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Abstract

Law enforcement agencies are having trouble recruiting, hiring, and maintaining ethnic minority officers. Although the Department of Justice identified multiple issues minorities face while pursuing and engaging in the profession, there have been few efforts to determine the source of these problems and how to overcome them. In a stressful profession that doesn’t historically align with being a minority, the difference between staying with that job or going to another one may lie in how connected to the job and how satisfied with that job minority law enforcement feel. The current study explores how ethno-racial and police identity salience and identity conflict affect job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. I found that minority officers with higher ethno-racial identity had more identity conflict. The relationship between ethno-racial identity salience and job satisfaction and vocational connectedness was mediated by identity conflict. Also, individuals with higher police identity salience had higher job satisfaction and vocational connectedness and those with higher identity conflict had lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. These results show the importance identity plays in job satisfaction and vocational connectedness, particularly in a profession with a strong vocational culture.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The presence of ethno-racial minority law enforcement officers in historically White social control institutions is a contradiction personified. Not only must they “protect and serve”, but they are forced to navigate the institutional pathways contrived to ostracize them. Minority police officers sit at the intersection of generational victimhood, as a result of centuries of racism, and being perpetuators in the maintenance of their own oppression. Although there is an abundance of scholarly literature surrounding minorities and law enforcement relations, minorities are seldom recognized outside of being objects of police activities (Cintron, 2019; Feinstein, 2015; Murphy, et al., 2018). In these discussions police officers are implicitly considered to be White. There are few analyses concerning individuals that sit at the intersection of being a minority and a law enforcement officer. Moreover, minority law enforcement officers are exposed to the same stressors as their White counterparts. These stressors may ultimately influence job satisfaction and vocational connectedness (Bemana, et al., 2013; Johnson, 2012). Those stressors may become exacerbated by being a minority in a predominantly White workplace. This study explores the relationship between ethno-racial and police identity salience, vocational connectedness, and job satisfaction in minority law enforcement officers.

Similar to many other vocations, police departments struggle with procuring and maintaining a diverse workforce (DOJ, 2016; Police Executive Research Forum, 2019; USCCR, 2016). Between 2016 and 2019 the national proportion of ethnic minority police officers rose from approximately 28 percent (Hyland & Davis, 2019) to approximately 33 percent (Data USA, 2020). Although this increase reflects the proportion of minorities based on U.S. Census data, few cities have met the threshold where the demographics of their police departments reflect that of the communities they police (Leatherby & Oppel, 2020). While police departments struggle
with workforce diversity in a similar capacity to other vocations, harrowing events such as the
deaths of Michael Brown, George Floyd, and Breonna Taylor by their local police departments
brought these diversity issues to the forefront of discussions surrounding police affairs and
policy reform. These issues highlight the distressing relationship between minorities and policing
agencies. This relationship dates back centuries (Crutchfield, et al., 2012; Feinstein, 2015;
Hawkins, 1995; Wilson, 1999), but minority police officers resist that history to go into policing,
often citing their desire to make a difference in their communities (Bolton & Feagin, 2004).

**Historical significance of minorities in the police force.**

The presence of minority police officers in police agencies is a relatively new concept.
American police forces have been a predominantly white space since its conception in the 1600s
(Banton, et al., 2020; Bolton & Feagin, 2004). There are two historical references surrounding
the development of police agencies. Driven by political and social agendas, the development of
the police force depends on the region. During the Civil War era, Southern states hired
individuals to find runaway slaves and prevent slave revolts (Banton, et al., 2020; Dulaney,
1996; Hassett-Walker, 2021; Rousey, 1987; Waxman, 2017). The presence of slave patrols was
present over a century before the establishment of the first police department (Hassett-Walker,
2021; Turner, 2006; Waxman, 2017). Northern states, however, initially hired police for
protection of ports and businesses (Dulaney, 1996; Hassett-Walker, 2021; Waxman, 2017). As a
result, White individuals maintained a monopoly over police power in both Northern and
Southern areas, in both colonial and antebellum periods (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; Dulaney,
1996).

It wasn’t until the Reconstruction Era that we began to see “free men of color”, formally
known as city guards, in New Orleans, Louisiana (Dulaney, 1996; Rousey, 1983; Schweninger,
However, the presence of Black individuals in policing positions was very short-lived. In the South, there were many state and public interventions aimed at ridding local and state police departments of Black police officers (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; Hassett-Walker, 2021; Rousey, 1985). By 1910, nearly every police department in the South was “free” of Black police officers (Williams & Murphy, 1990). Although there is very limited literature surrounding Latino and Asian police officers, there is no evidence to show that Latino police officers were appointed before the 1920s (Cardenas, 2021; Kennedy, 2019), and Asian police officers were not appointed until the 1950s (Associated Press & Lam, 2018). The push to hire more minority police officers was further aided by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (DOJ, 2016; USCCR, 2016).

The current state of minorities in policing.

Modern policing is plagued by historical evidence of racism, innumerable accounts of abuse of authority, and racial monochromatism (Crutchfield, 2012; Feinstein, 2015; Najdowski & Goff, 2022). For decades political and social organizations called for an increase in minority police officers in an attempt to better reflect the minority communities being policed (Ba, et al., 2021; Bolton & Feagin, 2004; DOJ, 2016; USCCR; 2000). Despite the implementation of affirmative action policies and other federal initiatives, police departments are continuing to struggle with recruiting, hiring, and retaining minority police officers (Doerner, 1995; DOJ, 2016; Police Executive Research Forum, 2019). Local and federal governments cited shortages of minority police officers due to a variety of factors. Most notably, there is a decrease in applicants of both minority and non-minority officers (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; Hyland, 2019), early exits from the field (Police Executive Research Forum, 2019), and early retirement (USCCR, 2000).
For minority police officers, the feelings of being in one of the most stressful jobs (Renzulli, 2019) are often coupled with pay disparities, sexual and racial harassment, low job satisfaction, and lack of proper recognition (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; Cooper, 2021; USCCR, 2000). Additionally, experiential racism is habitually denied within police departments. During a qualitative study by Bolton and Feagin (2004), minority officers reported both direct and indirect experiences of racism while pursuing careers in police departments. Minority police officers documented unjust recruitment practices such as the presence of juvenile records (Hickey, 2021) or low scores on promotion tests (Broom, 2020). Police departments reflect the history of racial oppression and segregation experienced in public and social spaces, even in the presence of minority police officers. This often manifested as racially charged jokes, being overlooked for promotions, and interdepartmental segregation (Rousey, 1987).

Although the overt instances of racism are few, racial issues within police departments have taken a more subtle approach. A qualitative study by Peterson and Uhnoo (2012) found that many minority officers experienced “banter, jokes, and casual remarks” filled with discriminatory statements and racial slurs. This effect was reflected in a myriad of studies citing that minority officers deemed these remarks as “tests” of their loyalty to the ‘blue’ (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; Peterson & Uhnoo, 2012). Additionally, minority law enforcement officers may differ in their responses to discrimination. In one qualitative study (Gallardo (2020), Latino officers did not view racist jokes as harmful and derogatory and that their experiences did not meet the threshold of discrimination or prejudice.

The lack of minority police officers nationwide has sparked academic, social, and political conversations. A U.S. Department of Justice task force (2016), highlighted numerous barriers that hindered their ability to recruit, hire, and retain minority police officers. Strained
relationships between minority communities and law enforcement and police reputation were cited as reasons for the lack of minorities during law enforcement recruitment processes. Similarly, residency restrictions, cost of applications, and inadequately tailored examinations prevent the hiring of minority individuals (USCCR, 2000). Difficulty adjusting to departmental culture and the lack of mentoring relationships and professional development models were also listed as reasons for difficulties retaining minority police officer. The key to department integration for minority police officers may lie within the concepts of minority identity and how it may, or may not, coexist with the police officer vocational identity.

Officers with similar identities tend to congregate and create networks. Those networks pass on accumulated knowledge of departmental culture, experiences, and advice (du Plessis, et al., 2021). Without that knowledge, minority police officers tend to have a difficult time integrating into departmental culture, and more importantly, succeeding within the department (Roberts & Mayo, 2019; USCCR, 2000). In organizational settings, individual success depends on other individuals within that organization. Minority individuals, specifically Black, Indigenous, and people of color, are often left out of work circles and are therefore restricted access to an abundance of information that could aid in their advancement within their work organization (Fassinger, 2008). More importantly, those social networks tend to pass important information and have been used to influence and advance the careers of many employees throughout time (McDonald, et al., 2009).

Identity theory

In order to look at minorities in policing, it is important to explore how one’s identities may affect their everyday experiences. Identity theory conceptualized identity as a crucial part of an individual’s social structure. One’s identity determines new and existing networks,
organizations, and institutions. More specifically, an individual’s identity is linked to their knowledge of their group membership and the emotional attachment to that group (Tajfel, 1974). Due to the dynamic nature of people, one person has multiple identities, i.e., gender, vocation, hobbies, race, ethnicity, etc. Although they are unaware of it, individuals are constantly juggling which identity to bring to the forefront (Stets & Burke, 2000). Identity salience is linked to the significance of group membership; each identity has a place on a personal hierarchy. Identities that are of personal importance are placed higher on the hierarchy than identities of lesser importance, for example, a teacher that is also a parent may place their parental identity higher than their vocational identity, but be more aware of their teacher identity while in class (Stets & Burke, 2014). As a result, there are individual circumstances for when a particular identity is activated (Stets & Burke, 2000). Identities seldom fit perfectly together like puzzle pieces. When two identities do not fit together with one another, conflict between the two can ensue, causing harm to the individual’s wellbeing (Benet-Martinez, et al., 2002). Individuals with two identities, often existing between their ethnic identity and another dominant identity, are referred to as bicultural. Traditionally, bicultural identity is studied between two ethnic or cultural identities; the literature often cites relationships between the ethnic identity of immigrants and the American identity (Berry, 2003). However, biculturality can be applied to any two identities that overlap within an individual.

In the current context, police officer identity has long been considered a monolith, with few deviations from its fraternal history (du Plessis, et al., 2021). As today’s police forces become more diverse, minority police officers may find that their ethnic identity can come into conflict with their occupational identity. However, the tradition of police recruits being systematically indoctrinated based on the “Us versus Them” mentality created a silent conflict
between those that do not fit in the monochromatism of policing as an occupation and the institution of policing itself (Hochstedler & Conley, 1986; Williams & Murphy, 1990). Although many police organizations act as unions that advocate for entire police departments, minority police officers do not see themselves reflected in these groups. As a result, many of the minority-centered organizations operate as advocacy groups, which may hint at police departments’ attempts to maintain uniformity (Hager & Li, 2020).

Minority officers experience racism, discrimination, and are treated as outsiders either directly or through subtle or implicit actions throughout the department (Dulaney, 1996; Irlbeck, 2008; Wieslander, 2020). As a result, minority police officers will either leave (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; DOJ, 2016; Dulaney, 1996), fully acculturate (Irlbeck, 2008), or create a façade that only lasts while they are on the clock (Hewlin, 2003). However, there is little research regarding which officer is liable to choose which route. For some officers, their mechanisms for coping with being a minority in the workplace may lie in their ability to blend in with the majority group. This may look different for different racial/ethnic groups. Latino police officers may find that their skin color can create either more opportunities or problems within their department; being considered “White-passing” has its advantages, as does changing one’s name to appear less cultural, e.g., Roberto to Robert. Most Black police officers do not have the liberty of being White-passing, so their mechanisms may be overcompensating by participating in discriminatory acts against their own racial group or volunteering for racialized tasks within their department (Dulaney, 1996). When minority workers have conflict between their culture and occupations, they may feel suppressed, isolated, and out of place. As a result, minority workers are less likely to perform, less likely to succeed, and have lower job satisfaction (Roberts & Mayo, 2019; Travis, et al., 2006).
Job satisfaction and Vocational connectedness

Law enforcement can be one of the most mentally and emotionally straining jobs there is (Anshel, 2000; Paoline, 2003). Police officers are often contacted when people are at their worse; nobody calls the police when they are having a good day. Not only are police officers subjected to ordinary organizational stressors, such as lack of departmental support and long work shifts, but they also have atypical vocational stressors, such as colleague death and exposure to volatile situations (Volanti & Aron, 1994; Volanti, et al., 2017). High amounts of stress within law enforcement often result in poor psychological and physical health for police officers, such as frequent headaches, and an increase in drinking alcohol and smoking cigarettes (Avdija, 2014). Police officers also experience higher amounts of burnout, which is characterized by depersonalization and high levels of emotional exhaustion (Russell, et al., 2014). Stressors have a direct effect on job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. Individuals that are under significant stress are less likely to feel satisfied with their job and are more likely to pull away from their vocation, thus creating a cycle of burnout, lack of satisfaction and lower vocational connectedness (Bemana, et al., 2013; Johnson, 2012). Job satisfaction and vocational connectedness were the focus of the current study. Job satisfaction was measured using multiple facets such as work, supervisors, pay, and much more. Vocational connectedness was measured by looking at how much individuals identify with the identity of their vocation.

Vocational connectedness is defined as the extent to which individuals feel respected, included, accepted, and supported in their organization (Cockshaw & Shochet, 2007). Due to the nature of the vocation, police officers’ sense of self-legitimacy is another important factor when discussing predictors of job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. Self-legitimacy is an officer’s belief in their own authority and their ability to conduct the duties of their job (Tyler,
Although higher self-legitimacy has been linked to higher organizational commitment (Tankebe, 2010), its connection with job satisfaction and vocational connectedness has not been examined. There are few studies exploring the link between job satisfaction and vocational connectedness; there are even less looking specifically at these variables with police officers.

**Importance of minority vocational experiences**

Previous quantitative research neglected to explore minority police officers’ vocational experiences. It is important that the push to hire more minority police officers is explored through the lens of minority officers. The workplace may be considered a nexus of social oppression due to it being the primary source of social interaction for many adults. Workplaces for minority individuals are often rife with microaggressions and microinequities (Fassinger, 2008; McCluney, et al., 2021; Rabelo, et al., 2020). Individually, they may not mean much, but they can snowball and have a tremendous influence on the wellbeing of minority workers (Choi, et al., 2020; Ménard & Brunet, 2010; Sue, et al., 2007). Ethnic minorities may also feel continuous pressure to assimilate to the culture of the organization. White individuals historically define and control access to work, and thus have developed cultural norms within these institutions (Helms, et al., 1994; Ray, 2019). Therefore, minorities often feel as if they must “play the game” to succeed within the organization (Hewlin, 2003; McCluney, et al., 2021). This feeling is often coupled with the minorities’ lack of access to social networks within predominantly White organizations and the simultaneous need to break into White social networks (McDonald, et al., 2009). As a result, minority police officers may strongly identify with police culture despite police institutions not being designed to accommodate them.

Individuals determine which identities are most important based on certain contexts (Stets & Burke, 2014). For many people, their vocational identity coincides with their personal...
identity. Genuine self-expression in the workplace is positively associated with job satisfaction and employee well-being (Ménard & Brunet, 2010). When minority workers are unable to culturally express themselves within their department, they may feel suppressed, isolated, and out of place. As a result, minority workers are less likely to perform, less likely to succeed, and have lower job satisfaction (Roberts & Mayo, 2019; Travis, et al., 2006). Minority individuals endure more emotional labor in their work environments, which can lead to poorer psychological safety and sense of well-being. This often stems from their feelings of loneliness and disconnection from others due to being one of few minorities in their predominantly White workspace (Prime & Salib, 2015; Travis, et al., 2016). Researchers and policy makers must consider the disproportionate amount of emotional labor minority workers are forced to dispense while in these predominantly White spaces.

Ethno-racial minorities are not a monolith; therefore, their experiences within their workplaces may not mirror one another’s. As mentioned previously, it seems that one possibility is that some Latino police officers may have a fair enough skin tone to be considered White-passing, and therefore, their experiences within their departments may be different from Black, Asian, or Native police officers. This is showcased in studies that found that Latino officers had more similar outlooks on policing to White officers than to other minorities. They were more likely to view police brutality incidents as isolated. Their reports of their experiences within their department were more closely related to White officers than Black officers (Gallardo, 2020). Due to the differences in experiences, it is important to consider the experiences of different minority officers.

There is evidence that unfair vocational practice extends to police departments (Bolton & Feagin, 2004). There are significant racial disparities regarding reception of awards, promotions,
and recognition within police departments. Minority police officers are less likely to be recognized, promoted, or given raises when compared to their White counterparts (DOJ, 2016; Najdowski & Goff, 2022; USCCR, 2000). They are less likely to have guidance and mentors within their department. As a result, many of them are uneducated about incentive and promotion processes due to White officers withholding information, as well as their superiors moving the goal post for minorities to receive the same incentives as their White counterparts (Bolton & Feagin, 2004; DOJ, 2016; Hochstedler & Conley, 1986; Rousey, 1987). The literature reiterates the concept of hiring minorities, providing a safe space for them, and affording them the same opportunities as White police officers.

About this study

Historical evidence showcases the fundamental role police officers played, and continue to play, in the formation and maintenance of racism. The foundation of police departments is a principal component in the organizational culture of many departments, which supports or challenges unfair treatment against minority workers. As a result, minority police officers may have different experiences within their department than their White counterparts. The potential conflict between their organizational and ethno-racial identities may result in lower job satisfaction and lower vocational connectedness. Moreover, the effect may be moderated by the strength of their ethno-racial and police identity salience. This research investigates the effect of ethno-racial and police identity salience on job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. The research investigates: How does ethno-racial and police identity salience of minority police officers affect their job satisfaction and vocational connectedness? Is this relationship mediated by bicultural identity conflict? My hypotheses are as follows: (1) Minority law enforcement officers with higher ethno-racial identity salience will have higher identity conflict, leading to
lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness than minority law enforcement officers with lower ethno-racial identity salience. Conversely, individuals with higher police identity will have lower identity conflict; therefore, having higher job satisfaction and vocational connectedness than minority law enforcement officers with lower police identity. (2) The relationship between identity conflict, job satisfaction, and vocational connectedness will be moderated by ethno-racial and police identity salience. Such that minority law enforcement officers with high ethno-racial identity salience and high identity conflict will have lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. Minority law enforcement officers with high police identity salience and low identity conflict will have higher job satisfaction and vocational connectedness.
Chapter 2: Methods

Participants

I used G*Power to compute a statistical power analysis to determine the appropriate sample size. The power analysis suggested a sample size of 59 to detect an effect of $f = 0.15$ (Johnson, 2012) with a power of 0.90, $\alpha = .05$. Participants consisted of 76 active minority law enforcement officers. The overall sample was 76% male, 24% female, and 58% Black, 30% Latino. Participants were dominant English speakers and currently work for a local, state, or federal police department. They also identified as an ethno-racial minority. Due to the variation of policies for compensating law enforcement, upon completion of the survey, participants chose a charity to donate $10 for their survey participation. Participants were recruited through email, cold-calling police administrators, and survey dispersal at a law enforcement conference for a national organization. Twenty-five percent of participants were recruited from police departments, 11.9% were recruited through a personal referral, and 25% were recruited from the law enforcement conference. The remaining 28% either refused to answer the question or became aware of the survey through methods not recorded during the survey.

Measures

Demographics. All participants were asked standard demographics questions, such as race/ethnicity, gender identity, age, and education level (Appendix A). Due to the sample being law enforcement officers, participants were asked additional questions related to their work demographics, such as their rank, their length of time in the force and if they have any military affiliation.
**Job satisfaction.** Job satisfaction was measured using an abridged version of the Job Descriptive Index (Balzer, et al., 1997). The Job Descriptive Index (AJDI) is a 25-item measure that consists of 5 facets. The 5 facets consisted of questions about work on present job satisfaction ($\alpha = 0.39$), present pay ($\alpha = 0.86$), opportunities for promotions ($\alpha = 0.89$), supervision ($\alpha = 0.74$), and coworkers ($\alpha = 0.76$) (e.g., Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your job?). Participants are given 5 words to describe their experience as it corresponds with each facet (e.g., People on your present job: boring, slow, responsible, smart, lazy, frustrating). Each question is answered using either “yes” if it describes the people they work with, “no” if it does not describe the people they work with, or “?” if they cannot decide. Job satisfaction cannot be measured solely based on the sum of the different aspects of work. Therefore, participants received 8 additional items that comprise the Job in General (JIG) scale. The JIG scale is answered in the same manner as the AJDI, with participants answering “yes”, “no”, or “?” ($\alpha = 0.79$) (Balzer, et al., 1997). The sum of the scale is used, with scores ranging from 0 to 324. Due to licensing protocol through Bowling Green State University, this scale will not be provided through the Open Science Framework. I conducted a principal component’s analysis to determine how each facet contributed to job satisfaction as a construct (see Table 4). I found that all of the facets loaded onto one factor, indicating that they all contribute to job satisfaction.\(^1\)

The work facet of the job satisfaction Scale demonstrated poor reliability ($\alpha \leq 0.39$). One possible reason for this is the sample used for this study. The work aspect of policing may be more nuanced than what the scale accounts for. Police work can vary from day to day, making it

\(^1\) An analysis for job satisfaction was run without the inclusion of the work facet. The results of the analysis presented in this study did not change substantially.
difficult for officers to describe their work in the simple terms used in the scale. Due to legal aspects surrounding the development of the job satisfaction, that facet was included in the analysis of job satisfaction. However, there is a need to develop better ways to measure work as a function of job satisfaction in police officers.

**Vocational Connectedness.** Vocational connectedness was measured using the Organizational Identification Questionnaire (OIQ). The OIQ is a 10-item scale that was developed to represent the connection between individuals and the organizations in which they belong (Miller, et al., 2000). A sample item is “I am proud to be an employee of [insert organization here]”. Each question is answered on a Likert-type scale (1= strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree). (α = 0.85). I conducted a principal component’s analysis to determine how each item in the scale contributed to the vocational connectedness construct (see Table 4). I found that the items were loading on two separate factors; only one of the items loaded onto a second factor. I removed the item, which increased the reliability of the measure to (α = 0.87). Due to the small increase after removing an item, I opted to retain the 10-item scale.

**Identity Salience.** Identity salience is used to measure the self-esteem associated with one’s group. More specifically, how important an individual’s group identity is to their self-concept. Identity salience was measured using a 4-item subset of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSE) named Importance to Identity (Luhtanen, & Crocker, 1992). Due to the presence of two identities: ethno-racial and vocational identity, participants completed this scale twice, with explicit instructions to think of either their identity as a police officer (α = 0.78). or their ethnic/racial identity (α = 0.82). A sample item is “The social groups I belong to are an important reflection of who I am.” Each question is measured on a Likert-scale (1= strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree). I ran a principal component’s analysis for both ethno-racial and
police identity salience (see Table 5). All the items for each scale loaded onto a single factor, signifying that each item contributed to each identity salience scale.

Identity Conflict. Conflict between two cultural identities was measured using an adaptation of the Bicultural Identity Integration Scale: Version 2 (BII-2). BII-2 is a bidimensional measurement used to assess how an individual perceives their two cultural identities to be compatible or opposing (Huynh, et al., 2018). I utilized one dimension, the measurement of ‘Bicultural Harmony vs. Conflict’, an 8-item scale. A sample item is “I find it easy to balance both law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s)”. Each question is measured on a Likert-scale (1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree) ($\alpha = 0.84$). I ran a principal component’s analysis for identity conflict (see Table 5). All the items for each scale loaded onto a single factor, signifying that each item contributed to identity conflict scale.

Work Experience. Work experience was measured using an adaptation of the Work Experience Measurement Scale (WEMS) (Nilsson, et al., 2010). WEMS is a multidimensional measurement for experiences at work. I utilized one dimension, the measurement of supportive working conditions, a 7-item scale. A sample item is “there is a good atmosphere where I work”. Each question is measured on a Likert-scale (1= Totally disagree, 6= totally agree). ($\alpha = 0.79$). I ran a principal component’s analysis for work experience (see Table 6). All the items for each scale loaded onto a single factor, signifying that each item contributed to work experience scale.

Instances of Workplace Discrimination. Workplace was measured using an abridged version of the Chronic Work Discrimination and Harassment Scale (House, et al., 2012). This is a 10-item scale that outlines experiences of workplace discrimination and harassment ($\alpha = 0.87$). A sample item is “how often are you watched more closely than other workers?”. Each question is answered on a Likert-scale (1= Once a week or more, 5= Never). I ran a principal component’s
analysis for instances of workplace discrimination (see Table 6). All the items for each scale loaded onto a single factor, signifying that each item contributed to the instances of workplace discrimination scale.

**Self-Legitimacy.** Self-legitimacy measures how confident a police officer is in their authority and was measured using the Self-Legitimacy Scale (White, et al., 2021). A sample item is “I have confidence in the authority vested in me as a law enforcement officer”. Each question is answered Likert-scale (1= Strongly disagree, 5= Strongly agree) ($\alpha = 0.51$). I ran a principal component’s analysis for self-legitimacy (see Table 6). All the items for each scale loaded onto a single factor, signifying that each item contributed to self-legitimacy scale.

**Procedure**

**Police department recruitment.** All participating departments received posters (*Appendix H*) accompanied with survey links and QR codes that officers could scan with their smart phones. These posters were posted in break rooms and in common spaces through the departments. Departments also received a “Frequently Asked Questions” document (*Appendix I*).

**Email recruitment.** For departments that opted to disperse the survey via email, departments were sent recruitment posters (*Appendix H*), which were then dispersed to active law enforcement officers via email.

**Law enforcement conference recruitment.** A table was set up at a law enforcement conference for a national police organization. The table was equipped with recruitment flyers (*Appendix H*), flyers containing only the QR code, and paper versions of the surveys. For participants that opted to complete the survey using the paper version, they were assigned a
random number after returning their survey. This number was then put into an Excel spreadsheet and uploaded into Qualtrics by undergraduate research assistants.

Upon receiving the survey, participants read and approved the informed consent form. They then completed a series of questions regarding their demographics, job satisfaction, vocational connectedness, ethno-racial and police identity salience, identity conflict, self-legitimacy, work experiences, and instances of workplace discrimination. At the end of the survey, participants chose one of four charities to donate $10 to. The charities were as follows: Concerns of Police Survivors (C.O.P.S.), Project Blue, National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, and First Responders Children’s Foundation.
Chapter 3: Results

This group of participants had high ethno-racial identity salience ($M=4.63$, $SD=1.51$). This is high in comparison to other measures of ethno-racial identity salience, where the means range from 2.99 to 4.25 (Douglass, et al., 2016; Hurtado, et al., 2015). Participants scored moderately on police identity salience ($M=3.62$, $SD=1.40$). There are studies looking at other job salience measures, where the means range from 2.54 to 4.50 (Capitano, et al., 2017; Mitchell & Boyle, 2015). They were also quite connected to their vocation ($M=4.35$, $SD=1.11$) when compared to other studies looking at vocational connectedness in other vocations, whose means range from 3.97 to 4.09 (Jones, 2010; Walumbwa, et al., 2011). Participants also had high identity conflict ($M=3.17$, $SD=0.80$) with studies looking at similar constructs ranging from 2.14 to 3.05 (Cheng & Lee, 2013). Participants had high job satisfaction ($M=272.36$, $SD=76.56$). The scores for job satisfaction can range from 0 to 324. The means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables can be found in Table 1 below.

A correlation test was conducted on the independent and dependent variables (see Table 1). The results show that minority law enforcement officers’ job satisfaction is positively correlated with vocational connectedness ($r=.67$, $p<.01$), police identity salience ($r=.28$, $p<.05$) and self-legitimacy ($r=.36$, $p<.05$), but negatively correlated with identity conflict ($r=-.39$, $p<.01$). Vocational connectedness is positively correlated with police identity salience ($r=.39$, $p<.01$) and self-legitimacy ($r=.39$, $p<.01$), but negatively correlated with identity conflict ($r=-.47$, $p<.01$). Identity conflict is positively correlated with ethno-racial identity salience ($r=.38$, $p<.01$). Police identity salience is positively correlated with self-legitimacy ($r=.35$, $p<.01$).
There were two hypotheses. The first hypothesis stated that minority law enforcement officers with higher ethno-racial identity will have higher identity conflict; therefore, having lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness than minority law enforcement officers with lower ethno-racial identity. Conversely, individuals with higher police identity will have lower identity conflict; therefore, having higher job satisfaction and vocational connectedness than minority law enforcement officers with lower police identity. To test this hypothesis, I ran a multivariate multiple regression with ethno-racial/police identity salience and identity conflict as the independent variables and job satisfaction and vocational connectedness as the dependent variables. The analysis shows that participants with higher ethno-racial identity salience had more identity conflict ($\beta = 0.15, t(71) = 2.59, p = .02$) and there was no effect for police identity salience ($\beta = -0.07, t(71) = -1.11, p = .27$) (see Table 2). Participants that had higher police identity salience demonstrated more job satisfaction ($\beta = 14.33, t(70) = 2.43, p = .02$) and officers with higher identity conflict demonstrated less job satisfaction ($\beta = -34.20, t(70) = -3.17, p = .003$, but no effect was found for ethno-racial identity salience ($\beta = -2.33, t(70) = -0.42, p = .68$). Participants that had higher police identity salience demonstrated more vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.31, t(70) = 3.96, p < .001$) and officers with higher identity conflict demonstrated less vocational connectedness ($\beta = -0.60, t(70) = -4.22, p < .001$), but no effect was found for ethno-racial identity salience ($\beta = -0.09, t(70) = -1.24, p = .22$). (see Table 3).

As the primary test of my hypothesis, I ran a Preacher & Hayes mediation analysis to determine if identity conflict mediated the relationship between ethno-racial identity salience and job satisfaction and vocational connectedness (see Figure 1). Identity conflict mediated the relationship between ethno-racial identity salience, job satisfaction ($\beta = -5.36, p = .02$) and vocational connectedness ($\beta = -0.09, p = .02$). However, there were no direct effects for job
satisfaction ($\beta = 0.27, p = .96$) or vocational connectedness ($\beta = -0.04, p = .61$). There were also no total effects for job satisfaction ($\beta = -5.09, p = .34$) or vocational connectedness ($\beta = -0.13, p = .08$).

Next, I hypothesized that the relationship between identity conflict, job satisfaction, and vocational connectedness will be moderated by ethno-racial and police identity salience. There were no moderation effects found for ethno-racial and police identity salience, job satisfaction ($\beta = 1.64, t(67) = 1.34, p = 0.18$) or vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.02, t(67) = 1.27, p = 0.21$).
Figure 1

Note: A model of the mediation of identity conflict on the relationship between ethno-racial identity salience and job satisfaction and vocational connectedness.
Exploratory Analyses

Ethno-racial and police identity salience and identity conflict proved to be predictors for job satisfaction and vocational connectedness in minority law enforcement officers. I opted to explore work experience, instances of workplace discrimination, and self-legitimacy as predictors of job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. I ran similar analyses to my hypothesized predictors. I also ran post-hoc analyses to investigate gender and race effects. Due to the different recruitment types, I ran analyses to determine if recruitment type had an effect on the results. All correlations for work experience, instances of workplace discrimination, and self-legitimacy are in Table 1 below.

**Work Experience.** Work experience ($M = 4.17, SD = 0.93$) measured supportive working conditions. When running a multiple regression analysis, it was found that participants with more supportive working conditions had higher job satisfaction ($\beta = 53.13, t(72) = 7.28, p < .001$) and higher vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.70, t(72) = 6.06, p < .001$). Work experience was negatively correlated with identity conflict, suggesting that participants with more supportive working conditions reported less identity conflict $r = -0.48, p < .01$.

**Instances of Workplace Discrimination.** When running a multiple regression analysis, it was found that individuals with more experiences of workplace discrimination ($M = 2.81, SD = 1.1$) had lower job satisfaction ($\beta = -31.98, t(71) = -4.31, p < .001$) and lower vocational connectedness ($\beta = -0.41, t(71) = -3.65, p < .001$). Instances of workplace discrimination were positively correlated with identity conflict, suggesting that participants with more instances of workplace discrimination reported more identity conflict $r = 0.32, p < .01$. 
**Self-Legitimacy.** Self-Legitimacy ($M = 4.35, SD = 0.63$) measured how confident a police officer is in their authority. A multiple regression analysis found that participants with higher self-legitimacy had higher job satisfaction ($\beta = 43.7, t(72) = 3.25, p = 0.002$) and higher vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.73, t(72) = 3.75, p < .001$). Self-legitimacy was positively correlated with police identity salience, suggesting that those high in police identity salience reported higher self-legitimacy $r = 0.35, p < .001$.

**Race Effects.** Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables within the Latino and Black samples can be found in Table 7 and Table 8 below, respectively. When running an ANOVA for each variable, there were no significant differences based on ethnicity/race. Please note that in the original analyses ethnicity/race also included participants that identified as Native, Asian, Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Mixed Race, or other. For the remainder of these analyses, I will only consider Black and Latino participants due to the small number of respondents from the other groups. I then ran post-hoc analyses based on ethno-racial identification. I separated the data set based on ethno-racial identification and ran multivariate multiple regression analyses on each subset. I found that Latino participants with high racial identity salience had higher identity conflict ($\beta = 0.22, t(19) = 2.15, p = 0.05$) and higher job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.56, t(19) = 2.88, p = 0.01$). I found that Black participants with high ethno-racial identity salience had lower vocational connectedness ($\beta = -0.21, t(41) = -2.1, p = 0.05$) and those with high police identity salience had higher vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.25, t(41) = 2.55, p = 0.02$). It should be noted that this study did not power up for making ethnic comparisons and one must be particularly careful drawing inferences from these comparisons.

**Gender Effects.** Means, standard deviations, and correlations for all variables within the women and men samples can be found in Table 8 and Table 9 below, respectively. When running an
ANOVA for each variable, there were no significant differences based on the gender for any of the variables except instances of workplace discrimination. Women reported more instances of workplace discrimination than men $F(2, 72) = 3.88, p = .03)$. The results for both men and women reflected that of the total group.

**Recruitment Type.** As mentioned previously, participants were recruited through multiple channels. I ran an ANOVA to determine if there were any differences in the variables based on recruitment type. I did not find any differences. Additionally, 72% of the participants outlined where they were recruited from, but 28% either did not answer or were recruited in ways other than what was outlined above.

**Length of Time in Department.** Length of time in department ($M = 2.63, SD = 0.86$) did not predict job satisfaction ($\beta = 15.32$, $t(72) = 1.5$, $p = 0.2$), but did predict vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.35$, $t(72) = 2.43$, $p = 0.02$). The longer the participant has been in their department, the higher their vocational connectedness.

**Length of Time in Law Enforcement.** Length of time in law enforcement ($M = 2.8, SD = 0.84$) did not predict job satisfaction ($\beta = 18.59$, $t(71) = 1.75$, $p = 0.08$). However, minority police officers that have been in law enforcement longer have higher vocational connectedness ($\beta = 0.43$, $t(71) = 2.77$, $p = 0.01$).
Chapter 4: Discussion

The nationwide shortage of law enforcement officers is a problem that continues to increase daily (DOJ, 2016). With the current political and social climate, it is important that we approach recruitment and hiring law enforcement from a multicultural perspective. The purpose of the current study was to explore how ethno-racial identity salience and identity conflict might affect job satisfaction and vocational connectedness in minority law enforcement officers. These data showed that minority police officers that had higher police identity salience felt more satisfied with their job and more connected to their job as a police officer. Those that were higher in identity conflict had lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. More specifically, minority police officers whose ethno-racial identity and police identity did not merge well were not as satisfied with their job or as connected to their job. This highlights how these two historically opposing identities can affect job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. The absence of an effect for ethno-racial identity salience indicates that the presence of a high ethno-racial identity salience by itself is not enough to influence job satisfaction and vocational connectedness.

In line with what I predicted, I found that minority law enforcement officers with high ethno-racial identity salience had more identity conflict. However, I did not find my predicted effect for police identity salience. Additionally, my prediction that ethno-racial and police identity salience and identity conflict would affect job satisfaction and vocational connectedness was partially supported. Individuals that had higher police identity had higher job satisfaction and vocational connectedness and individuals with higher identity conflict had lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. This effect was not found for ethno-racial identity salience. Identity conflict did, however, mediate the relationship between ethno-racial identity
salience and job satisfaction and vocational connectedness, though it did not mediate the relationship for police identity salience. Ethno-racial and police identity salience did not moderate the relationship between identity conflict and job satisfaction and vocational connectedness; my prediction was not supported. Lastly, as expected, we found that individuals with lower self-legitimacy had lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. For the remainder of this section, I will discuss how these results tie into previous work on law enforcement and minority workers, limitations, future directions, and how my findings may influence law enforcement in practical manners.

**Minorities in policing.**

Law enforcement agencies all over the nation are having issues recruiting, hiring, and retaining police officers, specifically minority law enforcement officers (DOJ, 2016). Studies outlined minority officers’ difficulty adjusting to departmental culture and their ability to exist within the cultural identity of policing (Roberts & Mayo, 2019; USCCR, 2000). These factors, coupled with other issues, such as experiences of racism, ultimately influence job satisfaction and vocational connectedness for minority officers; often pushing them to leave the profession altogether. Industrial/Organizational literature posited that minorities in predominantly white institutions often find themselves having to hide or dampen their ethnic identity in order to “play the game” and succeed within that organization (Hewlin, 2003; McCluney, et al., 2021). I combined the two ideas to test how ethno-racial identity salience and identity conflict affects job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. My findings supported the idea that minority law enforcement officers high in ethno-racial identity salience had more identity conflict and lower job satisfaction and vocational connectedness.
The reason we find this effect may be due to the foundation of law enforcement as an institution. As mentioned previously, law enforcement has been, and continues to be, a majority white, male institution. Although there have been steps towards making law enforcement more diverse, changing a long-standing vocational culture may be difficult. A possible solution is to make policy changes within departments that allow for more cultural awareness in everyday facilities of law enforcement departments. Current grooming standards (e.g., hair length or hair style), for instance, might more often limit Persons of Color compared to White individuals, and that might limit who might consider working as a police officer. Thus, changing grooming standards to allow officers to wear beards and have longer hair could allow for more men of color to go into law enforcement. However, implementation and adherence of such policies is an issue in departments. Thus, future research should seek to determine how to increase success in policy adherence in police departments, particularly in those with departments that oppose such policies.

**Exploring police identity salience**

Law enforcement officers are known for having a very strong vocational identity. We find these in terms such as “off-duty officer”, whereas many other vocations do not tend to maintain their work responsibilities while they are off the clock (e.g., being required to “take action” when witnessing a serious crime, identify themselves as an off-duty officer, and make arrests) (Texas Police Chiefs Association, n.d.; University of Pittsburgh Police Department, 2018). Traditionally, police identity has been considered a monolith, but with the diversification of police forces, minority police officers may find themselves at an intersection that does not allow them to have their police identity and minority identity exist in harmony (du Plessis, et al., 2021; Benet-Martínez, et al., 2002). I found that police identity salience and identity conflict had
an effect on job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. This reiterates the effects found in previous research. When minority workers have conflict between their cultural and occupational identities, they have lower job satisfaction (Roberts & Mayo, 2019). As mentioned previously, identity is fluid, and which identity an individual makes salient can change based on situation (Stets & Burke, 2000). Future research should explore how police identity salience may change based on situational factors and how that could ultimately influence job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. This is particularly important since I found that police identity salience positively predicts job satisfaction and vocational connectedness. Furthermore, future research should explore how to decrease identity conflict in minority law enforcement officers. This study showed that ethno-racial identity salience did not negatively predict job satisfaction and vocational connectedness unless mediated by identity conflict. Thus, decreasing identity conflict may increase job satisfaction and vocational connectedness.

Additionally, an exploratory analysis found that Latino officers had higher police identity salience than Black officers. This may be explained by some Latino officers’ ability to appear white-passing. Thus, they may identify more with their identity as a police officer than Black officers due to being more accepted within the profession. Although I did not find any racial differences in experiences of discrimination and work experiences, everyday interactions within police departments may account for the racial differences in police identity salience.

**Other Considerations**

The small sample size of this study is apparent. However, recruiting law enforcement is very difficult, and recruiting minority law enforcement is an even bigger task. The makeup of the sample is another limitation. The sample is currently 58% Black. This may be a function of the
recruitment strategy. As mentioned previously, many participants were recruited at a national Black law enforcement conference.

**Broader Impact**

The Department of Justice identified disparities in recruitment, hiring, and retention of minority police officers as barriers in the efforts to diversify law enforcement. Although many political and legal avenues have been explored, there is little empirical literature that investigates minority police officers. As mentioned previously, generations of White individuals occupying law enforcement positions has made it difficult for minority individuals to reap the benefits of the profession. Job satisfaction and vocational connectedness are imperative in conserving the current minority police force. This study found that increasing job satisfaction and vocational connectedness may lie in decreasing identity conflict and increasing police identity salience for minority law enforcement officers. Decreasing identity conflict may be accomplished through the implementation of multicultural policies within departments. The results of this study, and ideas built from it, could influence what policies are implemented surrounding how law enforcement personnel are allowed to behave, dress, and speak within their profession. Furthermore, although there is a myriad of reasons for a decrease in minority law enforcement, focusing on job satisfaction and vocational connectedness can remove barriers for many minority law enforcement officers where the threshold for going, and staying, in this profession lies in those two variables. The goal of this study, and the studies hereafter, is to continuously move towards solutions for long-term issues plaguing law enforcement all over the nation.
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Table 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>272.36</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vocational Connectedness</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity Conflict</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ethno-racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-Legitimacy</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workplace Discrimination</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Experience</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$. 
Table 2.

*Multivariate multiple regression with Ethno-racial and Police Identity Salience predicting Identity Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Conflict</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethno-racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
Table 3.

*Multivariate multiple regression with Ethno-racial and police identity salience and identity conflict predicting job satisfaction and vocational connectedness.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Vocational Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Ethno-racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>2.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity Conflict</td>
<td>-34.20</td>
<td>-3.17**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.*
Table 4.

PCA Factor Loadings for Job Satisfaction and Vocational Connectedness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Vocational Connectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Ethno-Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>Component 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.

PCA Factor Loadings for Workplace Discrimination, Work Experiences, and Self-Legitimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Workplace Discrimination</th>
<th>Work Experiences</th>
<th>Self-Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
<td><strong>Component 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Component 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Component 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 7.**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Vocational Connectedness</th>
<th>Work Experiences</th>
<th>Workplace Discrimination</th>
<th>Self-Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Conflict</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-.44*</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$. $N=23$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Vocational Connectedness</th>
<th>Work Experiences</th>
<th>Workplace Discrimination</th>
<th>Self-Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Conflict</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-.53**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$. $N= 44$
Table 9.

Means, standard deviations, and correlations for Ethno-Racial Identity Salience, Police Identity Salience, Identity Conflict, Job Satisfaction, Vocational Connectedness, Work Experiences, Instances of Workplace Discrimination, and Self-Legitimacy for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Vocational Connectedness</th>
<th>Work Experiences</th>
<th>Workplace Discrimination</th>
<th>Self-Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.49*</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Conflict</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.64**</td>
<td>-0.69**</td>
<td>-0.55**</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.49*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$. N = 17
Table 10.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Vocational Connectedness</th>
<th>Work Experiences</th>
<th>Workplace Discrimination</th>
<th>Self-Legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethno-Racial Identity Salience</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Identity Salience</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Conflict</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates \( p < .05 \). ** indicates \( p < .01 \). \( N = 58 \).
Appendices

Appendix A

Demographics

Race/Ethnicity

- Latino or Latino or Spanish Origin of any race
- Not Latino or Latino or Spanish Origin
  - White or Caucasian
  - Black or African American
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native
  - Asian
  - Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
  - Two or more races
  - Non-Resident
  - Race and Ethnicity Unknown

Gender Identity: How do you identify?

- Woman
- Man
- Transgender
- Gender non-conforming
- Prefer to self-describe here
- Prefer not to answer

Age

- What is your current age?
  - 21-30
  - 31-40
  - 41-50
51 or older

Education: select your highest level of education
- Less than a high school degree
- High school degree or equivalent (G.E.D.)
- Some college, but no degree
- Associate’s degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Graduate degree

How long have you worked for this department?
- Less than 1 year
- 1-9 years
- 10-19 years
- 20 or more years

What is your current position within your department?

Have you ever served in the military?
- Yes
- No
Appendix B

Abridged Job Descriptive Index

[Redacted].
Appendix C

Organizational Identification Questionnaire

1. I am proud to be a law enforcement officer.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

2. I talk up law enforcement to my friends as a great job to work.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

3. I really care about the fate of law enforcement.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

4. I have warm feelings toward law enforcement as a job.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

5. I would be willing to spend the rest of my career in law enforcement.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
6. I would describe law enforcement as a large “family” in which most members have a sense of belonging.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

7. I am glad I chose to work for law enforcement rather than another job.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

8. Law enforcement’s image in the community represents me well.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

9. I find it easy to identify myself as law enforcement.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Neither agree or disagree
   e. Somewhat Agree
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

10. I find that my values and the values of law enforcement are similar.
     a. Strongly Disagree
     b. Disagree
     c. Somewhat Disagree
     d. Neither agree or disagree
     e. Somewhat Agree
     f. Agree
     g. Strongly Agree
Appendix D

Collective Self-Esteem Scale

Instructions: Think about your identity as a police officer. Answer the following questions:

1. Overall, my group membership has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

2. The social group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

3. The social group I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

4. In general, belonging to this social group is an important part of my self-image.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

Instructions: Think about your ethnic/racial identity. Answer the following questions:

1. Overall, my group membership has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
c. Disagree Somewhat
d. Neutral
e. Agree Somewhat
f. Agree
g. Strongly Agree

2. The social group I belong to is an important reflection of who I am.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

3. The social group I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree

4. In general, belonging to this social group is an important part of my self-image.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Disagree Somewhat
   d. Neutral
   e. Agree Somewhat
   f. Agree
   g. Strongly Agree
Appendix E

Bicultural Identity Integration Scale- Version 2

1. I find it easy to harmonize law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s).
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
2. I rarely feel conflicted about being a minority and law enforcement.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
3. I find it easy to balance both law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s).
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
4. I do not feel trapped between the law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s).
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
5. I feel torn between law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s).
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
6. Being bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
7. I feel that my law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s) are incompatible.
   a. Strongly Disagree
b. Disagree
c. Not Sure
d. Agree
e. Strongly Agree

8. I feel caught between the law enforcement and my racial/ethnic culture(s).
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Not Sure
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
Appendix F

Self-Legitimacy Scale

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. I have confidence in the authority vested in me as a law enforcement officer.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree

2. I am confident that I have enough authority to do my job well.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree

3. I feel my job positively impacts the members of my community.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree

4. I do not hesitate to use my authority when I believe it is necessary to intervene in a situation.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neutral
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
Appendix G

Work Experience Measurement Scale

Please enter your opinion on the following statements about your work situation.

1. We encourage and support each other at work.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Somewhat Agree
   e. Agree
   f. Totally Agree

2. There is a good atmosphere where I work.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Somewhat Agree
   e. Agree
   f. Totally Agree

3. I think the work routines function well.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Somewhat Agree
   e. Agree
   f. Totally Agree

4. I get feedback on the work I do.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Somewhat Agree
   e. Agree
   f. Totally Agree

5. I am happy about my job.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Somewhat Disagree
   d. Somewhat Agree
   e. Agree
   f. Totally Agree

6. I feel that my employer invests in my health.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
c. Somewhat Disagree
d. Somewhat Agree
e. Agree
f. Totally Agree

7. I get advice and practical help from others when necessary.
   a. Totally Disagree
   b. Disagree
c. Somewhat Disagree
d. Somewhat Agree
e. Agree
f. Totally Agree
Appendix H

Chronic Work Discrimination and Harassment Scale

1. How often are you watched more closely than others?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

2. How often does your supervisor or boss use racial or ethnic slurs or jokes?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

3. How often does your supervisor or boss direct racial or ethnic slurs or jokes at you?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

4. How often do your coworkers use racial or ethnic slurs or jokes?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

5. How often do your coworkers direct racial or ethnic slurs or jokes at you?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

6. How often do you feel that you have to work twice as hard as others work?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

7. How often do you feel that you are ignored or not taken seriously by your boss?
   a. Once a week or more
b. A few times a month
c. A few times a year
d. Less than once a year
e. Never

8. How often do others assume that you work in a lower status job than you do and treat you as such?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

9. How often has a coworker with less experience and fewer qualifications gotten promoted before you?
   a. Once a week or more
   b. A few times a month
   c. A few times a year
   d. Less than once a year
   e. Never

10. How often have you been unfairly humiliated in front of others at work?
    a. Once a week or more
    b. A few times a month
    c. A few times a year
    d. Less than once a year
    e. Never
Appendix I
Recruitment Flyer

Minority Law Enforcement Survey

Eligibility

1. Law enforcement/Police Officer.
2. Identify as a minority.
3. Currently active in law enforcement.

The main aim of this survey is to determine ways to recruit, hire, and retain minority law enforcement officers. It will explore job satisfaction, job connectedness, and work experiences.

You will be taking an anonymous online survey that lasts approximately 15-20 minutes. This survey is completely voluntary.

For every survey completed, $10 will be donated to law enforcement/first responders’ charities that you choose at the end of the survey.

Scan QR Code with mobile phone camera

OR

Click URL below
Appendix J

Frequently Asked Questions

1. **What do I have to do for the survey?**
   a. Any participating officers will click the link or scan the QR code with their mobile phone camera. These are both located on the survey flyer. Officers will take the survey. That concludes the officer participation.

2. **What if my department does not want our officers to answer certain questions?**
   a. If you have any questions that you do not feel comfortable with your department answering, those questions can be removed during your department’s participation window. If there are any questions that the department would like to add, that can also be arranged.

3. **You are looking only at minority law enforcement officers; can other officers complete the survey?**
   a. Yes! However, unless your department requests it, only minority law enforcement officers’ results will be reported in the final paper. There are plans to compare minority police officers to their counterparts in the future.

4. **How do you plan to keep officers that take your survey anonymous?**
   a. I have removed the collection of personal data, such as location and IP address, from the survey software, Qualtrics. I do not ask questions that would allow me to identity who took the survey and where the survey was taken. Also, due to the removal of that information, participant data, which are collected from all over the nation, will be an aggregate. This means that all departments will be mixed in.

5. **What if I am uncomfortable answering this question?**
   a. The entire survey and each of its questions are voluntary. If you do not wish to answer a question, or feel uncomfortable answering a question, you can skip the question and move on to the next. However, I would love if every question was answered, since it would help me paint the complete picture for the questions I am asking.

6. **Why this police department?**
   a. I believe that surveying a large number of police departments will give me a good representation of the minority police/law enforcement population. This department may have also been selected due to its demographics. Since I am researching minority law enforcement, I want to survey departments that have a good number of minority officers.

7. **Why are you doing this survey?**
   a. There is an ongoing issue in law enforcement with recruiting, hiring, and maintaining police officers. This is a national issue that has been at the forefront of recruitment and police research for quite some time. Due to the current political climate, communities are focusing heavily on minority police officers. A lot of the research does not ask individual officers their thoughts or feelings about their job. My aim is to address this issue from the officers’ perspectives, and hopefully be able to shed light on an ongoing issue, as well as begin to work towards solutions.
8. **How would you use these data once they are collected?**
   a. I am collecting these data for my thesis, in pursuant of my PhD. Once data is collected, I will have a public defense that will showcase the data that I have collected. Afterwards, I will send a document with my results, and with explanations, to all departments that elected to participate in the survey. I will also have the option to publish these data in a paper. If/when I choose to do so, I will reach out to all departments that elected to participate and show them my paper that I plan to publish.
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