosario, S., Fonseca, J., & da Costa, J. T. (2014). Cultural and linguistic adaptation and validation of the long version of Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (COPSOQ II) in Portuguese. *Occupational Safety and Hygiene II*, 441-446.
- Ryder, N. (1965). The cohort as a concept in the study of social change. *American Sociological Review*, 30(6), 843-861.
- Schafer, J. A. (2009). Developing effective leadership in policing: Perils, pitfalls, and paths forward. *Policing: An International Journal*, 32(2), 238-260. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510910958163>
- Schaible, L. M., & Gecas, V. (2010). The impact of emotional labor and value dissonance on burnout among police officers. *Police Quarterly*, 13(3), 316-341. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F10986111110373997>
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., Gonzalez-Roma, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015630930326>
- Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Scott, J. (2000). Is it a different world to when you were growing up? Generational effects on social representations and child-rearing values. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51(2), 355-376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2000.00355.x>
- Schullery, N. M. (2013). Workplace engagement and generational differences in values. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 76(2), 252-265. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1080569913476543>
- Schumacher, G. (2003). Qualities of police leadership: A snapshot on leading generation X. *Canadian Police Chief Magazine*, 25-26. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=199416>
- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 519-542. <https://doi-org/10.1177%2F0022022101032005001>
- Shane, J. M. (2010). Organizational stressors and police performance. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 807-818. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.05.008>
- Shaw, S., & Fairhurst, D. (2008). Engaging a new generation of graduates. *Education + Training*, 50(5), 366-378. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910810889057>
- Sherman, R. O. (2006). Leading a multigenerational nursing workforce: Issues, challenges, and strategies. *Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 11(2), 1-10.
- Shragay, D., & Tziner, A. (2011). The generational effect on the relationship between job involvement, work satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Revista De Psicologia Del Trabajo Y De Las Organizaciones*, 27(2), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.5093/tr2011v27n2a6>

- Skolnick, J. H. (2010). A sketch of the policeman's working personality. In S. K. Rice & M. D. White (Eds.), *Race, ethnicity and policing: New and essential readings* (pp. 15-32). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Smola, K., & Sutton, C. D. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 23(4), 363-382. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.147>
- Sparrow, M. K., Moore, M. H., & Kennedy, D. M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A new era for policing*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Stanley, D. (2010). Multigenerational workforce issues and their implications for leadership in nursing. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 18(7), 846-852. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2010.01158.x>
- Stein, R. E., & Griffith, C. (2015). Resident and police perceptions of the neighborhood: Implications for community policing. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 28(2), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0887403415570630>
- Steinheider, B., & Wuestewald, T. (2008). From the bottom-up: Sharing leadership in a police agency. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, 9(2), 145-163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614260802081303>
- Stinchcomb, J. B., & Leip, L. A. (2012). Recruiting the next generation of jail employees: Does generational relevance or agency size make a difference? *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37(3), 452-470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-011-9124-4>
- Stone, C., & Travis J. (2011). *Toward a new professionalism in policing*. Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management.

- Storch, J. E., & Panzarella, R. (1996). Police stress: State-trait anxiety in relation to occupational and personal stressors. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 24*(2), 99-107.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(95\)00058-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(95)00058-5)
- Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York, NY: William Morrow.
- Sullivan, S. E., Forret, M. L., Carraher, S. M., & Mainiero, L. A. (2009). Using the kaleidoscope career model to examine generational differences in work attitudes. *Career Developmental International, 14*(3), 284-302.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966442>
- Sun, I. Y. (2003). A comparison of police field training officers' and non-training officers' conflict resolution styles: Controlling versus supportive strategies. *Police Quarterly, 6*(1), 22-50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611102250573>
- Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review, 37*(3), 513-548.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5893.3703002>
- Thacher, D. (2005). The local role in homeland security. *Law & Society Review, 39*(3), 635-676. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2005.00236.x>
- Thompson, C., & Gregory, J. B. (2012). Managing millennials: A framework for improving attraction, motivation, and retention. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 15*(4), 237-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10887156.2012.730444>
- Thorsen, S. V., & Bjorner, J. B. (2010). Reliability of the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 38*(3_suppl), 25-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1403494809349859>

- Thurman, Q. C., & Reisig, M. D. (1996). Community-oriented research in an era of community-oriented policing. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 39(5), 570-586.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764296039005005>
- Thurman, Q. C., & Zhao, J. (2004). *Contemporary policing: Controversies, challenges, and solutions*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Tolbize, A. (2008). Generational differences in the workplace. *Research and Training Center on Community Living*, 5(2), 1-21. Retrieved from
https://rtc3.umn.edu/docs/2_18_Gen_diff_workplace.pdf
- Trzesniewski, K. H., & Donnellan, M. B. (2010). Rethinking “Generation Me” a study of cohort effects from 1976-2006. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5(1), 58-75. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1745691609356789>
- Tulgan, B. (2000). *Managing generation X: How to bring out the best in young talent*. New York, NY: WW Norton.
- Tulgan, B., & Martin, C. A. (2001). *Managing Generation Y: Global citizens born in the late seventies and early eighties*. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development.
- Turner, A. (2015). Generation Z: Technology and social interest. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 71(2), 103-113. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jip.2015.0021>
- Twenge, J. M., Campbell, S. M., Hoffman, B. J., & Lance, C. E. (2010). Generational differences in work values: Leisure and extrinsic values increasing, social and intrinsic values decreasing. *Journal of Management*, 36(5), 1117-1142.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309352246>

- Uchida, C. D. (1997). The development of the American police: An historical overview. In R. Dunham, & G. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings* (pp. 11-30). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- U. S. Department of Justice. (2018, September 23) *Community oriented policing services*. Retrieved from <https://cops.usdoj.gov/about>
- Utterback, J. (1994). Mastering the dynamics of innovation: How companies can seize opportunities in the face of technological change. [Abstract] *SSRN*.
- Vena, J. E., Violanti, J. M., Marshall, J., & Fiedler, R. C. (1986). Mortality of a municipal worker cohort: III. Police officers. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 10(4), 383-397. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajim.4700100406>
- Vila, B. (1996). Tired cops: Probable connections between fatigue and the performance, health and safety of patrol officers. *American Journal of Police*, 15(2), 51-92. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07358549610122485>
- Violanti, J. M. (1999). Alcohol abuse in policing. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 68(1), 16-18.
- Violanti, J. M. (2003). Suicide and the police culture. In D.P. Hackett & J.M. Violanti (Eds.), *Police suicide: Tactics for prevention* (pp. 66-75). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Violanti, J. M., & Aron, F. (1995). Police stressors: Variations in perception among police personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23(3), 287-294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(95\)00012-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(95)00012-F)

- Violanti, J. M., Vena, J. E., & Marshall, J. R. (1986). Disease risk and mortality among police officers: New evidence and contributing factors. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 14(1), 17-23. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232431007_Disease_risk_and_mortality_among_police_officers_New_evidence_and_contributing_factors
- Vollmer, A. (1933). Police progress in the past twenty-five years. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 24(1), 161-175. Retrieved from <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2378&context=jclc>
- Walker, S., & Katz, C. M. (2012). *Police in America*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Walker Smith, J., & Clurman, A. (1997). *Rocking the ages: The Yankelovich report on generational marketing*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. E. (2004). What can police do to reduce crime, disorder, and fear? *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593(1), 42-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002716203262548>
- Wesner, M. S., & Miller, T. (2008). Boomers and millennials have much in common. *Organizational Development*, 26(3), 89-96
- Westerman, J. W., & Yamamura, J. H. (2007). Generational preferences for work environment fit: Effects on employee outcomes. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 150-161. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710733631>
- Weston, M. (2001). Coaching generations in the workplace. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 25(2), 11-21.

- Wieck, K. L. (2003). Faculty for the millennium: Changes needed to attract the emerging workforce into nursing. *Journal of Nursing Education, 42*(4), 151-158.
- Wieck, K. L., Prydun, M., & Walsh, T. (2002). What the emerging workforce wants in its leaders. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 34*(3), 283-288.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2002.00283.x>
- Williams, K. C., Page, R. A., Petrosky, A. R., & Hernandez, E. H. (2010). Multi-generational marketing: Descriptions, characteristics, lifestyles, and attitudes. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 11*(2), 21.
- Wilson, J. M., Dalton, E., Scheer, C., & Grammich, C. A. (2010). *Police recruitment and retention for the new millennium*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
Retrieved from <https://ric-zai-inc.com/Publications/cops-p199-pub.pdf>
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly, 249*(3), 1-18.
Retrieved from <http://www.lakeclaire.org/docs/BrokenWindows-AtlantaicMonthly-March82.pdf>
- Wong, M., Gardiner, E., Lang, W., & Coulon, L. (2008). Generational differences in personality and motivation: Do they exist and what are the implications for the workplace? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 23*(8), 878-890.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940810904376>
- Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace*. New York, NY: American Management Association.

Zemke, S., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2013). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of boomers, gen Xers, and gen Yers in the workplace*. New York, NY: AMACOM.

Zhao, J., Thurman, Q., & He, N. (1999). Sources of job satisfaction among police officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice Quarterly*, *16*(1), 153-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829900094091>

Zhao, J. S., He, N. P., Lovrich, N., & Cancino, J. (2003). Marital status and police occupational stress. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *26*(2), 23-46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2003.9721181>

Appendix A

Permissions from Dr. Thomas Clausen

From: Thomas Clausen (TCL) <tcl@arbejdsmiljoforskning.dk>
Sent: Friday, November 17, 2017 5:52 AM
To: Will Akin
Subject: Permission to use COPSOQ-II

Dear Will Akin,

Thank you very much for your mail.

You are more than welcome to see the COPSOQII-questionnaire for your research as long as you clearly indicate that you are using the COPSOQ-questionnaire.

You can read more about COPSOQII in a special issue of the Scandinavian Journal of Public Health from 2010 that is available as Open Access.

Furthermore, I can recommend you to look at the website of the International COPSOQ-network (<http://www.copsoq-network.org/>) for inspiration.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas Clausen

Thomas Clausen (TCL)
Senior Researcher, MSc, PhD
Telephone: +45 39 16 53 68
e-mail: tcl@nrcwe.dk

National Research Centre for the Working Environment
Lerso Parkallé 105
DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark
Phone: +45 39 16 52 00
Fax: +45 39 16 52 01

From: Thomas Clausen (TCL) <tcl@nfa.dk>
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 5:24 AM
To: Will Akin
Subject: SV: Permission to use COPSOQ-II

Dear Will,

Good to hear from you and I hope that your work is progressing well.

The three versions of the COPSOQII can, of course, be used in their entirety but is it also a possibility of select individual scales for your purposes. Therefore, I have no problems with you leaving out the said questions.

All the best,

Thomas

Thomas Clausen (TCL)
Senior Researcher, MSc, PhD

T +45 39 16 53 68 | | E tcl@nfa.dk

The National Research Centre for the Working Environment
105 Lersø Parkallé
DK-2100 Copenhagen
T +45 39 16 52 00 | F +45 39 16 52 01
Secure e-mail: nfa@nfa.dk | W nfa.dk

From: Thomas Clausen (TCL) <tcl@nfa.dk>
Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2019 5:15 AM
To: Will Akin <wkakin@olivet.edu>
Subject: SV: Permission to use COPSOQ-II

Dear Will,

Thanks a lot for your mail. Good to hear from you and big congratulations on the successful defense of your thesis..

You are welcome to publish the questions from the COPSOQII that you have used in your dissertation. The questions are already publicly available, so there is no problem in that.

All the best,

Thomas

Thomas Clausen (TCL)
Senior Researcher, MSc, PhD

T +45 39 16 53 68 | | E tcl@nfa.dk



The National Research Centre for the Working Environment

105 Lersø Parkallé

DK-2100 Copenhagen

T +45 39 16 52 00 | F +45 39 16 52 01

Secure e-mail: nfa@nfa.dk | W nfa.dk

Appendix B
Demographic Questions

1) What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2) In what year were you born?

3) Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?

- Single, never married
- Married or domestic partnership
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Separated

4) Which race/ethnicity best describes you?

- White
- Native American or American Indian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Other

5) What is the highest level of school that you have completed?

- G.E.D. or High School Diploma
- Some college credit, no degree
- Trade/technical/vocational training
- Associates degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree
- Professional degree
- Doctorate degree

6) How many years have you worked at your agency?

7) About how many employees work at your agency?

8) Which of the following categories best describes your employment status?

- Full-time
- Part-time
- Reserve
- Retired

9) What is your current salary?

10) What state are you currently employed in?

11) Which law enforcement organization is your employer?

12) How many law enforcement agencies have you worked for including your current employer?

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 or more

13) How many years total have you worked in law enforcement?

- Less than 1 year
- 2 – 5 years
- 6 – 10 years
- 11 – 15 years
- 16 – 20 years
- 21 – 25 years
- 26 – 30 years
- 31 – 35 years
- 36 – 40 years
- More than 40 years

Appendix C

Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II

The following questions are about your psychosocial work environment. Please choose the answer that fits best to each of the questions.

1A. Do you get behind in your work?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

1B. Do you have enough time for your work tasks?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

2A. Is it necessary to keep working at a high pace?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

2B. Do you work at a high pace throughout the day?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

3A. Does your work put you in emotionally disturbing situations?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

3B. Do you have to relate to other people's personal problems as part of your work?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

4A. Do you have a large degree of influence concerning your work?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

4B. Can you influence the amount of work assigned to you?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

5A. Do you have the possibility of learning new things through your work?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

5B. Does your work require you to take the initiative?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

6A. Is your work meaningful?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

6B. Do you feel that the work you do is important?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

7A. Do you feel that your place of work is of great importance to you?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

7B. Would you recommend a good friend to apply for a position at your workplace?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

8A. At your place of work, are you informed well in advance concerning for example
important decisions, changes, or plans?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

8B. Do you receive all the information you need to do your work well?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

9A. Is your work recognized and appreciated by the management?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

9B. Are you treated fairly at your workplace?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

10A. Does your work have clear objectives?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

10B. Do you know exactly what is expected of you at work?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

11A. To what extent would you say your immediate superior gives high priority to job satisfaction?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

11B. To what extent would you say that your immediate superior is good at work planning?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

12A. How often is your nearest superior willing to listen to your problems at work?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

12B. How often do you get help and support from your nearest superior?

Always Often Sometimes Seldom Never/hardly ever

13. Regarding your work in general. How pleased are you with your job, everything taken into consideration?

Very satisfied Satisfied Unsatisfied Very unsatisfied

The next two questions are about the way your work affects your private life and family life.

14A. Do you feel that your work drains so much of your energy that it has a negative effect on your private life?

Yes, certainly Yes, to a certain degree Yes, but only very little No, not at all

14B. Do you feel that your work takes so much of your time that it has a negative effect on your private life?

Yes, certainly Yes, to a certain degree Yes, but only very little No, not at all

15A. Can you trust the information that comes from the management?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

15B. Does the management trust the employees to do their work well?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

16A. Are conflicts resolved in a fair way?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

16B. Is the work distributed fairly?

A very large extent A large extent Somewhat A small extent A very small extent

Appendix D

Regions and States of Participants

Region	State	Participants	Percentage
Midwest	Kansas	63	14.3
Midwest	Illinois	4	0.9
Midwest	Indiana	3	0.7
Midwest	Iowa	3	0.7
Midwest	Michigan	3	0.7
Midwest	Minnesota	25	5.7
Midwest	Missouri	227	51.5
Midwest	Nebraska	1	0.2
Midwest	North Dakota	1	0.2
Midwest	Ohio	7	1.6
Midwest	South Dakota	1	0.2
Midwest	Wisconsin	(343) 5	(77.8) 1.1
Noncontiguous	Alaska	1	0.2
Noncontiguous	Hawaii	(2) 1	(0.4) 0.2
Northeast	Connecticut	4	0.9
Northeast	Massachusetts	6	1.4
Northeast	Maine	5	1.1
Northeast	New Jersey	9	2.0
Northeast	New York	10	2.3
Northeast	Pennsylvania	(41) 7	(9.3) 1.6
Pacific	California	11	2.5
Pacific	Oregon	2	0.5
Pacific	Washington	(17) 4	(3.9) 0.9
Rocky Mountains	Colorado	4	0.9
Rocky Mountains	Nevada	1	0.2
Rocky Mountains	Utah	(6) 1	(1.3) 0.2
Southeast	Arkansas	1	0.2
Southeast	District of Columbia (DC)	3	0.7
Southeast	Florida	2	0.5
Southeast	Kentucky	1	0.2
Southeast	Louisiana	2	0.5
Southeast	Maryland	1	0.2
Southeast	North Carolina	3	0.7
Southeast	South Carolina	1	0.2
Southeast	Tennessee	2	0.5
Southeast	Virginia	1	0.2
Southeast	West Virginia	(18) 1	(4.1) 0.2
Southwest	Arizona	4	0.9
Southwest	New Mexico	1	0.2
Southwest	Oklahoma	3	0.7
Southwest	Texas	(14) 6	(3.2) 1.4
Total		441	100.0

Note. Regional subtotals appear in parentheses.