

Concrete and Glass Ceilings

**Concrete and Glass Ceilings:  
An Analysis of Motivations and Aspirations in  
the Police**

Daniel Ebor Challam

Shillong,  
18<sup>th</sup> July, 2018

# Concrete and Glass Ceilings: An Analysis of Motivations and Aspirations in the Police \*

Daniel Ebor Challam

## Abstract

Demographic changes are becoming evident, as India is settling into the third stage of its demographic transition. The ageing population, and the new generation of potential employees entering the labour market, are changing the shape and form of the workforce. Organizations benefit when employees are motivated and aspiring and ensuring this entails that this perspective is accommodated into the fold. While a substantial amount of research has examined the motivation for individuals to become police officers, very little is known about what motivates individuals after joining the force, particularly in the context of India. Using survey data collected from police personnel of the Constable rank of Meghalaya Police, this study attempts to answer three questions: How do background characteristics influence motivations for promotion; how do perceptions of the work environment influence these motivations; and what are the probable sources of motivation? Some implications for policy and future research are discussed.

**Keywords:** Police; Motivation; Promotional Aspirations; Background Characteristics; Work Environment Perceptions; Organizational Characteristics; Job Development.

---

\* This study would not have been possible without the support and assistance of Shri. B. R. Rana IPS, Additional Director General of Police, Meghalaya. I would also like to thank Shri. Davis. R. Marak IPS, Superintendent of Police, East Khasi Hills, for inputs that have been immensely useful. Last but not least, I would like to thank all the respondents of Meghalaya Police who have taken part in the study.

## 1. Background

The police in India, is one of the largest employers of ‘manpower’ in the country. With a population of about 1.3 billion (as per the latest revision of the United Nations’ World Population Prospects, 2017), the police to population ratio works out to be about 145 police personnel per 1,00,000 people, using the actual strength. Very little has changed in the design and structure of the Indian Police System since 1861. The Police Act, 1861 which vests the administration of the police, directly in the hands of the state government, used to be the ‘law of the land’, that oversaw policing in Indian states.

The Meghalaya Police is a law enforcement agency in the state of Meghalaya, which was formerly a part of Assam Police until Meghalaya attained its statehood in the year 1972. As of 2018, the force has a strength of 16,369, with an actual strength of 12,642; while the total number of Women Police stands at 550. Specifically, in East Khasi Hills, the total actual strength of the Constabulary is 1589, out of which, 103 are women. The then Assam Police was also guided by The Police Act, and Meghalaya Police also inherited the same system at the time of statehood. However, in 2010, Meghalaya introduced its own legislation, The Meghalaya Police Act.

The organization is currently headed by an officer of the rank of Director General of Police, assisted by two Additional Director Generals of Police, two Inspector Generals of Police, three Deputy Inspector Generals of Police, thirty-four Superintendents of Police as well as Commandants of battalions. At the district level, the police administration is headed by the Superintendent of Police, who is responsible for the maintenance of law and order in the district, among other responsibilities; while at the Sub-Divisional level, the Sub-Divisional Police officers are responsible for the same. The police force in general, is divided into two main branches namely, the Armed Branch, and the Unarmed Branch.

The key function of the Armed Branch of the police is to deal with law and order situations. Primarily, the force is trained to quell disturbances, and perform quasi-military roles, such as guards and armed escorts. The qualification for entry into the Armed Branch is passing the 8<sup>th</sup> grade. The key function of the Unarmed Branch of the police however, is the prevention, detection, and investigation of crime. The force is also engaged in traffic regulation, and surveillance duty, and comprises the staff of Police Stations, Outposts and Court Offices. The qualification for entry into the Unarmed Branch is passing the 12<sup>th</sup> grade.

## 2. Introduction

Given the continually changing nature of democracy, policing is emerging to be one of the most complicated social services, made more so, by a growing population's increasing fear of crime and violence, as well as the increasing demands of specialised services from police organizations such as community policing. In many ways, the police force not only reflects the nature of the state, but rather, is also a major determinant of how a state changes or develops.

Despite the fact that police officers experience a great deal of pressure, and are required to work long hours, we still see individuals pursuing careers in law enforcement. As such, it is important to understand the motivations for why individuals choose this field. In addition to their motivations, it is also important to understand how police officers perceive certain issues regarding the working environment, as these can help shed light on police personality and cognition. Success in policing, is crucially related to the level of motivation held by police personnel, in addition to other factors affecting organizational success. Preference Theory (Hakim, 1998) posits that those who aspire to certain career goals are more likely, in the long-run, to achieve job-related success relative to those who did not start with high expectations for themselves (Hakim, 2002). Although the claim holds only for women in Hakim's study, there is no reason to believe that the same will not apply to men, in general.

Many international studies have shown that one of the least important reasons, for choosing a career in the police, was for power; while one of the most important reasons, was for the opportunity to help people (White et. al., 2010). The extent to which this holds true however, depends upon the degree of socialization of an individual into the police organization, which is a distinct identity, with its own set of social categories, social norms, and identity utility (Akerlof & Kranton, 2010). It also depends on the socio-cultural, economic, as well as historical context under consideration.

The dynamic nature of the modern workplace requires that an administration constantly review and improve itself, and achieving this, necessitates an understanding of employees' motivations, which is essential for maintaining a productive work environment, as well as effectively managing a diverse workforce. One way to do this, is to explore the differences in expectations that respondents may have with regard to the promotional process. The end results will help one arrive at potential ideas for ways in which an administration can encourage positive behaviour through structured incentives.

### 3. Review of Literature

Despite the importance of police officers' aspirations for promotion, little is actually known about the topic. Studies in the area focus mostly on determinants of job satisfaction among police officers (Forsyth & Copes, 1994), or on comparisons between men and women (Archbold et. al., 2010). Moreover, many of the studies tend to be limited to locales such as the United Kingdom and Wales (Boag-Munroe et. al., 2017), Norway (Fekjær & Halrynjo, 2012), and Nigeria (Aremu & Lawal, 2009). Particularly in India, only one such study has been conducted in Delhi (Sahgal, 2007). Although the findings of these studies are ground-breaking, they are of debatable generalizability when taken in the context of the police in India, because of the considerable differences in cultures, police structure and hierarchy, and the role that the police plays. Furthermore, most of these studies do not analyse promotional aspirations directly, but rather, analyse the determinants of job satisfaction. In spite of these overall limitations in the existing body of literature, it must be said that good preliminary groundwork has been laid for future research.

Background characteristics have received a fair amount of attention when it comes to research regarding promotional aspirations. While variables such as Education and Training, may give officers greater confidence in their ability to do their job well (Kakar, 2003), variables such as Family Size and Marital Status may leave officers torn between work and family (Stichman et. al., 2010). Considering the importance of diversity, variables such as Gender and Identity, are also important background characteristics that have been studied. Archbold and Hassell (2009), found that female police officers perceived organizational barriers when they choose to participate in the promotion process, while Foley et al. (2008) found that minority recruits were more likely than Whites to report advancement opportunities as a primary reason for opting for a career in policing.

Occupational climate variables such as Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and views regarding the administration, can influence the extent to which police officers expect to be promoted. Jaramillo et. al. (2015), found that Stress is an important antecedent of organizational commitment. They also found that Job Satisfaction is the strongest predictor of organizational commitment, with the former having negative effect, and the latter having a positive effect. Rizzo et al. (1970) found that both Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict were associated with lower degrees of job satisfaction, and that ambiguity was associated with job-related anxiety. Finally, Gau et. al. (2013) found that those who hold more favourable views toward the top management or administration, place a greater importance on getting promoted.

## 4. Data

The data for the current study is drawn from a comprehensive survey undertaken in the month of June, 2018. A questionnaire was sent to different police agencies across the district of East Khasi Hills and was administered to police personnel of the Constable rank belonging to these agencies. 160 responses in total were collected, of which 40 responses belonged to Male Constables of the Armed and Unarmed branches respectively, and 40 responses belonged to Female Constables of the Armed and Unarmed branches respectively. Following the methodology of Gau et. al (2013), the survey was aimed to capture respondents' perceptions of the workplace, their role orientations, their attitudes and motivations, as well as their background characteristics. In assessing promotional aspirations, we particularly focus on gender, family size and marital status as determinants of our two dependent variables used in the analysis, namely, *Expected Rank on Retirement*, and *Promotion Valence*.

Table 1 provides an overview of how the dependent variables are defined. The first dependent variable, *Expected Rank on Retirement*, comes from a survey item where respondents were asked to select from options that include Constable, Head Constable, Sub- Inspector, Inspector, and Deputy Superintendent of Police. Rank equivalence between the Armed and Unarmed branches, was determined using the Basic Pay Scale provided by Meghalaya Police. This variable is important, as it captures the aspirational aspect of police personnel with regards to promotion within the administrative hierarchy, i.e., it captures the intensity of ambition.

The second dependent variable, *Promotion Valence*, is drawn from the survey item, 'Getting promoted to a higher rank is important', to which respondents were asked to choose from a 4-point Likert scale, whose responses were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree, Strongly Agree. The scale was reverse coded, such that agreement to the statement was assigned a higher a value as compared to disagreement to the statement (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree). This variable captures the importance that police personnel give to promotion within the administrative hierarchy, i.e., it captures the intensity of motivation.

Table 1: Description of Dependent Variables.

Variable	Description
Expected Rank	1 = Constable / Lance Naik / Naik, 2 = Havildar / Head Constable, 3 = Sub- Inspector, 4 = Inspector, 5 = Deputy Superintendent of Police
Promotion Valence	4-point Likert Scale, range 1-4

Table 2: Description of Explanatory Variables.

Variable	Expected Sign	Description
Gender	-	0 = male, 1 = female
Community	-/+	0 = others, 1 = SC/ST
Education	+	1 = 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2 = 10 <sup>th</sup> , 3 = 12 <sup>th</sup> , 4 = bachelor's, 5 = master's
Marital Status	-	0 = unmarried, 1 = married
Family Size	-	Number of respondent's family members
Age	-	Age of the respondent
Additional Training	+	0 = no, 1 = yes
Branch	-	0 = unarmed, 1 = armed
Stress	-	3-item additive index, range 3-12
Job Satisfaction	+	3-item additive index, range 3-12
Role Ambiguity	-	3-item additive index, range 3-12
Management Attitude	+	3-item additive index, range 3-12
First Option	-/+	0 = no, 1 = yes
Promotion Motivation	+	0 = financial, 1 = power
Stress Cause	+	0 = personal, 1 = professional

Table 2 provides an overview of how the explanatory variables are defined. The first set of explanatory variables include background characteristics of the respondents, specifically, *Gender* (0 = male, 1 = female), *Community* (0 = others, 1 = Scheduled Caste / Scheduled Tribe), *Education* (1 = 8<sup>th</sup> grade passed, 2 = 10<sup>th</sup> grade passed, 3 = 12<sup>th</sup> grade passed, 4 = Graduation, 5 = Post-Graduation), *Marital Status* (0 = Unmarried, 1 = Married), *Family Size* (Family members in respondent's household), *Age* (Age of the respondent), *Additional Training*, which includes add-on courses undertaken by the respondent in their academic and professional life (0 = no, 1 = yes), and *Branch* (0 = Unarmed Branch, 1 = Armed Branch).

The second set of explanatory variables focuses on the respondents' perception of the workplace or working environment, which includes *Stress*, *Job Satisfaction*, *Role Ambiguity*, and *Management Attitude*. Each variable, is measured using a 3-item additive index, with each item presented as a 4-point Likert Scale, soliciting a response in the form of agreement or disagreement to the statements presented, as in the case of the dependent variable, *Promotion Valence*. Thus, each variable can take on a minimum value of 3, and a maximum value of 12.

*Job Stress* combines responses to the statements, 'I am usually calm when I'm on duty', 'I feel tense when I'm on duty' (reverse coded), and 'I feel irritated when I'm on duty' (reverse coded). Lower values on the index imply lower levels of stress, while higher values on the index imply higher levels of stress.

*Job Satisfaction* combines the responses to the statements, 'There are better job options than the police', 'I like my job better than my colleagues' (reverse coded), and 'I find real enjoyment in my job' (reverse coded). Lower values on the index imply lower levels of satisfaction, while higher values on the index imply higher levels.

*Role Ambiguity* captures the doubt that respondents have with regards to what is expected of them in the line of duty. It combines responses to the statements, 'My job has clearly specified tasks', 'I know what is expected of me in my job', and 'I know what my responsibilities are'. Lower values on the index imply certainty, while higher values on the index imply uncertainty.

*Management Attitude* captures respondents' perceptions of the administrative hierarchy by looking at whether respondents believe hard work pays off, and by looking at respondents' perception of disciplinary action at the organizational level. It combines responses to the statements, 'My superiors recognize individual hard work' (reverse coded), 'My superiors recognize teamwork' (reverse coded), and 'If my colleagues make mistakes, they will be given a chance to explain themselves to my superiors' (reverse coded). Lower values on the index imply a negative perception of the administration, while higher values on the index imply a positive perception of the administration.

The third set of explanatory variables focuses on respondents' sources of motivation or demotivation, and are captured by *First Option*, *Promotion Motivation*, and *Stress Cause*. *First Option*, is taken from the item 'A job in the police was your first option' (0 = no, 1 = yes). *Promotion Motivation* captures whether respondents are motivated by financial considerations or by considerations of power (0 = financial benefits, 1 = power, prestige and perks). *Stress Cause* captures whether the cause of respondents' stress is personal or professional (0 = personal, 1 = professional).

Table 3: Summary Statistics.

Variables	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<i>Dependent Variables:</i>					
Expected Rank	160	3.40	1.28	1	5
Promotion Valence	160	3.41	0.59	2	4
<i>Explanatory Variables:</i>					
Gender	160	0.50	0.50	0	1
Community	160	0.79	0.41	0	1
Education	160	3.20	1.07	1	5
Marital Status	160	0.77	0.42	0	1
Family Size	160	5.63	2.56	2	15
Age	160	36.29	8.51	20	58
Additional Training	160	0.51	0.50	0	1
Branch	160	0.50	0.50	0	1
Stress	160	6.19	1.25	3	10
Job Satisfaction	160	7.74	1.25	3	11
Role Ambiguity	160	5.88	1.25	3	12
Management Attitude	160	8.25	1.84	3	12
First Option	160	0.54	0.50	0	1
Promotion Motivation	160	0.60	0.51	0	1
Stress Cause	160	0.33	0.47	0	1

Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for the dependent and explanatory variables. With regards to background characteristics, female and male respondents make up 50% of the sample respectively, while the armed and unarmed branches make up 50% respectively. 79% of the sample is represented by respondents who belong to the SC/ST communities, while 21% is represented by Others. The average educational attainment of the respondents is 12<sup>th</sup> grade, while the average age of the respondent is about 36 years. The average family size is about 6 members, with 77% of the sample being married individuals, while the remaining 23% is unmarried. With regards to motivation, 54% of the sample chose a career in the police as a first option. 60% of the sample is motivated by considerations of power, while 40% is motivated by monetary benefits. Lastly, 33% of the sample cites professional causes of stress.

## 5. Methodology

Given that our dependent variables are ordinally ranked in nature, linear regression techniques such as the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) method cannot be used for the purpose of estimation. Thus, the standard regression technique to be used, is the Ordered Logistic (ologit) regression. One of the key assumptions of the ologit model is that the parameters do not differ across the categories of the dependent variable. This is often referred to as the parallel lines assumption. For the cumulative ologit model, this means that for an ordinal dependent variable  $Y$ , with  $M$  categories and  $N$  explanatory variables, the model can be written as follows:

$$Pr(Y_i > j) = g(X\beta) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j + X_i\beta)}{1 + [\exp(\alpha_j + X_i\beta)]}$$

where,

$\alpha_j$  = constant term;  $X_i$  = explanatory variables;  $\beta$  = coefficient of  $X_i$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ;  $j = 1, 2, \dots, M - 1$ ; and the  $\beta$ 's are the same for all  $j$ .

However, the parallel lines assumption of the ologit model is often violated and thus, the model may prove to be problematic. So, it is more appropriate to use the Generalized Ordered Logistic (gologit) regression model (Williams, 2006). This model can be written as follows:

$$Pr(Y_i > j) = g(X\beta_j) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j + X_i\beta_j)}{1 + [\exp(\alpha_j + X_i\beta_j)]}$$

where,

$\alpha_j$  = constant term;  $X_i$  = explanatory variables;  $\beta_j$  = coefficient of  $X_i$

$i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ ;  $j = 1, 2, \dots, M - 1$ ; and the  $\beta$ 's are the not the same for all  $j$ .

The probabilities that  $Y$  will take on values 1, 2, ...,  $M$  are given by:

$$P(Y_i = 1) = 1 - g(X_i\beta_1)$$

$$P(Y_i = j) = g(X_i\beta_{j-1}) - g(X_i\beta_j); j = 2, \dots, M - 1$$

$$P(Y_i = M) = g(X_i\beta_{M-1})$$

The ologit model is basically a special case of the gologit model. In fact, the formulae for the ologit model and gologit model are the same, except that in the ologit model the  $\beta$ 's, but not the  $\alpha$ 's, are the same, for all values of  $j$ .

For the purpose of the current study, both ologit and gologit models will be estimated.

## 6. Results

Table 4 presents the results of the Ordered Logit regression with *Expected Rank* on Retirement as the dependent variable. Five specifications of the regression model are considered. Column I estimates the regression using the entire sample, Columns II and III are specifically limited to Female and Male respondents, and Columns IV and V are specifically limited to Armed and Unarmed Branch respondents, respectively.

As can be seen from Column I, *Gender* is an important determinant of the dependent variable. When comparing Female and Male respondents, the former is less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement. Likewise, as evident from the negative coefficient on *Branch* in Column I, respondents who belong to the Armed Branch, are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, as compared to their counterparts from the Unarmed Branch. Taken together, the coefficients of *Branch* and *Gender* in Columns II and IV respectively, tell us that Female respondents in the Armed Branch are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, as compared to Female respondents in the Unarmed Branch, and Male respondents in the Armed Branch respectively. *Community* and *Marital Status* appear to only have an effect on the dependent variable in Column III, i.e., Male respondents who belong to SC/ST communities, are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to others; while Male respondents who are married, are also less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to their unmarried counterparts. The strongest result, comes from *Education*, whose positive relationship on the dependent variable is valid in Columns I, II, III and V, and is highly significant. As compared to respondents with lower levels of education, respondents with higher levels are more likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, and this is particularly true for the Unarmed Branch. *Additional Training* has a positive impact on *Expected Rank* and holds in Columns I and III, i.e., Male respondents who have undergone additional training are more likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to those who have not.

Armed Branch respondents who are uncertain of their roles, are significantly less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, as compared to those who are certain, and this is clear from the negative sign on the coefficient of *Role Ambiguity* in Column IV. Finally, while Unarmed Branch respondents and Male respondents, who chose the police as a *First Option*, are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to those who view it as a second choice; Unarmed Branch respondents and Female respondents who are motivated by power, are more likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to those motivated by financial benefits, as can be seen from the positive coefficients on *Promotion Motivation* in Columns II and V.

Table 4: Ordered Logit Regression for Expected Rank on Retirement.

Explanatory Variables	Dependent Variable: Expected Rank on Retirement				
	(I) Full Sample	Gender		Branch	
		(II) Female Only	(III) Male Only	(IV) Armed Branch Only	(V) Unarmed Branch Only
Gender	-0.6003* (0.3547)			-1.1477* (0.6625)	0.2001 (0.5310)
Community	-0.3853 (0.3824)	0.2174 (0.6406)	-0.9152* (0.5327)	-0.4746 (0.5171)	-0.1576 (0.7438)
Education	0.5746*** (0.1934)	0.6258** (0.3025)	0.4867* (0.2919)	0.3091 (0.3011)	0.7917*** (0.3199)
Marital Status	-0.4745 (0.3978)	-0.2326 (0.5238)	-1.9703** (0.8131)	-0.9699 (0.7156)	-0.7667 (0.5862)
Family Size	-0.0216 (0.0620)	-0.0211 (0.0832)	-0.1015 (0.1146)	-0.0054 (0.0881)	-0.1118 (0.1014)
Age	0.0112 (0.0226)	-0.0175 (0.0430)	0.0215 (0.0319)	-0.0269 (0.0324)	0.0192 (0.0384)
Additional Training	0.5647* (0.3327)	0.1615 (0.5950)	0.8233* (0.4867)	0.3586 (0.5613)	0.6142 (0.5380)
Branch	-0.8317** (0.4038)	-1.2550* (0.7294)	-0.4345 (0.5769)		
Stress	-0.1135 (0.1360)	-0.0540 (0.2316)	-0.2088 (0.1935)	-0.0125 (0.1870)	-0.1629 (0.2256)
Job Satisfaction	0.2086 (0.1500)	0.3039 (0.2494)	-0.0473 (0.2256)	0.0222 (0.2369)	0.3422 (0.2144)
Role Ambiguity	-0.0535 (0.1465)	-0.2060 (0.3185)	-0.0959 (0.2235)	-0.4455* (0.2421)	0.2690 (0.2150)
Management Attitude	-0.1192 (0.0985)	-0.0879 (0.1530)	-0.1414 (0.1662)	-0.0731 (0.1455)	-0.1169 (0.1514)
First Option	-0.4377 (0.3226)	-0.6750 (0.4722)	-0.9159* (0.5423)	0.1309 (0.5698)	-1.2013** (0.5065)
Promotion Motivation	0.2849 (0.3112)	1.2264*** (0.4849)	-0.7247 (0.4643)	0.1321 (0.4351)	0.9886* (0.5396)
Stress Cause	-0.1829 (0.3431)	-0.4098 (0.5059)	0.0223 (0.5263)	-1.3607 (0.5329)	0.6035 (0.5124)
Observations	160	80	80	80	80
Chi-square	0.0000	0.0047	0.0031	0.0770	0.0077
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.0986	0.1258	0.1426	0.0914	0.1334

Note: Standard errors are given in parentheses with asterisks indicating \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01.

Table 5 presents the results of the Ordered Logit regression with *Promotion Valence* as the dependent variable of interest. As in Table 4, five specifications of the regression model are considered.

As can be seen from Columns I and V, *Gender* is also an important determinant of the dependent variable in this model. When comparing Female and Male respondents, particularly in the Unarmed Branch, Female respondents are less likely to give importance to promotions.

Once more, one of the strongest results in the model comes from *Education*, whose positive relationship on the dependent variable is valid in Columns I, II, III and V, and is highly significant. As compared to respondents with a lower level of education, respondents with higher levels of education are more likely to give importance to promotions, and this is particularly true for the Unarmed Branch.

*Marital Status* again, appears to only have an effect on the dependent variable in Column III, i.e., Male respondents who are married, are also less likely to give importance to promotions as compared to their unmarried counterparts.

Armed Branch respondents who have undergone *Additional Training*, are more likely to give importance to promotions as compared to those who have not, as can be seen from Column IV.

A negative relationship between *Management Attitude* and the dependent variable is observed from Columns II and V, which implies that Female respondents and Unarmed Branch respondents, who have a positive perception of the administration are less likely to give importance to promotions as compared to those who have a negative perception.

Another strong result comes from *Promotion Motivation*, whose positive relationship on the dependent variable is valid in Columns I, II, III and IV, and is highly significant. Respondents who are motivated by considerations of power, are more likely to give importance to promotions as compared to those motivated by financial benefits, and this is particularly true for the Armed Branch.

Finally, respondents who cite professional causes as their *Stress Cause*, are more likely to give importance to promotions, as compared to those who cite personal causes, and this is particularly valid for Male respondents and Armed Branch respondents, as evident from Columns I, III, and IV.

Table 5: Ordered Logit Regression for Promotion Valence.

Explanatory Variables	Dependent Variable: Promotion Valence				
	(I) Full Sample	Gender		Branch	
		(II) Female Only	(III) Male Only	(IV) Armed Branch Only	(V) Unarmed Branch Only
Gender	-0.9699** (0.4303)			0.0345 (0.8314)	-2.0221*** (0.7260)
Community	-0.3235 (0.4751)	0.2239 (0.7493)	-0.6348 (0.7365)	0.1340 (0.6781)	-0.4567 (0.9837)
Education	0.7085*** (0.2339)	0.7136** (0.3477)	0.6914* (0.3862)	0.6254 (0.4082)	0.9692*** (0.3901)
Marital Status	-0.5826 (0.4959)	-0.1295 (0.6098)	-3.033* (1.5859)	0.3317 (0.9248)	-0.7266 (0.7195)
Family Size	-0.0709 (0.0739)	-0.1110 (0.0949)	0.0430 (0.1573)	-0.1597 (0.1128)	0.1479 (0.1280)
Age	0.0199 (0.0283)	-0.0115 (0.0475)	0.0155 (0.0434)	0.0515 (0.0457)	-0.0385 (0.0467)
Additional Training	0.6259 (0.4027)	0.2090 (0.6986)	0.7988 (0.6184)	1.7620** (0.7573)	-0.1367 (0.6611)
Branch	0.3142 (0.4714)	-0.5176 (0.8682)	0.8828 (0.6847)		
Stress	-0.2623 (0.1661)	-0.0976 (0.2561)	-0.4015 (0.2673)	-0.2892 (0.2466)	-0.4049 (0.2982)
Job Satisfaction	0.1364 (0.1815)	0.3210 (0.3140)	0.1142 (0.2948)	-0.0595 (0.3222)	0.2407 (0.2621)
Role Ambiguity	-0.2249 (0.1876)	0.0728 (0.3427)	-0.0965 (0.3145)	-0.1168 (0.3255)	-0.2278 (0.2863)
Management Attitude	-0.1575 (0.1286)	-0.3255* (0.1928)	0.2446 (0.2471)	0.0720 (0.1914)	-0.5072** (0.2337)
First Option	0.0665 (0.3853)	0.2650 (0.5317)	-0.8476 (0.6940)	-0.5845 (0.6919)	0.6114 (0.5668)
Promotion Motivation	1.3724*** (0.3814)	1.1496** (0.5493)	1.6177*** (0.6228)	2.0329*** (0.6067)	0.5139 (0.5924)
Stress Cause	0.9737** (0.4280)	0.6272 (0.5758)	1.4421** (0.7466)	1.3781** (0.7578)	0.4444 (0.6133)
Observations	160	80	80	80	80
Chi-square	0.0000	0.0797	0.0012	0.0002	0.0028
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.1954	0.1559	0.2872	0.2929	0.2513

Note: Standard errors are given in parentheses with asterisks indicating \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01.

Table 6 presents the results of the Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Model, with *Expected Rank* on Retirement as the dependent variable of interest. Given that our dependent variable has five possible outcomes, namely, Constable, Head Constable, Sub-Inspector, Inspector, and Deputy Superintendent of Police, the gologit model will have four sets of coefficients. In effect, four equations are estimated simultaneously.

While Female respondents are less likely than Male respondents, to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector and above, on retirement, as evident from the coefficient of *Gender* Column II, SC/ST respondents and Armed Branch respondents are less likely than others, to expect ranks of Head Constable and above, on retirement, as evident from the coefficient of *Community* in Column I. Both results are highly significant. Columns II and IV tell us once again, that respondents with higher levels of *Education* are more likely than those with lower levels, to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector and above, as well as the rank of Deputy Superintendent of Police, on retirement thus proving once again, that education is a significant predictor of *Expected Rank*.

Respondents with larger families are less likely than those with smaller families, to expect ranks of Head Constable and above, but are more likely to expect ranks of Inspector and above on retirement, as evident from the coefficient of *Family Size* in Columns I and III. Moreover, older respondents are less likely than younger respondents to expect ranks of Head Constable but are also more likely to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector and above on retirement, as evident from the coefficient of *Age* in Columns I and II, the latter result being highly significant.

While respondents with higher stress are less likely than those with lower stress, to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector and above, on retirement, respondents who are more satisfied with their jobs are more likely than those who are less satisfied, to expect ranks of Head Constable and above, on retirement. These highly significant results can be seen from the coefficients of *Stress* and *Job Satisfaction* in Columns II and I respectively. From the coefficients of *Role Ambiguity* in Columns I and III, we see that respondents who are uncertain about their roles in the line of duty are more likely than those who are certain, to expect ranks of Head Constable and above, but are less likely to expect ranks of Inspector and above, on retirement. Whereas, from the coefficient of *Management Attitude* in Column II, respondents who have a more positive view of the administration as less likely than those who have a more negative view, to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector and above, on retirement, and this result is highly significant.

Finally, respondents who cite professional stress as compared to those who cite personal stress, are more likely to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector, but are less likely to expect ranks of Inspector and above, on retirement as evident from the coefficient of *Stress Cause* in Columns II and III.

Table 6: Generalized Ordered Logit Regression for Expected Rank on Retirement.

Explanatory Variables	Dependent Variable: Expected Rank on Retirement			
	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)
	Equation I	Equation II	Equation III	Equation IV
	C vs. HC, SI, I, DSP	C, HC vs. SI, I, DSP	C, HC, SI vs. I, DSP	C, HC, SI, I vs. DSP
Gender	0.9517 (2.0374)	-1.8110*** (0.7303)	-0.4343 (0.5177)	0.2396 (0.5749)
Community	-16.1978*** (5.4184)	1.2296 (1.1914)	-0.0059 (0.5218)	-0.2156 (0.6915)
Education	-1.3423 (0.9614)	2.0515*** (0.7122)	0.2358 (0.2754)	1.0057*** (0.3671)
Marital Status	20.8374 (2432.527)	-21.1269 (2235.423)	0.0043 (0.6302)	-0.7942 (0.6380)
Family Size	-0.8924** (0.4004)	-0.0899 (0.1729)	0.2027** (0.1016)	-0.1992 (0.1240)
Age	-0.1807* (0.1014)	0.1952*** (0.0773)	-0.0213 (0.0374)	0.0083 (0.0555)
Additional Training	-1.0208 (1.6571)	0.1105 (1.0597)	0.6656 (0.4659)	0.1226 (0.5406)
Branch	-10.2989*** (3.6938)	1.5685 (1.1084)	-0.8410 (0.5481)	-0.7078 (0.7061)
Stress	0.5006 (0.6231)	-1.7165*** (0.5928)	0.2539 (0.2278)	-0.1000 (0.2513)
Job Satisfaction	4.1219*** (1.6605)	-0.0234 (0.4346)	0.0321 (0.2140)	0.2465 (0.2656)
Role Ambiguity	2.9627** (1.2614)	-0.6792 (0.4375)	-0.4396* (0.2310)	0.3565 (0.2863)
Management Attitude	1.2796 (0.7891)	-0.7970*** (0.3046)	-0.2037 (0.1530)	0.1352 (0.1751)
First Option	0.9139 (1.5352)	1.2113 (1.2042)	-0.7175 (0.4602)	-0.8021 (0.5467)
Promotion Motivation	1.3525 (1.9706)	0.7512 (0.8999)	0.6209 (0.4626)	0.2801 (0.5509)
Stress Cause	-1.2032 (2.2042)	3.3243** (1.6724)	-0.9567* (0.5230)	0.2203 (0.5910)
Constant	-47.1538 (2432.595)	28.5445 (2235.4350)	2.4728 (3.2137)	-7.4144** (3.8313)
Observations	160			
Chi-square	0.0000			
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.3698			

Note: Standard errors are given in parentheses with asterisks indicating \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01. C- Constable; HC- Head Constable; SI- Sub-Inspector; I- Inspector; DSP- Deputy Superintendent of Police.

Table 7 presents the results of the Generalized Ordered Logit Regression Model, with *Promotion Valence* as the dependent variable of interest. Given that our dependent variable has three possible outcomes, namely, Disagree, Agree, and Strongly Agree, the gologit model will have two sets of coefficients. In effect, two equations are estimated simultaneously.

*Gender*, proves to be a significant determinant of the dependent variable, as can be seen from its coefficient in Column II, i.e., Female respondents are less likely than Male respondents to strongly agree that promotions are important.

Once again, respondents with higher levels of education, are more likely than those with lower levels, to strongly agree that promotions are important, as evident from the coefficient of *Education* in Column II.

Column II tells us that respondents who face higher levels of stress, are less likely than those who face lower levels, to strongly agree that promotions are important, while Column I tells us that respondents who are more satisfied with their jobs are less likely than those who are less satisfied, to agree or strongly agree that promotions are important. These results are evident from the coefficients of *Stress* and *Job Satisfaction* respectively.

Respondents who chose the police as a first option, are more likely than those who considered it as a second option, to agree or strongly agree that promotions are important, and this is evident from the coefficient of *First Option* in Column I.

Finally, respondents who are motivated by considerations of power, are more likely than those who are motivated by financial benefits, to strongly agree that promotions are important and this result is highly significant, as can be seen from the coefficient of *Promotion Motivation* in Column II; while respondents who cite professional causes of stress are more likely than those who cite personal causes, to strongly agree that promotions are important, as evident from the coefficient of *Stress Cause* in Column II.

Thus, as can be seen from the preceding analyses, even though the Ordered Logit model may be one of the more popular methods for analysing ordinal dependent variables, the Generalized Ordered Logit model can help researchers avoid serious errors concerning statistical significance that could lead them to erroneously conclude that an explanatory variable has little or no effect on the dependent variable being studied. This can be clearly seen in the case of explanatory variables, *Family Size*, *Age*, *Stress* and *Job Satisfaction*, which were insignificant in the ologit regressions.

Table 7: Generalized Ordered Logit Regression for Promotion Valence.

Explanatory Variables	Dependent Variable: Promotion Valence	
	(I) Equation I D vs. A, SA	(II) Equation II D, A vs. SA
Gender	-3.7206 (2.3776)	-0.9972** (0.4582)
Community	0.4597 (1.7434)	-0.3052 (0.5015)
Education	1.2063 (1.1138)	0.6001** (0.2550)
Marital Status	-1.1606 (2.0737)	-0.3036 (0.5405)
Family Size	-0.4390 (0.3178)	0.0038 (0.0865)
Age	0.0872 (0.1035)	-0.0063 (0.0327)
Additional Training	-0.6810 (1.5820)	0.6768 (0.4321)
Branch	1.1840 (1.6565)	0.2619 (0.5039)
Stress	0.6037 (0.8712)	-0.3083* (0.1818)
Job Satisfaction	-4.0545* (2.1862)	0.2409 (0.1967)
Role Ambiguity	-0.8212 (0.7177)	-0.2566 (0.2069)
Management Attitude	-0.0738 (0.5541)	-0.1698 (0.1420)
First Option	3.9550* (2.1314)	-0.1079 (0.4090)
Promotion Motivation	1.2152 (1.2582)	1.3389*** (0.4100)
Stress Cause	18.0366 (1864.8030)	0.7688* (0.4432)
Constant	33.1677 (20.6065)	0.5672 (3.0280)
Observations	160	
Chi-square	0.0000	
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.2750	

Note: Standard errors are given in parentheses with asterisks indicating \*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01.

D- Disagree; A- Agree; SA- Strongly Agree.

## 7. Discussion

The aim of the current study is to empirically examine the factors that shape variation in aspirations for promotion for police personnel of the Constable rank. With the creation of new districts, and formation of new battalions, there are more avenues for promotion within Meghalaya Police. Hence, *Expected Rank* and *Promotion Valence* make for good measurable outcomes. In this light, three sets of explanatory variables i.e., background characteristics, perception indices, and sources of motivation, were tested to see their influence on respondents' predicted rank at retirement, as well as on the importance placed on aspiring to reaching a higher rank.

The first, and most prominent finding uncovered from the study, is the strong and statistically significant impact that background characteristics had on respondents' promotional aspirations. *Gender*, and *Education* were two variables that had consistent influences on *Expected Rank* and *Promotional Valence* across all models.

With regard to *Gender*, the fact that Female respondents as compared to Male respondents, expect lower ranks and give smaller importance to promotions is not surprising. Specifically, Female respondents are more likely to expect ranks of Constable and Head Constable on retirement, i.e., they perceive upward mobility as difficult. They are also more likely to disagree that promotions are important. Promotions for Female respondents have been taking place on a regular basis, only in the last ten years. So, Female respondents, do not have a role model to look up to. Joshi (2015) in a study conducted in Delhi, concluded that women police perceive that they are not rewarded with promotions and incentives like men, and that they have to work twice as hard, to prove themselves. Sahgal (2007) in a study of Delhi Police, concluded that promotions entail a shift in schedule that may conflict with family responsibilities. Moreover, promotions may also imply a transfer, which further adds to the burden of family responsibilities.

With regard to *Branch*, it can be seen that respondents of the Armed Branch expect lower ranks on retirement as compared to their Unarmed Branch counterparts. Specifically, they are more likely to expect to stay at the Constable rank on retirement. This may be attributed to the fact that the Armed Branch is larger than the Unarmed Branch, and so, opportunities for promotion are less. Focusing particularly on Female respondents in the Armed Branch, it can be seen that they expect smaller ranks on retirement as compared to their Unarmed Branch Female counterparts, as well as their Armed Branch Male counterparts. What we see is a case of intersectionality, where Female respondents are doubly disadvantaged, not only due to their gender, but also due to the branch that they belong to.

*Education* has been found to be a fairly consistent predictor of the dependent variables and is specifically important for respondents in the Unarmed Branch i.e., they are more likely to expect higher ranks on retirement and are also more likely to agree that promotions are important. This may be due to the fact that respondents who belong to the Unarmed Branch, are more likely to be engaged in investigation and paperwork. Moreover, the qualification for entry into the Armed Branch is lower than that for the Unarmed Branch. It is expected that a marginal increase in education levels, would lead to a significant increase in returns. In general, it must be noted that respondents who are more educated, are more likely to expect the ranks of Sub-Inspector and Deputy Superintendent of Police on retirement and are also less likely to disagree that promotions are important. Specifically, these are also the ranks for which direct recruitment is an option, through an open examination, for which a higher qualification is required.

Respondents who have undergone *Additional Training* are also more likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, and this is particularly true for Male respondents. However, this result does not apply to Female respondents. Training builds capacity and enhances the expectations for higher ranks. For Female respondents, it would seem that training is not a strong enough factor to improve expectations, as it is probably overshadowed by other important considerations, such as family obligations. At the same time, it must be noted that there are more training opportunities for Male respondents, as compared to Female respondents. Respondents from the Armed Branch who have undergone training are also more likely to give importance to promotions, and this is because training improves performance and skill in crisis situations such as law and order, anti- insurgency operations, etc.

Turning to *Marital Status*, it can be seen that Male respondents who are married are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to unmarried Male respondents. Male respondents who are married are also less likely to give importance to promotions. The variable however, is insignificant when we focus only on Female respondents. This is because, regardless of whether they are married or not, have a women double responsibility of taking care of the elderly and the young in their family, and also playing the role of breadwinner i.e., they simultaneously take part in the reproductive and productive economies (Elson, 1999). Men are generally exempted from such obligations, unless they are married and have children i.e., there is a pressure from family to forego promotions due to displacement.

Although *Family Size* turns out to be an insignificant variable in the ologit variants of the model, we find that it is significant in the gologit variants. For respondents with a larger family as compared to those with a smaller family, we see that ranks of Head

Constable and above, are less likely to be expected, while at the same time, ranks of Sub-Inspector and above, are more likely to be expected on retirement. A simple explanation for this phenomenon may be that, for those who expect lower ranks, an increase in family size represents a burden, while for those who expect higher ranks, an increase in family size does not. Moreover, there may be reason to believe that there is reverse causality at play, whereby respondents who expect higher ranks on retirement, have larger families on average.

A peculiar result comes from *Community*, which tells us that SC/ST Male respondents, expect lower ranks on retirement as compared to others. In general, SC/ST respondents are more likely to expect to retire at the rank of Constable, as compared to others. This is counterintuitive, given that Meghalaya is a state that is predominantly tribal, with 85% of posts reserved for the Scheduled Tribes. But what can be concluded, is that Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes may hold different sets of assumptions and beliefs about the promotional process or desirability of advancement as compared to others. Specifically, it may be believed, that the Scheduled Tribes who are indigenous to the state, have ancestral and political roots in their place of birth and therefore, promotions which entail transfers will bring about a high degree of displacement to the family of the respondents under consideration, and are thus undesirable. For Non-Tribal respondents, this is not as much a consideration as compared to their ST counterparts.

Another odd result comes from *Age*, which tells us that older respondents as compared to younger respondents, are less likely to expect ranks of Head Constable and above but at the same time, are more likely to expect ranks of Sub-Inspector and above on retirement. A probable cause for this, is that respondents are simply satisfied with their current positions and have achieved sufficient seniority, such that they are only willing to see themselves retire at ranks that are much higher than Head Constable. With the introduction of the Assured Career Progression Scheme, or ACPS (Government of Meghalaya, 2017), which guarantees to individuals, the financial benefits of the next higher rank without the corresponding promotion, the aforementioned claim is further strengthened.

In terms of our second class of explanatory variables i.e., perception indices, we see that all four variables emerge as significant, although none seem to have a consistent impact on the dependent variables.

With regard to *Stress*, we find that it has a negative impact on *Expected Rank* as well as *Promotion Valence*. With promotions, comes responsibilities and hence, a higher demand for better performance. Thus, respondents who suffer from higher levels of stress are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, specifically Sub-Inspector

and above; while at the same time, they are also less likely to strongly agree that promotions are important.

However, when we turn to *Job Satisfaction*, we see that satisfied respondents are more likely to seek advancement but are less likely to value promotions. Again, as in the case of *Age*, this can be explained by the fact that respondents who are satisfied with their current positions, would not easily like to give up familiar roles and duties in exchange for formalized supervisory responsibilities, i.e., if the current role is fulfilling, respondents would not want to move out of their comfort zones. With ACPS, respondents comfortably receive a financial upgradation without the duties of the higher rank.

Huey & Ricciardelli (2015), note that the limiting of daily tasks to ‘paperwork’ or ‘parenting’, is a consistent source of role strain, and leads to the undervaluing of the self. In the Armed Branch, tasks and duties tend to be specific to physical activities and so, there is little room for doubt. When looking at *Role Ambiguity*, we see that for respondents from the Armed Branch, those who are uncertain of their roles, are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement. However, it must be noted that the negative effect of role ambiguity only applies to ranks of Inspector and above in general. When considering ranks of Head Constable and above, the coefficient of role ambiguity is positive, which implies that respondents who are uncertain of their roles are more likely to expect ranks of Head Constable and above. This can be attributed to the fact that the roles and duties performed by the Constable and Head Constable ranks are comparable, whereas, the roles performed by the Inspector rank are incomparable with respect to the Constable rank.

Another statistically significant variable, is *Management Attitude*, whose coefficient is negative for Female respondents and Unarmed Branch respondents, in the model with *Expected Rank* as the dependent variable. Respondents who perceive a positive or lenient view towards the administration, are less likely to expect higher ranks on retirement, specifically ranks of Sub-Inspector and above. This implies that respondents do not desire to be a part of the group that they admire, which seems intuitively illogical. That these attitudes are negatively associated with aspirations for ranks of Sub-Inspector and above, may be explained by the fact that given the survey item’s explicit mention of the word ‘superiors’, perhaps respondents are not content to settle into positions that are only one step above Head Constable. Of course, this does not explain the absence of a significant relationship between management attitude and promotion to ranks of Inspector and above. Further research may help elaborate on this result.

Turning to the first of our motivation source variables, *First Option*, we see that Male respondents and Unarmed Branch respondents who chose the police as first career option, are less likely to seek advancement but in general, are more likely to agree that promotions are important. Although this may seem contrary to expectations, this phenomenon can be simply explained by the fact that in a Male breadwinner type framework, Male respondents who chose the police as a first option, are also more likely to have chosen it for job security and a steady salary. This result has also been uncovered by Wu et. al (2008), in a study of police cadets in China. They find that Chinese cadets have rated the desire for job security and steady salary as the most influential reasons to join the police. Thus, such respondents, although they value career advancement, are also more likely to be satisfied with lower ranks on retirement.

Looking at *Promotion Motivation*, we see that Female respondents and Unarmed Branch respondents, who are motivated by power, are more likely to expect higher ranks on retirement as compared to those motivated by financial benefits. In general, this is also true for *Promotion Valence*, where respondents are more likely to strongly agree that promotions are important. This is because, respondents who are motivated by considerations of power, are also the respondents who are more likely to be ambitious and thus, are more likely to value career advancement. With the introduction of honorary promotions, which guarantees to individuals, the prestige of the next higher rank without corresponding pay hikes, the aforementioned claim is strengthened. Particularly, given that women often have lower self-evaluation of their abilities and work performance than men (Sabat & Mishra, 2010), it is clear that dedicated women are the most likely to value promotions.

Finally, looking at *Stress Cause*, we find that Male respondents and Armed Branch respondents who cite professional causes as compared to personal, are more likely to give importance to promotion. In general, those who cite professional causes are more likely to strongly agree that promotions are important. The working environment of Male, and Armed Branch respondents in particular, is more stressful, as they have to deal with situations that require physical effort. Given that respondents who cite professional causes of stress, are more likely to be dedicated and hardworking, higher ranks imply supervisory responsibilities and hence, such respondents aspire to be promoted into roles which do not place them in positions where they are receiving orders but are rather issuing them. But the extent to which this holds true, is limited to the ranks of Sub-Inspector and above and is less likely for ranks of Inspector and above.

## 8. Limitations

The limitations of this study should be acknowledged, together with a discussion of implications for future research.

Firstly, this study is based on a relatively small sample of respondents. Although the sample appears to be fairly representative with respect to respondents' background characteristics, the findings obtained from the study may not be generalised to other districts in Meghalaya, let alone to other states in India. Future studies should target respondents from multiple police agencies across Meghalaya to create a more comprehensive sample.

Secondly, our dependent variables assessed aspirations from a subjective point of view. That is, respondents were asked how important they thought it was to be promoted to a higher rank, as well as their projection with respect to their rank within the police hierarchy. What we do not know based on the study however, is how this plays out behaviourally in a real-life setting. Future studies can use models of Game Theory to identify deviations of rational behaviour from stated attitudes.

Thirdly, given the lack of well-established models of police aspirations, the measures used in the study are highly experimental and exploratory. Although the explanatory variables were successful in explaining *Expected Rank*, we find that they exerted little statistical significance in explaining the importance with which respondents value promotions. Future studies should continue efforts to tease out relevant explanatory variables, beyond what is presented in the study.

Fourthly, the low R-square values associated with the regression models indicate that some important predictors of respondents' decisions to join the police were not included in the analysis, i.e., the models are likely to suffer from omitted variable bias. Given the extensive research currently being done on the importance of social networks, it would be important to capture the effect of personal relationships on the dependent variables. Future studies should take into consideration, factors such as these.

Lastly, future studies should also be extended to include police officers of different ranks in the sample, since it is very likely that such respondents could have different views with regards to the dependent variables in question. Moreover, studies can also be extended longitudinally, i.e., across time, in order to bring out the potential ways in which aspirations for promotion change over time.

In sum, despite the limitations presented above, the present study offers an original analysis of respondents' promotional aspirations, with a sample large enough to permit a degree of generalizability, not present in prior research in Meghalaya.

## 9. Conclusion

The current study seeks to add to the body of research in the area of organizational behaviour by focusing on whether in the police, motivations vary among respondents of different background characteristics. Although the study fills an empirical void by utilizing regression models to identify the predictors of police aspirations, it raises further questions about why certain variables matter. For example, it raises questions as to why respondents who belong to certain demographic groups are less willing to value or see themselves moving to a higher rank within the police hierarchy. This can be clearly seen in the case of Male respondents who belong to SC/ST communities, or in the case of Female respondents who belong to the Armed Branch.

Whether such a finding is a result of a lack of motivation, or a product of roadblocks in terms of opportunities, future work based on structured qualitative interviews, can immensely help supplement the quantitative work presented here, and can go beyond the Constable rank population to study ranks of the Sub-Inspector population and above.

Of course, the study not only leaves us with questions, but also with some implications for policy. Efforts to draw SC/ST and Female applicants should highlight specific features of the job, such as the opportunity to help those in need, job security, power and prestige, and most importantly, the opportunity to advance one's career within the hierarchy. Higher education, short term add-on courses, as well as additional training, can go a long way in motivating individuals to aim higher.

In fact, individuals can be motivated to set and attain, personal and professional achievements, with feedback provided to them by superiors, on their performance at work. In this way, constructive criticism can also serve to be a means for superiors to help motivate their subordinates. Promotional aspirations can be part of an overall program to ensure high quality policing in the state.

In a democratic setting, policing plays a crucial role in balancing increasing law and order needs, as well as human rights. As one of the most visible and authoritative figures in society, the Constabulary has the most extensive contact with the public, and its interaction with the public has significant impacts on the way that the public perceives and evaluates the performance of the policing system. The performance of any police organization is strongly related to the factors that motivate its employees. Thus, promoting individuals who are motivated, would be beneficial, since such individuals are more likely to respond positively to the requests and demands of a growing population, and thus maintain a healthier relationship with a free and secure society.

## References

- World Population Prospects*. (2018). Population Division - United Nations.
- The Police Act*. (1861). (Ind.)
- Hakim, C. (1998). Developing a Sociology for the Twenty-First Century: Preference Theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49(1), 137-143.
- Hakim, C. (2002). Lifestyle preferences as determinants of women's differentiated labor market careers. *Work and Occupations*, 29, 428-459.
- White, M. D., Cooper, J. A., Saunders, J., & Raganella, A. J. (2010). Motivations for becoming a police officer: Re-assessing officer attitudes and job satisfaction after six years on the street. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 520-530.
- Akerlof, G., & Kranton, R. (2010). *Identity Economics: How Our Identities Shape Our Work, Wages, and Well-Being*. Princeton, New Jersey; Woodstock, Oxfordshire: Princeton University Press.
- Forsyth, C., & Copes, J. (1994). Determinants of job satisfaction among police officers. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 24(1), 109-116.
- Archbold, C., Hassell, K. D., & Stichman, A. J. (2010). Comparing Promotion Aspirations of Female and Male Police Officers. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 12, 287-303.
- Boag-Munroe F., Donnelly J., Mechelen D. V., Elliott-Davies M. (2017). Police Officers' Promotion Prospects and Intention to Leave the Police, *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 11(2), 132-145.
- Fekjær, S. B., & Halrynjo, S. (2012). Promotion aspirations among male and female police students. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 14(1), 71-82.
- Aremu, A. O., & Lawal, G. A. (2009). A path model investigating the influence of some personal-psychological factors on the career aspirations of police trainees: A perspective from Oyo State, Nigeria. *Police Practice and Research*, 10, 239-254.
- Sahgal, P. (2007). Women in Police: A Study of Their Career Aspirations and Motivation. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 42(3), 408-429.
- Kakar, S. (2003). Race and police officers' perceptions of their job performance: An analysis of the relationship between police officers' race, education level, and job performance. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 18, 45-56.

- Stichman, A. J., Hassell, K. D., & Archbold, C. A. (2010). Strength in numbers? A test of Kanter's theory of tokenism. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*, 633-639.
- Archbold, C.A. & Hassell, K.D. (2009). Paying a marriage tax: An examination of the barriers to the promotion of female police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *32*(1), 56-74.
- Foley, P. F., Guarneri, C., & Kelly, M. E. (2008). Reasons for choosing a police career: Changes over two decades. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *10*, 2-8.
- Jaramillo, F., Nixon, R., & Sams, D. (2005). The effect of law enforcement stress on organizational commitment. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *28*, 321-336.
- Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. I. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *15*, 150-163.
- Gau, J. M., Terrill, W., & Paoline, E. A. (2013). Looking Up: Explaining Police Promotional Aspirations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *40*(3), 247-269.
- Williams, R. (2006). Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables. *Stata Journal*, *6*, 58-82.
- Joshi, S. (2015). The state of women in police in India and the discrimination faced by them. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, *2*(4), 73-86.
- Elson, D. (1999). Labor Markets as Gendered Institutions: Equality, Efficiency and Empowerment Issues. *World Development*, *27*, 611-627.
- Government of Meghalaya, Finance (PR) Department. (2017). *Modified Assured Career Progression Scheme (MACPS) for the State Government Employees* [Memorandum]. Meghalaya.
- Huey, L. & Ricciardelli, R. (2015). 'This isn't what I signed up for': When police officer role expectations conflict with the realities of general duty police work in remote communities. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, *17*, 194-203.
- Wu, Y., Sun, I. Y., & Cretacci, M. (2009). A Study of Cadets' Motivation to Become Police Officers in China. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, *11*, 377-392.
- Sabat, S. N., & Mishra, S. (2010). Role of women in the management of police organisation: a paradigm shift. *International Journal of Learning and Change*, *4*, 365-377.

## Appendix: Correlation Matrix for Explanatory Variables

	Gender	Community	Education	Marital Status	Family Size	Age	Training	Branch	Stress	Job Satisfaction	Role Ambiguity	Management Attitude	First Option	Promotion Motivation	Stress Cause
Gender	1														
Community	0.170*	1													
Education	0.153	0.226**	1												
Marital Status	-0.222**	-0.023	-0.217**	1											
Family Size	0.125	-0.013	0.041	-0.161*	1										
Age	-0.382***	-0.106	-0.517***	0.340***	0.045	1									
Training	-0.350***	0.028	0.101	0.058	-0.019	0.208**	1								
Branch	0.025	-0.263***	-0.505***	0.193*	-0.115	0.157*	-0.225**	1							
Stress	0.050	-0.047	-0.014	-0.048	0.101	-0.002	-0.0439	0.11	1						
Job Satisfaction	-0.13	-0.008	-0.224**	0.039	-0.007	0.154	0.005	0.220**	-0.334***	1					
Role Ambiguity	0.010	-0.014	0.118	0.016	0.058	-0.131	0.033	0.151	0.390***	-0.448***	1				
Management Attitude	-0.178*	0.053	-0.055	0.164*	0.126	0.211**	0.195*	-0.055	-0.328***	0.464***	-0.373***	1			
First Option	-0.038	0.091	-0.181*	0.033	-0.024	0.196*	0.086	0.163*	-0.104	0.240**	-0.132	0.214**	1		
Promotion Motivation	-0.174*	-0.098	-0.049	0.094	-0.198*	0.032	-0.030	0.050	-0.090	0.102	-0.11	-0.082	0.095	1	
Stress Cause	0.013	-0.068	0.13	-0.212**	0.144	-0.106	0.075	-0.12	0.288***	-0.15	0.049	-0.125	-0.182*	0.005	1

\*p<0.1; \*\*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.01.